

Living learning departs from the knowledges and experiences of those most in need rather than the tip of the iceberg of knowledge producers by creating cooperative, constituent, translocal, self-determined processes of sustainable and egalitarian knowledge-based transformations. [...] In other words, living learning is the radical politicization of everyday life and common knowledges as social spaces of knowledge production.

Lina Dokuzović Struggles for Living Learning

Struggles for Living Learning

Lina Dokuzović

Struggles for Living Learning

Lina Dokuzović

**Struggles for Living Learning:
Within Emergent Knowledge Economies and
the Cognitization of Capital and Movement**

**with a foreword by
Tom Holert**

**transversal texts
transversal.at**

ISBN: 978-3-903046-09-2

transversal texts

transversal texts is text machine and abstract machine at once,
territorium and stream of publication, production site and platform -
the middle of a becoming that never wants to become a publishing house.

transversal explicitly supports copyleft practices.

All contents, both original texts and translations, are subject to the
copyright of their authors and translators, but may be copied and
reproduced by any means for any kind of non-commercial and
non-institutional use and distribution, whether private or public.

This book is available in print or as an EPUB or PDF.

Download: transversal.at

Cover and layout design: Pascale Osterwalder

transversal texts, 2016

eipcp Vienna, Linz, Berlin, London, Zurich

ZVR: 985567206

A-1060 Wien, Gumpendorferstraße 63b

A-4040 Linz, Harruckerstraße 7

contact@eipcp.net

eipcp.net | transversal.at

This book was supported by the BKA: The Arts and Culture Division of
the Federal Chancellery of Austria.

BUNDESKANZLERAMT  ÖSTERREICH

The eipcp is supported by the Department of Culture of the City of
Vienna.

WIEN 
KULTUR

Contents

Preface	11
Foreword by Tom Holert	17
Knowledge: The New Frontier for Crisis Resolution and Creation	23
Part I	
The Increasing Commercialization of Education	27
Chapter 1: From the Commercial Revolution through the Cold War	29
The Superpower Knowledge Race of the Cold War	34
Structural Adjustment and Cognitive Capital	40
Chapter 2: Contemporary Intensive “New Frontiers”	47
The Knowledge Factory	50
Tuition and Debt Creation	53
Spatial and Temporal Transformations in Cognitive Capitalism	56
Autonomy and Austerity	63
Lifelong Learning	68

Chapter 3:	
Contemporary Extensive “New Frontiers”	75
Supranational Knowledge Economy Areas	78
Knowledge Exports	86
International Student “Cash Cows”	90
Porous Frontiers	93
Chapter 4:	
The Cognitivation of Migration	94
Cognitive Factors in Segregating Movement	96
Differential Inclusion through Fees and Debt	100
Spatial, Temporal, and Virtual Regulators	103
Chapter 5:	
The Limits to Capital and New Frontiers	107
Translocal Nodes of Social Agency	112
Part II -	
Emancipatory Grassroots Perspectives	119
Chapter 1:	
Co-research, Self-Education, Co-determination	121
Cooking up Occupations	124
Communication Strategies	126

Chapter 2:	
Documenting Struggles	130
The Academy of Fine Arts Vienna	130
Transnational Expansion of Knowledge-Based Struggles in Europe	143
Transcontinental Solidarity across the Mediterranean	152
The Lokavidya Jan Andolan	163
Challenges and Contradictions for Struggles	178
Chapter 3:	
Living Learning	185
The Contradistinctions between Living Learning and Lifelong Learning	194
Living Learning and Basic Income	198
Chapter 4:	
Points of Contention and Potentiality	201
Divergent Spatiotemporal Universes	205
Conclusion	207
References	212

PREFACE

This preface is a sort of road map for how the topic of this book was chosen, or rather how the research and my involvement in it came to be. It is also a preliminary note on the importance of lived research, as it drew and departed from the various experiences that accompanied my migration to Vienna to continue my studies. That migration was primarily driven by free access to education in the arts. My previous migrations included moving from former Yugoslavia to the USA in the early 1980s, then back to post-war independent Croatia in the mid-1990s, and back to the USA in 1999 to begin my tertiary education. After reaching an impasse in the USA, I moved to Austria and began studying at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna in 2004. That impasse arose due to the difficulties involved in my situation.

Several roadblocks guided my decision where to study. Aside from the grim projections for the youth in Croatia at the time of my decision, the deep corruption that had taken root in the country did not spare the educational system, where bribes and nepotism played an important role in university admissions. The USA was thus the logical alternative. However, being on my own without any financial support meant that the high cost of tuition, books and all other materials involved in higher education forced me to work full-time parallel to full-time study in order to pay my living expenses.

This was despite receiving a Pell Grant¹ and numerous scholarships. Approaching burnout and already developing carpal tunnel symptoms and joint/back problems in my late teens and early twenties, I eventually began looking for international alternatives and realized that many European universities were tuition-free or low cost. That's where this process began.

The Academy of Fine Arts Vienna appealed to me for several reasons, including the fact that Croatian citizens did not have to pay tuition. That changed the semester I began my studies, and from then on I began dealing with a new educational reform and migration-related series of hurdles. I essentially lost my first semester due to visa issues, and entered an old university system I had never experienced before – one of old masters and elitist mutual support rather than bureaucratic hurdles and financial/commercial structures of exclusion. Nevertheless, I believed I had finally begun exactly what I wanted to do, having so much space and freedom to be able to experiment with artistic strategies and critical theories, yet I found myself increasingly isolated in a complex system of structural exclusion that revolved around the university system. I learned more in those early years from the failures and shortcomings of trying to function than from the education itself.

Wanting to continue my education, but realizing that an international system of transferrable degrees was not in place (yet), I still found the Austrian system much more appealing as it offered far more time, flexibility,

¹ US federal financial aid, for which I was eligible for the maximum amount of approximately \$2,000 a year at the time. Most of these forms of support require full-time attendance and a high grade point average.

and resources.² However, following the differential implementation of tuition fees, neoliberal managerial terminology such as “lifelong learning,” “meritocracy,” “third-party investment,” and “knowledge management” increasingly circulated, reminding me of the conditions I left from in the USA. While it had become completely normal to work during one’s studies in the USA, it was not such a common notion across Europe. And my stories of “full-time” study didn’t resound to many locals either, as that type of “modularized” system was not yet (fully) implemented. However challenging as it was to function and finance living with no work permit and very limited work allowance under a student visa in Austria,³ it still seemed like a more promising option than trying to continue past undergraduate studies in the USA. That would have taken much longer and carried the threat of perpetual debt. Therefore, when the topic of knowledge production was proposed in the PCAP ([Post-]Conceptual Art [Practices]) class/study program, in which I studied at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, and a small reading group formed on the subject, I was driven to engage in that process to try and understand the transformations taking place and to find out what could be done with that knowledge. It

2 Ironically, as the Bachelor/Master system has since been implemented across Europe through the Bologna Process reforms, the fantasy of easily transferrable credits is still far from fulfilling its promise. And students have often struggled to profit from the “benefits” advertised by the reforms.

3 Financial aid granted much more money to students in Austria than I had ever encountered elsewhere. However, as a non-EU citizen I had no access to national financial aid or a vast majority of the scholarships and grants available to others. These restrictions will be elaborated in part II of this book.

was during those learning processes, which had resulted from the university but had also transcended university education, that we not only read about radical pedagogies, but began to practice them.

That reading group developed, expanded, merged with others, and incorporated teachers. The urgency of intervening in education reform politics led the participants to a range of actions. After a long process of research, events, and dissemination of information, conflicts with the university President began to escalate in 2009. By this time, those conflicts expanded well beyond the small reading groups and ultimately resulted in the occupation of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna by the vast majority of students and faculty. The news of the occupation spread rapidly during a protest march through Vienna and its universities. This news reached a national level within a few days and linked to and sparked various other university struggles across Europe shortly thereafter. These newly occupied spaces implemented grassroots democratic decision-making practices and experimental pedagogical structures. They provided shelters for the homeless, set up massive communal kitchens, and hosted numerous concerts, performances, and parties. That protest/occupation wave mainly lasted in that form in Europe from late 2008–10.

Those practices had great emancipatory significance. However, major problems arose which are symptomatic of such forms of organization. A critical self-reflection thus became necessary along with the development of historical points of reference, such as documentation and interventions into the historical narrative of the institution, because several months after an action would take place, new people would become involved and be

unaware of previous successes or failures, repeating them in the process. This was also a consequence of the increased student turnover resulting from the reforms. It was crucial that the painful lessons learned from struggles become documented and shared in a way that could be used in the long-term and shared across networks. So, in addition to researching where the restrictive policies and transformations which sparked these processes originated, I also began – often in collaboration with others involved in the protests – to simply document and report the goings-on and to analyze the impact, consequences, and potential deadlocks of what we were involved in.

After graduating, I began a PhD program at the same institution, partly as a way to extend my visa and partly as it made sense to collect my years of research into one document that could potentially intervene into the history-writing of the institution. A few months along, I was invited to join *creating worlds* (2010–12), a research project of the eipcp: European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies.⁴ For the first time my research was funded and I was able to travel extensively, researching and participating in conferences and meetings of activists around knowledge-based struggles. It was within those temporary meeting spaces that the various connections between movements in other institutions, organizations, cities, and parts of the world became evident. Through the knowledge gained in those spaces of exchange, participants could take home and concretely put into practice what they learned from actions in other spaces. It became very clear that such meetings

⁴ <http://eipcp.net/projects/creatingworlds/files/about/>

and forms of communication were crucial. By linking together and identifying that these were not isolated struggles, but rather specific experiences within a context of globalized transformation, movements could become stronger. Those meetings also transcended the space of the university in various ways and helped me to more clearly understand both the processes of transformation in higher education as well as how they influenced my own history of migration. Moreover, all of these collective experiences forced me to rethink the role of the university and to reacknowledge the importance of lived experience, especially for understanding and supporting future struggles.

Just as these struggles have resulted in various independent and co-written articles, collaborative actions, art projects, and my dissertation, I consider this book to be an additional contribution to that process of documenting and reflecting knowledge-based struggles. Furthermore, while such documentation has been important, there has also been a need to seize and reclaim spaces and redistribute resources that are less and less accessible as a result of rising fees and privatization within higher education. This book and many of the actions and theoretical perspectives described and proposed within it, therefore, attempt to challenge and transcend the boundaries developed around the university, the institutionalizations within formal education, the exclusions that have been exacerbated through recent reforms, and the hierarchical categorizations of knowledge by also serving as a contribution to supporting the demands for unconditional inclusion developed by the grassroots knowledge-based struggles described in the following chapters.

FOREWORD

A bold beginning that is both baffling and makes the reader crave more: “Knowledge: The New Frontier for Crisis Resolution and Creation.” At first sight, the title of the introduction to Lina Dokuzović’s engaging study on epistemic violence and epistemic obedience resembles the titles of countless policy papers on structural transformation, premised on the assumption that the hegemonic articulation of knowledge and economy (or information and society) would inevitably entail the advancement of neoliberal capitalism. However, Dokuzović’s title also has double meaning. As much as “knowledge” may be hailed as a medium to solve economic and ecological crisis through combined efforts at educational reform and the reconfiguration of labor by the ideologues of the so-called knowledge-based economy, it can effectively be (re)discovered and (re)used by those who suffer most from the transformations of capitalization, namely neoliberalization, governance, or corporate globalization.

Understood the latter way, the “crisis resolution” and “creation” associated with the über-term “knowledge” could appear, at times, less cynical than empowering. If what Dokuzović calls the “cognitization of capital” is a problem, then it is a problem in need of being conceptualized using Michel Foucault’s method of “problematization.” For to conceive the said “cognitization of capital” as axiomatic of the current political economy on a global scale, it is pertinent to determine the very

genealogy providing the notion's evidence and relevance, that is, to explore the historical and material circumstances that allows it to be thought of as an issue, a question, a problem.

Here one might recall Alfred Sohn-Rethel's assertion, "that the conceptual basis of cognition is logically and historically conditioned by the basic formation of the social synthesis of its epoch."⁵ Putting epistemology in historical materialist terms, as Sohn-Rethel, an early theorist of capital's "cognitization," proposed in his writings from the margins of the Frankfurt School discourse, requires a mode of contextualization close to Dokuzović's project of relating capital's historical process of abstraction to the material consequences of educational and migration politics. If geographical mobility of intellectual labor is one of the rhetorical cornerstones of a neoliberal politics of knowledge, as epitomized in the infamous Bologna Process and other treaties of higher education policy, the obvious problematic that occurs is related to the factual immobilization and exclusion of individuals by means of militarized frontiers, visa bureaucracy, economic selection, neocolonial attitudes or other modes of outright institutional racism. To arrive at a historical materialist theory of knowledge in the age of the pervasive destruction of livelihoods and financialization of the everyday, it appears suitable and necessary to work on the genealogy of its current state of abstraction.

By grounding her study in an account of the educational reprogramming of Western education in the

⁵ Sohn-Rethel, Alfred, (1978), *Intellectual and Manual Labour: A Critique of Epistemology*, London and Basingstoke: MacMillan, p. 7.

course of Cold War politics, Dokuzović provides an important lesson in genealogical problematization, since the contours and the reach of today's capitalism become vividly apparent as the outcome of historical struggles, reforms, and defeats. Among the numerous tangible effects of the commodification, monetization, and marketization of knowledge that followed the reorganization of university compliance with the logic of the enterprise, it is worth mentioning the entanglement of education and gentrification, the disastrous brain drain of the Global South, the proliferating epidemic of student debt, and the multiple restrictions of access to the sphere of education.

From the 1960s onward, a continually expanding new set of terms for communicating the ideology of universities' new role in the knowledge-based economy was manufactured, paralleling the discursive implementation of neoliberal governmentality at large. The "social synthesis" (Sohn-Rethel) of contemporary global capitalism is now partly marked by the tricky, multivalent semantics of terms such as "(lifelong) learning," "performance," "literacy," "responsibility," "mobility," "radical pedagogy," "knowledge production," or "intellectual property." Recoding and activating this vocabulary in a dissident and de-linking fashion could be counted among the key discursive strategies of the contemporary struggles around knowledge and education from which Dokuzović draws her motivation and inspiration.

Taking her cue from – always already translocal – social movements and upheavals that confront the rule of an educational regime based on the administration and marginalization of critical and living intellectual labor, the author relies on experiences as an activist in

the Austrian university struggles of 2009–10 and a participant observer of the Lokavidya Jan Andolan movement of India, among others. The occupation of the main assembly hall at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna from October 2009 onwards, which initiated a number of other occupations in Vienna and elsewhere, had been, to a certain degree, prepared by the students of the PCAP study program at the Academy, who right on time, towards the end of 2009, published the helpful, agitated reader *Intersections: At the Crossroads of the Production of Knowledge, Precarity, Subjugation and the Reconstruction of History, Display, and De-linking* (edited by Dokuzović, Eduard Freudmann, Peter Haselmeyer, and Lisbeth Kovačič). I met Dokuzović at that moment, being employed as a faculty member at the Academy and engaged in the development and implementation of the curriculum of a new program for doctoral studies for visual artists around that time. Due to the occupation and the ensuing discussions, my task of institutionalizing artistic research appeared even more problematic than I was already aware of. I am still grateful for the occupation's critical interventions into my own institutional operations, as the experience considerably radicalized my thinking around issues of art, knowledge, and political economy.

Seven years later, as Dokuzović's research and thinking on the topic of knowledge as the terrain of social and political struggle turns into a book, it makes me wonder to what extent the peculiar complicity of contemporary art's relationship with the knowledge economy, migration management, and educational politics needs to be reconsidered. Interestingly, *Struggles for Living Learning* limits its explicit mention of contemporary art and the

author's own subject position of an artist holding an art degree from the Academy of the Fine Arts Vienna. I take this to be a deliberate gesture of decentering contemporary art's alleged global pervasiveness. Not speaking *about* art, however, does not preclude the possibility that this book is speaking *from* or *alongside* art. At any rate, it opens up the possibility of linking Dokuzović's notion of "struggles for living learning" to struggles of a certain (and certainly minor) avant-gardist faction of contemporary art that searches for a role beyond the disasters of financialized aesthetics and commodified education.

Tom Holert

Berlin, May 1, 2016

KNOWLEDGE: THE NEW FRONTIER FOR CRISIS RESOLUTION AND CREATION

In recent years, institutions of education have been transformed through an upsurge of policies and reforms. While such reforms have historically developed along various trajectories, more recent reforms have chiefly been advanced by two major aims. On the one hand, these reforms support the transformation of economies that have suffered from crisis. For instance, the OECD has declared that: “Knowledge is now recognised as the driver of productivity and economic growth” (1996, p. 3). On the other hand, the production of knowledge and research should tackle the “grand challenges”⁶ of our time posed by globalization – e.g. the energy crisis, limited resources, or climate change – essentially linking it to sustainability policy.

Europe has been at the forefront of these recent processes with agendas that have specifically articulated targets and goals for resolving ecological and economic crises. Some of the key instruments for directing these aims have been the Lisbon Strategy,⁷ the Bologna

⁶ This term has been developed within both US and EU policy agendas, and has seen widespread use in initiatives that seek to use innovation for solving issues of environmental and economic sustainability.

⁷ The Lisbon Strategy was a development plan created in 2000 for making the EU the “most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth” by 2010 (Lisbon European Council 2000, *n. pag.*). It was followed up by the Europe 2020 strategy for another 10-year period starting in March 2010.

Process for establishing the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the Ljubljana Process for developing the European Research Area (ERA), and various other joint study programs, exchange programs, and agendas for creating a “European area of lifelong learning.” These new initiatives have formed what researchers and policy-makers refer to as a “new Renaissance” in Europe, a paradigm shift in society and politics as profound as the transition from agrarian/feudal to industrial society (European Commission 2009a, p. 8). In particular, the realization of an “Innovation Union” (European Commission 2010, p. 3) should support freely moving research and knowledge as cornerstones for sustainable growth.

The goals of the Lisbon Strategy were elaborated in a 2005 policy paper, which states that: “To be a genuinely competitive, knowledge-based economy, Europe must become better at producing knowledge through research, at diffusing it through education and at applying it through innovation,” referring to its own policy scheme as a “knowledge triangle” (Commission of the European Communities 2005, p. 3). Europe’s three-fold strategy is significant for one, because it has created a new model for *intensive* production, including the turnover of wealth, innovation, and growth of emerging forms of immaterial commodities in times of ecological/economic crisis, which will be examined in more detail in chapter two. It has also provided a new space for *extensive* spatial expansion through the emergence of these enclosed knowledge economy areas, which promote maximal mobility inside their respective borders, which will be examined in more detail in chapter three. These developing knowledge economy areas can thus

compete with other (emerging) knowledge economy areas such as the Maghreb or Australia. Europe aims to spearhead these processes by taking the most aggressive approach to reforming higher education and other institutions of knowledge production. And as these new spatial constellations have allowed Europe to transform its approach to filtering access to universities through differential inclusion that extends to its borders, higher education has become inextricably linked to the issue of migration in Europe.

The intensive and extensive transformations of structures and institutions of knowledge production should allegedly provide a new “immaterial” and thus post-industrial, non-resource-based sustainable frontier for capital within the context of material and spatial limits and their related ecological/economic crisis. However, the following chapters maintain that when knowledge is integrated and applied within such paradoxical practices, its emancipatory potential and its potential for just sustainability become diminished. It instead merely introduces new technologies for further displacing crises. This is the main argument of part I of this book. Part II juxtaposes radical grassroots practices in which I was involved that present an entirely different perspective by supporting the notion of immaterial knowledge-based social transformation for socially just change. Because part II was the motivation for this research, it ultimately merges with and contests the material in part I, thereby supporting the gravity of the perspectives in part II all the more.

To this end, the following chapters will outline key markers for how higher education has transformed under the influence of the neoliberalization of capitalism

and the emergence of Postfordist cognitive capitalism. Part I will outline historical processes that primarily focus on transformations taking place within the European knowledge economy. These examples will also extend to cases of how other world regions have been affected by those transformations in Europe, how they have implemented their own reforms for competing with Europe, and how their histories have influenced European knowledge policies. That recent phase of transformations will be introduced through a brief overview of early links between commercialization and higher education in the following section. This will be expanded through an examination of transformations of knowledge production through the Cold War era in order to critically analyze the nature of contemporary reform processes.

PART I
THE INCREASING
COMMERCIALIZATION OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER 1

FROM THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION THROUGH THE COLD WAR

A look at certain processes involved in the emergence of modernity helps to elucidate contemporary transformations of advanced capitalism. And an overview of the historical links between commercial markets and universities assists in an analysis of developments that remain effective today. These links emerged during the Commercial Revolution (Lopez)⁸ and the early era of “archaic globalization” (Bayly 2002, Hopkins 2002)⁹ which signaled the expansion of pre-modern European trade relations beyond the Mediterranean. This era is characterized by the expansion of major marketplaces which served as nodes along trade networks. As they increased in size, these marketplaces led to the emergence of big cities with urbanization and commercialization working hand-in-hand.

These nodes stimulated a commercial economy and led to a shift away from agrarian-based subsistence models of

⁸ Lopez defines the Commercial Revolution as spanning from the economic decline of the Western Roman Empire (5th century A.D.) to the fall of Constantinople (1453). By highlighting the significance of the accomplishments of the Commercial Revolution, Lopez roots the emergence of a commercial economy in Europe in the Middle Ages as opposed to the Industrial Revolution (Lopez 1995, p. 85).

⁹ The term *archaic globalization* was primarily developed by Christopher A. Bayly and Antony G. Hopkins to define pre-modern globalizing events from the earliest civilizations until the period of *proto-globalization* beginning in 1600 (Hopkins 2002b, p. 5).

society to trade-based globalizing models (Lopez 1995, p. 86).¹⁰

Following the expansion of land-based trade routes, the emergence of maritime trade was a decisive development, as it allowed for the transportation of larger quantities of goods and the evasion of various passage taxes on trade routes. However, it came with much greater risks. Storms, unknown routes, pirates, and other hindrances endangered ships and their crews. Military and merchant ships often became one and the same in order to allow defense on commercial voyages (Ibid., p. 100). Consequently, the need for insurance contracts during sea voyages emerged. Thus, during the 13th century, manuals of commerce and complex insurance and loan contracts developed significantly and became prevalent in Europe (Ibid., pp. 72–78; Cantoni and Yuchtman 2012, p. 5). This drafting and translation of important trade documents worked hand-in-hand with the rise of the new European university system (Cantoni & Yuchtman 2012).

The first university, the University of Bologna, was formed in 1088 (Ibid., p. 9). It replaced the Roman Catholic Church school system and developed an approach that prioritized science and research whilst representing Italian national unity (Rüegg 1992, p. 5). A major transformation in the university system took place through the continuous withdrawal of religion from higher education after the Papal Schism of 1378 (Cantoni & Yuchtman 2012). Thereafter, the number of markets and universities increased and market density began to correlate with university proximity in (the

10 This was also prompted by the need for seeking resources elsewhere due to the major crises caused by plagues and famines in Europe in the Middle Ages.

area referred to since modernity as) Germany in the 14th century (Ibid., pp. 4, 19–21). This strong correlation between the rise of the university and the establishment of commercial markets was partly the result of the need for legal training and the drafting and translation of new documents for trade relations (Ibid., pp. 10, 21, 24–25). These developments significantly influenced the role of the university in society.

The transformations resulting from the increase in world trade led to the emergence of modernity, modern nation-states, and proto-capitalism. And the exchange of knowledge, goods, and culture during the Commercial Revolution and archaic globalization supported the development of modern globalization. However, before modern globalization began, early modern or “proto-globalization”¹¹ also paved the way for the development of new methods of scientific inquiry, a mapping of the globe, and the establishment of a dominant Western Eurocentric approach to education that was disseminated to support those processes.

The conquests during the Age of Exploration progressed the purported pursuit of knowledge of the world whilst being a key driving force in enriching and advancing Europe. The knowledge and goods acquired during that time significantly contributed to the advancements that took place during the Renaissance.¹² Those practices of acquisition and conquest led to a vicious competition

11 Hopkins outlines four fluid overlapping categorizations which outline “a truly global history of globalization” rather than merely supporting the notion of the “rise of the West” (Hopkins 2002, p. 2), consisting of: archaic globalization (pre-industrial/pre-modern), proto-globalization (industrializing), modern globalization (industrialized/modern), and post-colonial (1950–present) (Ibid., p. 7).

12 This also applies to the succeeding Industrial Revolution.

between Western European powers for the domination of territories in the “West” and “East Indies,” from which resources could be expropriated for trade. From the 14th to the 16th century, this competition expressed itself in battles at sea. However, as Western European powers gained a stronger grip on outlying territories, the various temporary posts on trade routes became permanent trading posts, and these posts later became colonies. By establishing major colonial strongholds in outlying territories, European powers could stockpile resources and compete with one another on both commercial and military levels on-site in the colonies. This shift from overseas trade to the establishment of formal colonies paved the way for a mode of globalization based on exploitation and unequal divisions of labor and remuneration, rather than the exchange of knowledge and culture of archaic globalization. European colonizers gained immense wealth whilst compensating for limited resources, aiding the recovery from climatic and health disasters such as numerous famines or the Black Death. This enabled the accumulation of a massive surplus unique to preceding eras that lacked a commercial economy capable of handling activities on such a scale. All these factors equipped Western Europe for dominating world trade.

What began as globalized trade developed into colonization. It included a shift from the exchange of cultural and religious knowledge in archaic globalization to the coercive conversion of non-Europeans to commercialization and Christianity in proto-globalization. This happened throughout the colonized world, and (re-)education played a major role in controlling peoples, in developing commercial strongholds, and in “civilizing”

or “developing” the colonized for centuries to come.¹³ So while the role of the university during the following European Enlightenment and modernity – and not least the subsequent Industrial Revolution – was immense, it would not have been possible without notions of “progress” and “development” that became a part of education. It was these notions that marked a new era of thinking and striving for social and political goals during the Commercial Revolution and the transition to proto-globalization that preceded capitalization and modernity.

The onset of European modernity transformed the role of the university in society just as dramatically as it had following the Papal Schism. This took place in 1810 with the establishment of the “Western” model for higher education of the University of Berlin. This “Humboldt model” established the modern university with even greater emphases on the roles of research and the natural sciences, and created the conditions for modern universities to support the wealth of the modern nation-state. It also represented the “spiritual and moral training of the nation” (Lyotard 1984, pp. 32–33 quoted in Massumi 1987, p. xii).¹⁴ This “training” creates a system in which, according to Massumi, “each mind [is] an analogously organized mini-State morally unified in the supermind of the State” (1987, p. xii). This develops the conditions in which links between the state and university can be “endlessly reproduced and disseminated at every level of the social fabric” (Ibid.).

13 E.g. the East India Company’s Secretary of Board Control, Thomas Babbington Macaulay, implemented an education policy that “was deliberately designed to create a new class of ‘... *Indians in blood and colour but English in taste, opinions, morals and intellect*’” (Robins 2002, p. 85).

14 See Massumi’s translator’s foreword to *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987).

The transformations from the first university to the modern university have allowed for an understanding of the “wealth of nations” to undergo a paradigm shift away from the notion proposed by Adam Smith in 1776 regarding land-based resources and population increases.¹⁵ Consequently, the “wealth of nations” began to rely on more qualitative factors, i.e. human capital, thereby signifying a “*new* wealth of nations” (Moulier-Boutang 2011, p. 57; emphasis added). And the transformations of the educational system that emerged with the modern university played a pivotal role in enabling this shift.

The Superpower Knowledge Race of the Cold War

The “new wealth of nations” significantly impacts a nation-state’s prestige at a geopolitical level, and has in many cases been linked to the production of ideologies and propaganda for competition between nations with regard to their “wealth of knowledge.” Such practices reached a zenith during the Cold War when such “techno-national” competition replaced armed warfare. The overlapping competitions of the Space Race, arms race, and what I will refer to here as the “knowledge race” played a crucial role in creating the prestige necessary for supporting the emergence of the USA (and its form of capitalism) as the world superpower during the Cold War. While both of the dominant players, the USA and the USSR, boasted of their geopolitical strength, they already had a monumental advantage in the fact that they

¹⁵ These increases developed with renewed growth following plague-induced population declines. This perspective on growth for prosperity was later contested by Malthus in 1798.

were not typical national constructions but were rather massive unions of numerous smaller states. This gave them increased diversity, mass, populace, and exchange within those spaces. So as the race for world domination shifted away from earlier processes of European nations competing against one another, the ideological battle – still one of “progress” and “development” – became a battle between the two major opposing ideologies that gathered allies from around the world: capitalism and communism. During that time, Europe was devastated after two World Wars. That devastation and the raising of the stakes regarding a potential mutual annihilation of a nuclear war taught the US and Soviet governments a lesson in fruitful competition and “bitter peace,” a lesson which bolstered the Cold War (Sheehan 2007, p. 5).

The leaps in progress and technological development that resulted from Cold War competition were interpreted as signs of the strength of each nation and its respective economy and ideology. This was particularly the case in the Space Race. The Space Race began with the launch of Sputnik, the world’s first artificial satellite, by the USSR in October 1957 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution (Ibid., p. 26). The significance of that date certainly represented an ideological war between socialism and capitalism. However, it was also part of a string of events in a real competition of knowledge and technologies for advancing technological nationalism. This consisted of nations gaining dominance and political as well as economic power through the perpetuation of ideological notions regarding access to technologies and knowledge as well as subsequent prestige and power (Ibid., p. 9; Edgerton, 2007 p. 1).

The USA reacted to the Sputnik launch by transforming the small National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) into the state-of-the-art National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in 1958, and by radically restructuring education funding through the National Defense and Education Act (NDEA) in 1958. The NDEA thus supported the Space Race with an international knowledge race.¹⁶ Subsequently, in the years following the launch of Sputnik, the USA “was supporting a research enterprise of unprecedented size” (Rudolph 2003, p. 72).

The NDEA was designed to boost education at all levels through a shift in funding programs that allowed for universal legislation with respect to student loans, fellowships, and vocational programs for supporting the development of science and technology, because “[i]n the years following World War II, science and technology (S&T) had become key measures of a nation’s military prowess and international strength” (Bandeh-Ahmadi et al. 2007, p. I-1).¹⁷ The NDEA transferred formerly state and local legislation on education funding to entirely federal decision-making. This radical shift – whilst avoiding federal control of education on a broader scale – provided funding at all levels and allowed reforms to be implemented in all parts of the country. That shift in legislation was thus intended to remedy the “emergency” or crisis in education with “an emergency undertaking” (Eisenhower

16 According to Michael Sheehan, the impact of space exploration is also strongly felt regarding its expansive influence on various industries and the economy (2007, p. 18). Thus, its spillover effect not only multiplies military force, but it also acts as a “multiplier” in other areas including knowledge production.

17 To this end, John F. Kennedy even “promis[ed] to push America to a ‘new frontier’ of scientific achievement” (Sheehan 2007, p. 41).

1958).¹⁸ As education was originally the responsibility of state, local, and private sector domains in the USA, federal administration before the NDEA had only covered “emergency aid” interventions for supplementing state and local limitations. The NDEA, along with the increased number of youths following the post-WWII baby boom, led to a massive increase in college enrollment from the 1950s to the 1970s (Bandeh-Ahmadi et al. 2007, p. I-2).¹⁹ The post-WWII golden age of the US economy was thus “substantially fueled” by the increased access to education resulting from the development of funding programs (Chomsky 2011, *n. pag.*).

While the NDEA supported an increase in education across the board, socialist states also held education in a very high position for general productivity and for fueling the “wealth of nations.” States such as the USSR, China, India, or Yugoslavia placed special emphasis on the role of education for strengthening and securing their futures.²⁰ This perspective merely stimulated US reforms even more, causing them to take on a competitive edge against socialist agendas.

18 <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=11211>

19 The “development of mass education” or “diffuse intellectuality” of the new workforce (Vercellone 2005, p. 7) was initially supported by the G.I. Bill which provided low-cost education for returning veterans, leading to a massive increase in university graduates and a “dismantling of the working class” (Caffentzis 1975, p. 130).

20 This opinion and use of education for national competition was shared in the Western European space as well with individual nations such as West Germany leading radical new post-war reforms. Marion von Osten elaborates the belief that the “‘utilization of unutilized educational reserves’ was the only possibility not to fall back behind the Eastern Bloc in the competition for scientific innovation,” following Georg Picht’s declaration of the “‘German education disaster’” in 1964, which led to transforming “‘education of an elite to the education of the masses’” (2009, p. 40).

In the postwar years, higher education was conceived as a massive national mobilization. [...] It adopted a modified socialism, like a vaccine assimilating a weaker strain of communism in order to immunize against it. Although there was a liberal belief in the sanctity of the individual, the unifying aim was the social good: to produce the engineers, scientists, and even humanists who would strengthen the country (Williams 2009, pp. 91–92).

This “vaccination” ultimately led to a restructuring of the workforce, the labor market, and class divisions, both immediately after WWII as well as in the following decades (Caffentzis 1975, p. 132). The NDEA also provided the basis for many current financial aid programs by establishing “a broad acceptance of student loans as a method of financing postsecondary schooling” (Bandeh-Ahmadi et al. 2007 p. II-5). It also established more complex new systems for monitoring outcomes and educational statistics (Public Law 85–864 1958, p. 1605).

As the USA rose to become the world superpower during the Cold War, various financial instruments were introduced through the Bretton Woods system in order to support Europe’s recovery from WWII.²¹ The supra-national financial organs that emerged from the Bretton Woods system, the International Monetary Fund (IMF)

21 The Bretton Woods agreement, signed at the UN Monetary and Financial Conference in New Hampshire in July 1944, aimed to strengthen an international economic system after WWII along with the Marshall Plan. While many theorists predicted the fall of capitalism in the 1930s and 1940s, the post-WWII years brought a radical transformation in global capitalism that renewed its strength and shifted power relations. The USA was thereby able to secure its position at the top of a capitalist hierarchy, above borrower or “developing” nations.

and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (later the World Bank), supported the advancement of capitalization through the expansive restructuring of “developing” or non-aligned states and the emergence of new governance models in the following decades.

Despite the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1971, the institutions it bore remained, and the aid policies it established became Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs).²² SAPs are IMF and World Bank loan conditions for “developing” nations.²³ They create conditions for states to become more market-oriented and are primarily regulated through fiscal discipline (Koester et al. 1990, p. 8), purportedly enabling a smoother system for benefiting from free market structures.²⁴

22 SAPs were primarily implemented in the Global South, with early experiments taking place in Latin America (e.g. Chile, where Chicago School economists used principles of (neo-)liberalization and complete structural reform to influence a political coup in 1973 which was funded by the US Central Intelligence Agency [Klein 2007, p. 7]).

23 The ranking of a nation based on its level of “development” emerged as the ideological component of the post-war economic intervention led by the USA and the Bretton Woods financial organs. This perspective substantiated the notion that “development” can be defined and ranked along a fixed definition of access to global capitalism, advanced technologies, and the level of industrialization. A nation’s position on this scale, which assumes that all peoples and nations require the same “development” process, thus defines the level of financial (as well as political, military, or cultural) intervention “necessary” to reach a universal level of being “developed” (Escobar 1995, p. 15).

24 Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, these conditions have been referred to as the “Washington Consensus,” a term coined in 1989 by John Williamson for a set of common issues which represented a general consensus among policy makers. Those ten policies consisted of *fiscal discipline, reordering public expenditures, tax reform, liberalizing interest rates, creating a competitive exchange rate, trade liberalization, liberalization of inward foreign direct investment, privatization, deregulation, and providing property rights* (Williamson 2004, pp. 3–4).

SAPs were originally developed as a reaction to three major crises that had been mounting since the 1970s: the oil crisis, the debt crisis, and the economic recession / stagflation (Adepoju 1993, *n. pag.*). Major objectives of the SAPs have been the reform and increased privatization of education, healthcare, transportation, employment, and even land and water.

Structural Adjustment and Cognitive Capital

The conditions of SAPs, such as austerity cuts or the reduction of public expenditures, privatization, or focusing on direct export, and resource extraction, were created to allow an increase in foreign investment. However, they have in many cases led to a dependency on other national and supranational lending institutions, displacement of communities due to resource expropriation or land grabbing, and structural incapacity to pay off loans. These processes set in motion by SAPs dismantled public (and common) structures, institutions, and amenities across the board, and education has been a central target in the implementation of SAPs.

The book, *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (2000) (Eds. Alidou, Caffentzis, & Federici), advances a pivotal analysis of SAPs in the context of African education from the mid-1980s through the 1990s. The authors maintain that the role of the university is crucial in order to understand SAPs in general, and they claim moreover that an analysis of the African situation is critical for understanding contemporary transformations

taking place in higher education abroad, including the US and Europe.²⁵

Education played a key role in rebuilding postcolonial states in Africa (Alidou et al. 2000). Restructuring the education system was a key priority in many postcolonial nations – capitalist, socialist, or non-aligned – as a method of advancing the nation on all levels. The President of the National Union of Ghanaian Students thus states that: “Independence is meaningless and will elude us if it is not linked to our right to free education” (quoted in Federici 2000c, p. 87). Correspondingly, a wide range of professional and vocational subjects were supported in Africa, from physics to masonry (Johnson 1935, p. 1 cited in Alidou 2000a, p. 28). Furthermore, mass education was supported as the road for preparing Africa to understand all of the transformations taking place during decolonization (Ayu 1986, pp. 70–71 cited in Federici 2000c, p. 90), and for creating a more democratic university with less focus on building elites. University movements also played important roles in the anti-colonial struggle in all of Africa (Federici 2000c, p. 90). Participants of the student movements took over jobs left by colonial expatriates, addressed the masses on social change, strengthened national identity, and paved

25 By outlining World Bank and IMF policy papers, the editors focus on the role of the debt and extermination processes set in motion through SAPs and thus shift the primary blame away from the figure of the corrupt African state. This is a careful analysis, however, because the corruption of the state was precisely the logic by which so many SAPs were adopted, as policy-makers argued that the privatization and liberalization of education and curricula would “protect” students by driving out state oppression. Ironically, however, those oppressive state departments and officials received increased funding while the programs for education were drastically cut.

the way for a new independent economic future (Ibid., p. 91). However, SAPs put an end to the goals of independence, “when the expansion of education was demanded by all the social forces as a crucial condition for social and economic progress” (Carnoy & Samoff 1990 cited in Federici 2000b, p. 62). Alidou et al. see this attack on education as “part of a broader attack on the place of Africa in the International Division of Labor, on the value of African workers, and on the capacity of Africans to achieve self-determination, the still unrealized goal of the anti-colonial struggle” (Alidou et al. 2000, p. xiii). They argue further that SAPs are a “concerted attack on *all* public entitlements and worker’s rights – from health care, to land use, food, transportation, employment – that has plunged Africans into a state of poverty unprecedented since the end of colonialism and, in some respects, worse than anything ever witnessed during the colonial period” (Ibid., p. xiv).

Moreover, the implementation of SAPs in African nations was in many cases reinforced through repressive forces that attempted to brutally stamp out student activism and self-empowerment. Consequently, the promises of economic independence and social mobility that accompanied higher education in the past began to become obsolete in a new system that instead promoted emigration and lifelong debt. This change has taken place through the radical segregation and vocationalization – that is, the reduction of educational programs to solely cater to vocational training – of higher education by SAPs. Silvia Federici outlines this process as beginning with an attack on the autonomy of intellectual production, which takes place through budget cuts at universities that allow international agencies to

forcefully intervene and modify universities as they see fit (2000d, p. 20). She outlines a process underway since the 1980s in which budgets are cut, staff is laid off and replaced with foreign staff, and ever-rising tuition fees drive out “excess” students. This affects the survival of departments that have to search for and satisfy foreign donors to exist, adapting their content and curricula as a result. Students thus rely on loans, seen as strategies to “borrow on future earnings” (Caffentzis 2000a, p. 7). However, those eligible for such loans compose a narrow margin of applicants, such that the loan programs lead to financial segregation that helps to construct a small, affluent elite. According to SAP documentation, all of this composes “excellence” and should lead to the formation of “programs or centers of excellence” (Ibid.). These programs thus “capture the elite” and train them to manage the relations between international finance and the state (Federici 2000b, p. 66).

On the other end of the spectrum of segregation, however, are programs that support a vocationalization of Africa’s youth. George Caffentzis asserts that this follows the claim (from e.g. documents of the World Bank) that “no serious socio-economic knowledge is presently being produced in Africa, or can be produced without the sustained intervention, direction and guidance provided by foreign agencies” (2000b, p. 70). Alidou clarifies the logic of vocationalization reforms with the World Bank and IMF’s claims that Africa “lacks both intellectual and technological capacity to sustain higher education” (Alidou 2000b, p. 39). She asserts that SAPs support this reasoning by bringing in foreign workers to take over management and to “identify” local needs. Alidou refers to this policy as racist and colonial,

because it assumes that African youths are not capable of abstract thought beyond unskilled labor (2000a, pp. 28–29). However, she expands the ulterior motives of such a pretense, stating that: “In reality, this ideology masked the fact that the entire colonial enterprise depended on the exploitation of African labor and mineral resources, and that vocational education was considered necessary from the viewpoint of British capitalist/imperial interests because it was expected to produce skilled laborers” (Ibid., p. 29).

This segregation in higher education has forced many youths to emigrate to other parts of the world, often bound to unskilled or illegal labor. At the other extreme, those who manage to invest in education and gain employment find positions as technocrats that support the reproduction of the same system. The teachers that were employed at universities for years, who can no longer finance basic subsistence after austerity measures or since their replacement by foreign expatriates, have also either taken on extra non-professional jobs locally or have been forced to emigrate. Thus, another result of SAPs with respect to knowledge production has been a major transfer of cognitive capital from Africa to advanced capitalist nations, causing an “unprecedented brain drain” (Federici 2000b, p. 65). This brain drain and Alidou’s claim in the previous paragraph of vocationalization of education as a necessary part of the colonial project constitute two extremes of segregated education in contemporary processes of increasing the “new wealth of nations.” The “missing middle” between vocationalization and brain drain has been filled with “on-the-job training” and low-paid or unpaid internships that cater to the private sector and which displace costs

to other areas outside of education (Caffentzis 2000a, p. 7). Caffentzis thus concludes that these processes assign Africa's workforce to long-term unskilled labor with no need for higher education – the racist argument – on the one hand, and suppress resistance and oppositional thought, on the other.

Federici elucidates the grim backdrop of SAPs, referencing the economic historian Jerker Carlsson's report, "The Future of the African University," in which he suggests the policy perspective of "phasing out the university [in Africa] 'as an institution that is perhaps outdated'" (2000a, p. 84). This perspective also instrumentalizes demands for preserving "traditional knowledges" by supporting them as a *no cost alternative*, seen as not interfering in the commodification of education (Ibid., p. 86). Federici thus argues that SAPs end both free education and higher education in areas where a concerted effort is being made to devalue labor. These processes condemn spaces impacted by SAPs to exporting/expelling their cognitive capital, thereby remaining areas of resource extraction, rather than spaces that can support renewable, stable, and independent growth. Or, as the FCSG (Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth) paper so eloquently asserts against the backdrop of expansive global knowledge economy development, "the continent is unable to prepare itself to take advantage of the expanding frontiers of knowledge" (1991, p. 18 quoted in Caffentzis 2000a, p. 15).

Resistance to these transformations is met with the extreme brutality of permanent police and military occupations of universities. In this context, nations pose as watchdogs for foreign investors, thereby identifying transformations of the role of nations in structures of

new governance. Education is reduced to basic literacy – as in the colonial era – and the “intellectual re-colonization” refers to a control of what is researched, studied, or expressed by supranational foreign agencies to those lucky enough to access elite privatized education (Federici 2000d, p. 19). The subsequent vocationization and demonetarization contribute to the production and maintenance of the lowest-cost workforce on the planet, which supports competitiveness on the international market, and thus attracts increased foreign investment (Caffentzis 2000a, p. 10). This cheap labor also produces an additional avenue for higher returns to foreign investors.

Consequently, education, originally regarded as the foundation for reproducing a stable, independent nation, now provides a precarious situation laden with dependence, and met with debt, emigration, or reproducing the very system of SAPs. Federici summarizes this process, stating:

Thus, in many ways, the battle that students are fighting – even when they are confronting the state on “bread and butter” issues such as housing, food, book and transport allowances – is a continuation of the battle for African self-determination. But today it is a battle that brings them directly in conflict with the international power structure, as represented by the World Bank, the IMF, and the panoply of agencies through which the ex-colonial powers and the US are trying to assert their rights to Africa’s resources (2000c, p. 95).

SAPs – which emerged in reaction to various crises – were developed to remedy a “crisis in education” (as did the NDEA). However, there are two distinct narratives of this crisis. For one, lending institutions claimed that

SAPs were a necessary intervention for curing an existing crisis. On the other hand, teachers, students, and others in educational institutions experienced the SAPs as a major crisis in themselves.

The SAP-driven experiments in privatizing and radically transforming education in “developing” nations have in many ways provided a model for recent transformations in higher education in “developed” nations. Caffentzis thus emphasizes the importance of the experiences of SAPs for understanding contemporary transformations in education in the USA and Europe. The relevance of these experiences for analyzing more recent transformations in “developed” world regions will play a major role in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEMPORARY INTENSIVE

“NEW FRONTIERS”

The early 1970s were a time of various overlapping economic and political transformations with the emergence of Postfordist modes of production, the expansion of new governance models, and the coming development of neoliberalism. These transformations were the result of the aforementioned mounting resource-based and financial crises, as well as various socially induced “crises” that challenged the capitalist order. The mass wave of protests during and in the wake of 1968 prompted transformations of capitalism just as much as economic crises had. These included issues such as women’s rights, civil rights, peasant and land struggles, the war in Vietnam, expansive socialist and communist movements,

anti-dictatorship and anti-colonial struggles, general strikes, widespread occupations, ecology, nuclear energy, and free education among others. These movements were related not least to a rise in critical thinking that was influenced by the greater population of educated youths following the post-WWII baby boom and the increased access to higher education of previous decades.

All of these factors led to a major crisis of Fordism, which spurred what Luc Boltanski and Éve Chiapello dub the “new spirit” of capitalism; a capitalism defined by a divergence from Taylorist and Fordist modes of production to more globalized, higher-skilled, and complex technologies of production that rely on a greater flexibility of workers (2005, p. 19). That “new spirit” developed as the result of demands for greater “autonomy and self-management, and the promise of an unbounded liberation of human creativity” (Ibid., p. 170). Those demands emerged as reactions to authoritarian hierarchies, on the one hand, and the explosive access to education, on the other. Those processes were additionally accelerated by the oil crisis and recession of the mid-1970s (Ibid., p. 185), and were intertwined with “globalization, the opening of markets, the growing strength of the newly industrializing countries, new technologies, changes in consumer habits, diversification of demand, [and] increasing rapidity of the life-cycle of products” (Ibid., p. 195).

A key component within the transformations of advanced capitalist societies during the 1970s was the Digital Revolution. The development of new media technologies catalyzed an increase in the networking of people, industry, transportation, capital, goods, and services which created a tighter interconnectedness be-

tween industry and finance as well as between people, the media, and new forms of communication. These developments led to the formation of information societies which place information at the center of political, economic, and cultural growth (Crawford 1983). Yann Moulier-Boutang defines this “total paradigm shift, comparable only to the expansion of the world that took place between 1492 and 1660” (2011, p. 48), as a “third phase” of capitalism (2011).²⁶ This position diverges from Enzo Rullani’s claims that we are not necessarily entering a new era in which knowledge is the central economic factor, but have rather been shifting towards more complex applications of knowledge in the economy that have been developing since the emergence of the Industrial Revolution and modernity (2011, p. 12). Moulier-Boutang instead points to the rise of digital technologies and the consequent emergence of cognitive capitalism as creating a radically new transformation of capitalism by means of the production of value through knowledge, culture, and immaterial labor.²⁷

Critical analyses of cognitive capitalism and Postfordism place an emphasis on immaterial labor, service, precarious labor, the isolation of workers, new forms of biopolitical exploitation and regulation of labor, a standardization of specialized labor, flexible work, and

26 Moulier-Boutang defines the “first type” of capitalism as slavery-driven mercantilist capitalism and the “second type” as industrial capitalism driven by manual labor, raw materials, and based on the Mancunian factory (2011, pp. 9, 47–48).

27 Postfordism’s proclivity for producing information, experiences, and relations rather than material objects which produce and reproduce the “informational and cultural content of the commodity” (Lazzarato 1996, p. 133).

the “feminization” of labor.²⁸ These transformations are also linked to an increased diffusion of finance and capital and deregulated corporate globalization through new governance structures. The shift away from modern nation-state regulation of economic activities to supra-national financial intervention that followed the establishment of the Bretton Woods financial institutions has expanded to intervening into how neoliberal capitalism and its principal institutions of reproduction, such as educational institutions, function.

The Knowledge Factory²⁹

In order to meet the demands of the economic, political, and social transformations of an emerging Postfordist information society, education has changed significantly. These transformations have been driven by complex reform processes that focus on making education more profitable, focused, and faster, thereby transforming it

28 “[T]he mass entry of women in the labor market, but first of all to the becoming productive of the relations, affection, care attitudes, once confined in the reproductive sphere and historically determined as feminine” (Roggero 2007, *n. pag.*). J. K. Gibson-Graham claim that a feminization of the job market began during the post-WWII boom (2006, p. 47), whereas Mezzadra and Neilson claim that it is “an outcome of women’s struggles for emancipation and an effect of a more general diversification and heterogenization of the workforce” (2013, p. 104).

29 The immediate productivity that takes place within the university before students are able to apply their knowledge in the workforce defines the notion of the “factory of knowledge” (Aronowitz 2000). For an alternative analysis of the factory of knowledge from a Deleuzo-Guattarian perspective, i.e. regarding its *detrterritorialization* and *reterritorialization* beyond the space of the traditional factory, see Raunig (2013, pp. 17–28).

into a commodity itself. Educational institutions have in many cases adopted private sector managerial techniques such as streamlining, benchmarking, and standardization. They increasingly emulate corporate institutions in attempts to acquire funding following a widespread departure of state subsidization and the introduction of disciplinary actions such as cutbacks and austerity measures.

Bill Readings's *The University in Ruins* (1996) analyzes the processes of transition of the university from an institution of the nation-state to an institution of postmodern or rather "posthistorical" corporate bureaucracy.³⁰ Readings claims that "the University is becoming a transnational bureaucratic corporation, either tied to transnational instances of government such as the European Union or functioning independently, by analogy with a transnational corporation" (1996, p. 3). The processes of corporate restructuring of universities have included the integration of advisory boards and other executive committees. They have also adopted corporate models of "ranking," which encourage universities to compete with one another. Universities consequently adjust their internal policies to the standards for which ranking institutions have created a market. One such criterion for these rankings is the number of rejected student applications, i.e., the more students rejected, the more exclusive and upscale an institution is regarded to be (Mills 2012, *n. pag.*). High rankings are desirable for universities, as they ensure prestige and thus higher profitability. Readings examines the terms that influence

30 Readings employs the latter term, emphasizing that rather than a smooth shift from modern to postmodern universities, "posthistorical" implies that the university has "outlived itself" and continues to exist despite these transformations (1996, p. 6).

these rankings such as “excellence” or “quality” as guidelines and indicators for consumer outputs/products (1996, p. 22). Through this commercial logic, “non-excellent” departments can be regarded as dispensable and can be eliminated. In this way, the logic of meritocracy has become increasingly imposed in higher education.

At the same time, universities experience greater and greater intervention from the private sector. In other words, university boards that have begun to emulate corporate boards now also consist of shareholders and donors taking decision-making roles on those boards. Thus, the university is also increasingly being run by corporate interests, which act as shareholders in the educational enterprise. Within this context, “success,” “excellence,” and “quality” are determined by the quantification of market-related factors such as private partnerships, donor funding, fundraising programs, and third-party investment. And notions such as “adding value” to students have become prevalent as strategies for raising test scores and negotiating teachers’ salaries (Foster 2011, *n. pag.*). This leaves students in a dual role of consumer and producer, afraid of losing their positions at institutions of education. Students thus become self-disciplined to fervently promote themselves as prime candidates for employment, and can also become increasingly apolitical for fear of the risk associated with protest (Bell 1976 cited in Dyer-Witheford 2005, p. 82). Edu-factory³¹ thus claims that:

31 Edu-factory began in 2006 as a transnational mailing list, discussion platform, and online archive, and was centered around university transformations, knowledge production, and the publication of analyses and statements of protests, conflicts, and actions in institutions of knowledge production.

As was the factory, so now is the university. Where once the factory was a paradigmatic site of struggle between workers and capitalists, so now the university is a key space of conflict, where the ownership of knowledge, the reproduction of the labor force, and the creation of social and cultural stratifications are all at stake. This is to say the university is not just another institution subject to sovereign and governmental controls, but a crucial site in which wider social struggles are won and lost (Caffentzis & Federici 2009, p. 125).

This does not mean that knowledge production has replaced factory-based labor by any means. However, it signifies an important shift taking place in advanced capitalist Postfordist societies with regard to the most advanced form of capitalist production. It also includes a shift in the various forms of reterritorialization of conflict and struggle to areas including the university, but also, well beyond it.

Tuition and Debt Creation

The imposition of neoliberal logic into schools has been accompanied by tuition increases and the consequent creation of student debt. Tuition is a phenomenon that emerged at different times in recent decades in different parts of the world. For example, tuition fees in the USA began to rise with the expansion of higher education after WWII, and have increased significantly since the 1980s (Lazerson 1998, pp. 68, 74). Tuition fees were introduced in the UK in the 1990s (Alley & Smith 2004, *n. pag.*), and more recently (from the 1990s) in most other European countries. The deregulation of tuition

has followed in many countries in recent years. Deregulation can cause tuition to skyrocket, forcing students to rely on student loans, on the one hand. It can also result in the financial and class segregation of applicants due to the filtering role that rising fees take on, on the other. A major cause for tuition deregulation has been the systematic removal of public funding from universities. Such unlimited tuition increases lead to “a regression to a world of special privilege in which one must inherit wealth in order to avoid debt and job dependency” (Hudson 2012 quoted in Giroux 2013, *n. pag.*).

Morgan Adamson refers to mounting student debt since the 1970s as a “new regime” involved in constructing the “post-modern university” (2009, p. 97). This “new regime” emerged with the expansion of the international credit system that followed the decline of the Bretton Woods system (*Ibid.*, p. 100). That expansion was accelerated by the widespread public disinvestment that followed the recession, crises, and economic stagnation of the 1970s. In the situation that resulted, universities were made to bear the brunt of the sweeping deficits through, for instance, increased public disinvestment (Foster 2011, *n. pag.*). Caffentzis summarizes the dynamics of this transformation, drawing a link between the financialization of education and the cognitivization of capital: “The overarching goal of capital with respect to student loan debt is to shift the costs of socially necessary education to the workers themselves at a time when a world market for cognitive labor-power is forming and a tremendous competition is already developing between workers” (2011, p. 35).

With the costs of university education transferred onto students, student debt amounted to one trillion

dollars in the USA in 2012 (Louis 2013, *n. pag.*), surpassing car loans as well credit card debt that year (de Vise 2012, *n. pag.*). Furthermore, while debtors in the USA have the right to declare bankruptcy as a legal declaration of inability to pay outstanding debts, this right has been denied for student debt. Student debt has thereby created a new classification of debtor. Caffentzis thus maintains that student debtors must be regarded differently than private consumer debtors in order not to “misrepresent their content, making invisible their class dimension and the potential allies in the struggle against them” (Caffentzis 2011, p. 35).

Some of the indirect effects of student debt include the depoliticization of student life, as students often have to work several jobs while studying or, in an attempt to reduce their time to completion, pile on as many credits as possible into shorter time periods to avoid greater fees. Adamson thus describes the contrast relation between the revolutionary student movements of the late 1960s and the compounding indebtedness over the following years of the subsequent era as a “revolution in reverse” (2009, p. 105). This “reversal” occurs as debt captures the time of study as well as the debtor’s future by making an investment in one’s potential productive activity (Ibid.). At the other extreme, however, many of the consequences of student debt remain invisible, including drop out, exile, or suicide (Caffentzis 2011, p. 33).

Ironically, these grim scenarios have attracted investors by creating a new market for investment in student debt. Investors such as hedge fund managers are now able to invest in or speculate on debt and turn a profit: such investors first buy student debt from private loans and

then sell or trade the debt assets among other investors. This is referred to as *securitization*, and “has made it possible to *transform* debt into tradable securities on the financial market” (Lazzarato 2012, p. 23; emphasis added). As this new financialized area has emerged for investment in the face of financial crisis, investors’ losses have been compensated with new gains from the field of education at the cost of and increasing losses of students.³² In other words, financial crisis has been displaced to the new frontiers of knowledge, therefore, not actually remedying the root of the interrelated crises but transferring the burden to the most vulnerable parts of the affected population.

Spatial and Temporal Transformations in Cognitive Capitalism

The reorganization of institutions of knowledge production for becoming more profit and market-oriented has also relied on spatial and temporal restructuring, as these factors have played a major role in recent transformations of global capitalism. Some spatial transformations consist of spaces within institutions of education

³² Furthermore, many universities have themselves either become bankrupt or shut down as a result of speculation and the various financial structures involved in an increased reliance on banks. In the case of the University of Amsterdam complex links between a shift from public ownership to university ownership of their real estate, and the subsequent disinvestment and autonomization, has led to complex financial schemes and speculation to the degree that projects, departments, and courses have been cut just to finance a debt that fluctuates with real estate bubbles and the depreciation of property values (Engelen et al. 2014).

becoming more limited, on the one hand. For instance, more and more university halls are rented out to private interests to compensate for public disinvestment. On the other hand, vast complex spatial reconstructions are taking place on a global level. The latter will be the focus of chapter three, which will deal with extensive transformations of knowledge-based economic restructuring. The element of time has, however, had more visible transformations on an intensive level.

Today, temporal and spatial processes work hand-in-hand. Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson assert, with regard to recent transformations in global capitalism, that the “extensive” spatial axis of change has been complemented by the interrelated “‘intensive’ expansion” of time (2013, p. 68). This complementation takes place in a way that transforms time by intensifying it. In other words, while modernity was heavily driven by spatial expansion, postmodernity has been forced to adapt to spatial limitations by speeding up industry and production.³³ Carlo Vercellone takes his analysis of the role of time in Postfordist labor paradigms one step further. By anchoring the role of time in the factory system of Fordism, claiming that time was a central force in the control of labor that developed with increased industrialization, he exposes the complex roles of the integration of all living times introduced by the “mutation of work” in Postfordism (Vercellone 2005, p. 6). He thus relates this shift to the integration of knowledge in labor processes, calling this a “historical passage from the time-value of labour to *knowledge-value*” (Vercellone 2007, p. 30; emphasis added).

33 This is what David Harvey refers to as “time-space compression” (1992, pp. 141, 240).

These processes of compressing space and time through the speeding up of programs, exams, and graduation are manifested in and constituted by institutions of knowledge production. Such practices result in increased student turnover, thus allowing an increase in profits through tuition and other fees produced by a larger number of students investing in universities. This acceleration of education follows the logic of “just-in-time production”³⁴ by eliminating “excess” time and “waste,” allowing greater turnover. Consequently, however, the mass “democratization” of speedy open admissions – i.e. the replacement of ivory tower models of exclusion with barriers of tuition which purportedly allow access to universities to everyone who can access a student loan – creates new forms of financial segregation. Caffentzis thus maintains that with open admissions policies “income turns to be the new divider” (1975, p. 139).

The acceleration of studies is also linked to various disciplinary financial instruments.³⁵ This is relevant in the context of increased modularization of study programs, as many universities now charge fees based on credits from individual courses as individual units of sellable knowledge. At an institutional level, this leads to different departments producing varying amounts of

34 *Just-in-time* is a production model developed in Japan in the 1950s by Taiichi Ohno for maximizing production at Toyota. Through tight management structures it aims to eradicate the necessity for storing inventory (Mito & Ohno 1988).

35 E.g. many universities in the USA have a maximum number of allowed absences in a given course before a student is forcefully withdrawn, losing their invested tuition fees. Unexcused or undocumented problems such as a flat tire, problems on the job, familial issues, etc. can cause a student to lose money and be penalized on their academic record.

profit from their students, on the one hand. On the other hand, students have to keep a keen eye on not slipping in multiple areas at the same time, e.g. keeping up grades, maintaining attendance, paying different amounts, etc.

This modularization also takes place through the stratification of an increased number of degree levels.³⁶ Purportedly, this stratification exists in order to provide a more flexible system for students who are unsure of what they want to study, who wish to change their major in the middle of their studies, or who want to settle for a more vocational degree for direct employment (Egger-Subotitsch et al. 2010, pp. 11–15). It should also facilitate the goal of supporting international mobility through the implementation of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) in states where the Bologna Process was implemented (Ibid., p. 6). These tendencies, which have become widespread in Europe through the Bologna Process, were progressively implemented from 1999–2010, and have adopted structures (similar to those in the USA and UK) for allegedly making the university systems more compatible (Ibid., p. 29).

Similar models have also been exported to other parts of the world. Such examples can in some cases more

³⁶ E.g. the Bologna Process reforms in Europe have stratified university programs – that were rewarded a diploma, magister, or similar degrees for (typically) four-year programs on a master’s degree level – into two tiers with the bachelor/master system. In Austria, the *magister* or *diplom* generally lasted (a recommended minimum of) four years, where the two new tiers, bachelor and master, require five–seven for a master’s degree of equivalent recognition to the *diplom* or *magister* that they “upgraded” (Egger-Subotitsch et al. 2010, pp. 7, 10–11).

clearly expose the structure of those processes due to the more extreme transformations involved. For example, while conducting interviews in Delhi, India in December 2011, I was informed of a similar two-tiered structure inspired by the Bologna Process that was introduced there as “semesterization.” This model came bundled with a new mode of regulation called “internal assessment.” Students have subsequently been graded on attendance, which radically limits their extracurricular activities and also filters out those students who must work on the side to finance their studies. Semesterization has also led to greater competition among students and an increase in plagiarism, according to teachers interviewed at Delhi University (DU).³⁷ Furthermore, interviewees claimed that the times and resources for study have been radically reduced. The teachers interviewed thus claimed that it marked “a fundamental break in the democratic functioning of the university” (NSI 2011b).³⁸ They additionally explained how semesterization, which brought an increase in assessment through not only annual exams but mid-terms and various other quarterly evaluations, also introduced the ordinance for wielding “emergency powers.”

These emergency powers can be used to spontaneously intervene or modify structures that are unproductive with respect to the overall goals of the program. The first implementation of these powers significantly

37 This material is from an interview I conducted with a group of teachers and students on 26 Nov. 2011, involved in the New Socialist Initiative (NSI), who are actively involved in contesting university reforms that have led to a stronger commodification of education at DU and across India: <http://nsi-delhi.blogspot.com/>

38 See previous footnote.

reduced the consultations with faculty and students on decision-making, and was thus described by them as “a return to colonial forms of repression in education” (Ibid.). A breaking up of times has also led to the breaking up of spaces at DU. And now that there are a greater number of students investing into the university,³⁹ departments have increasingly been broken up into different campuses. Many of these are at the outskirts of the city and “correspond” to the content of their programs, i.e. “lower” level vocational programs are now located in more remote and dangerous parts of town, thus also functioning as a form of filtration. This has prompted greater competition, turf wars, and insecurity between departments, staff, and students.

This pattern of breaking-up or modularizing and stratifying educational programs has become broken down even further in some countries with the introduction of associate degrees.⁴⁰ In addition to vocational certification, associate degrees also tend to target immaterial, freelance, or service industry certifications such as graphic design, network administration, nursing, or digital imaging. These degree programs are generally

39 According to the teachers interviewed, DU admits approximately 50,000 new undergraduate students per year and has an overall student body of around 400,000. Of those 400,000, more than 50% are from economically poorer backgrounds or lower castes, which are now more easily exposed and more susceptible to discrimination due to the removal of anonymity in testing has that accompanied semesterization.

40 Associate degrees identify a two-year tier that either comprises a vocational certification or can be used for preparation for a bachelor’s degree for students unsure of what they want to study. Associate degrees primarily exist at junior colleges, vocational colleges, or community colleges in the USA with some similar programs in Canada, the UK, Australia, and Hong Kong (Haidar 2013, *n. pag.*).

lower-cost and shorter in length, and thus appeal to students who require flexibility or who have lower incomes, those who want to avoid student loans, need to work parallel to studying, are raising a family, or want quicker access to the job market. These motivations are very similar to the claims made in Europe for supporting the implementation of the B.A./M.A. system. However, the increasing segregation of education into “higher level” elite programs with alternatives of “lower level” programs displayed by associate degrees, which offer the convenience of being cheaper, shorter, and more flexible, generally limits students to lower-wage labor as a result. Such segmentation allows for the advancement of notions of equal opportunity (although this equality is fractured through financial segregation), meritocracy, and “market sector competition to lay the basis for extraordinary growth” (Lazerson 1998, p. 70).

These university transformations comprise what student activists in Vienna have criticized as the creation of “diploma factories” that generate un-/de-skilled training (*Verschulung*) rather than independent thought processes. Stewart Martin refers to this process as creating “McDegrees” or the exponential expansion and “incorporation of new sectors” into higher education (2008, p. 32). This process is taken one step further through the introduction of online courses, televised courses, and distance learning. Martin refers to the increased self-discipline, self-initiative, creativity, and “emphasis on ‘transferrable skills’” (Ibid., p. 33) as demonstrative of the “neo-liberal restructuring of what used to be considered beyond the market” (Ibid., p. 32). Analyzing notions of “biocapitalist currency” and “human capital,” he thus defines these transformations as indicative of a shift

from the capitalization of education to the “educationalisation of capital” (Ibid., p. 34).

Autonomy and Austerity

The displacement of measures against economic crisis into institutions of education (and the lives of students and educators) through debt or the reduction of time, space, and resources has led to great backlash in recent decades. And one of the major demands of various university movements – from the late 1960s to today – has been greater university autonomy (Boltanski & Chiapello 2005, p. 191; Caffentzis 2000b, p. 79). University activists in the late 1960s, who demanded a less hierarchical university with more opportunities for democratic participation and decision-making, rejected the notion of the “ivory tower” and its exclusivity and seclusion from society. Some of the consequences of those protests and their demands followed the same logic as other transformations taking place in the workforce: flexibilization and precarization (Federici 2000d, p. 20). Thus, where demands were made for an autonomy of intellectual thought and decision-making, the “autonomy” that universities were granted in many cases rather gave way to the precarization of the university as part of a larger precarization of the labor market. In other words, as a perverse result of student protests demanding less top-down control of universities, these processes provided means for neutralizing subversive activities by appropriating their vocabulary. Martin claims that, “[t]hese developments have led to a crisis of ideas of emancipatory education. Not merely because they

have become embattled, but due to their appropriation and instrumentalisation” (2008, p. 34). The perversion of a concept like *autonomy*, he claims, can lead to the reconfiguration of obedience “transformed into an act of freedom” (Ibid., p. 41).

This “autonomy,” which has developed with the commodification of education, refers to an increased autonomy from state subsidies through the withdrawal of public financial responsibility. Furthermore, funding cuts have in turn been exacerbated through structural transformations that have taken place at the state level. For example, in Austria, the Ministry of Science and Research, which was responsible for universities until 2013, has now been absorbed by the Ministry of Economics (APA/Der Standard 2013, *n. pag.*). In India, the Department of Higher Education is now run by the Ministry of Human Resource Development. The impact of state disinvestment results in institutions of education being forced to solicit funding from the private sector in order to survive – from investors who often consequently have an influence on the structure and functioning of the institution (Giroux 2002, *n. pag.*). This notion of “autonomy” has developed in a similar way as SAPs and with similar goals, including modified curricula, restructured departments, tuition hikes, and the comprehensive expansion of competition, which has resulted in precarity in all areas.

This “autonomization” has primarily become implemented and widespread through expansive processes of standardization, which provide guidelines and benchmarks for progress. In other words, institutions of education become externally goal-oriented to meet statistical criteria rather than the needs of students.

Consequently, those who do not meet the designated standards have their funding cut or removed entirely. This can take place at the level of an institution, department, or research, for instance. These control mechanisms of deficit reduction, or austerity measures, are a key tool for battling economic crisis. They force institutions, departments, teachers, students, and programs to modify their functions and foci, on the one hand. They rely more and more on private sector and corporate intervention – third-party investment – on the other.⁴¹

The implementation of standardization and criteria of “excellence” outlined in previous sections becomes optimized within the context of soliciting funding through, among others, “clusters of excellence.” Through such clusters, various interdisciplinary researchers and projects or programs that are otherwise individually underfunded can be united to achieve a shared research goal. This has the benefit of providing a large amount of potential spillover as innovation – a main goal of the EU’s knowledge policy today – through mutual proximity. Clustering also allows the various participants to apply for funding from a larger variety of sources as well as larger pots due to the breadth of such projects. These clusters inherently support interdisciplinarity, which is a concept that has been expanding in recent years. While “hot” new interdisciplinary programs have been promoting universities (and vice versa) in recent years, they have had the advantage of being able to apply for a wider range of funding, on the one hand, and have attracted

⁴¹ See e.g. Michael Dobbins and Christoph Knill on how the removal of lump-sum grants from universities, which have necessitated third-party funding, “have enhanced governance capacities” in the university system (2014, p. 134).

foreign or non-resident students who pay higher tuitions than regular students, on the other. To consider this critically is not to say that interdisciplinarity is problematic per se. In fact, it departs from a tradition of radical transversal practices. However, it is the appropriation of such practices for reaching the bottom line which indicates a neoliberalized shift.⁴²

These processes are often a last resort for university departments, research projects, and courses that are threatened with elimination due to their low level of “profitability.” This most frequently includes the humanities, or “[p]rograms and courses that focus on areas such as critical theory, literature, feminism, ethics, environmentalism, post-colonialism, philosophy, and sociology [which] suggest an intellectual cosmopolitanism or a concern with social issues” (Giroux 2002, *n. pag.*). Thus, while budgets are being slashed drastically, more interdisciplinary programs have been popping up in an attempt to reinclude those “unprofitable” practices in different constellations (Dokuzović 2011a, *n. pag.*). Clustering and emerging forms of interdisciplinarity represent not only “alternative” survival methods. They also represent additional models for appropriating “autonomy” through the co-optation and rebranding of existing practices according to corporatized measures that allow instrumentalized reinclusion.

A further dimension of the “autonomization” of education from the state is clarified through corporatization processes of “corporate takeover.” These processes are

⁴² Adamson thus maintains that: “one must constantly emphasize her [one’s own] interdisciplinarity, a term which has lost much of its radical content and points, rather, to the flexibility of academic labor” (2009, p. 99).

not exclusive to higher education. They take place across the board and can be clearly elucidated in the example of the US No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, which caused hitherto unheard of radical transformations in elementary schools. Referred to by John Bellamy Foster as “the corporate-driven onslaught on students, teachers, and public schools” (2011, *n. pag.*), the logic of the NCLB Act can be understood through the practice within corporate governance of creating a “market for corporate control” (Kroszner 2008, *n. pag.*). When imposing such actions, “outsiders can buy or take control of poorly managed firms and replace the managers and the system of corporate governance” (Ibid.). Foster maintains that the door to such corporate takeover of education was opened through standardization and assessment (2011, *n. pag.*).⁴³

The NCLB Act has been able to virtually shut down schools for “underperforming” according to standardization criteria.⁴⁴ The impact of the NCLB Act can be seen

43 The NCLB laid out rules for grading the proficiency of students and schools during a specified time frame. The penalties were extreme and increased in severity with each year: “In the fourth year, the school would be subject to ‘corrective action,’ requiring curriculum changes, staff changes, or a longer school year. In the fifth year, a school still not making AYP [Adequate Yearly Progress] would be ordered to ‘restructure.’ A school that was ordered to restructure was allowed five ‘options,’ all amounting to essentially the same thing: (a) change to a charter school; (b) lay off the principal and staff and replace them with others; (c) hand over control of the school to private management; (d) relinquish control of the school to the state; or (e) ‘any other major restructuring of the school’s governance’” (Foster 2011, *n. pag.*).

44 For example, William H. Taft Elementary School in Cincinnati, Ohio had its entire faculty and principal fired due to underperformance. It was then revamped into a private research facility for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (Kent 2008, *n. pag.*). Ironically, while the Act claims to *leave no child behind*, the final

in the amount of schools that were forced to “restructure” during its implementation. From 2007–08, 3,500 schools were expected to undergo restructuring, and the numbers continued to rise dramatically over subsequent years. Funding did not increase while these extreme measures were imposed, thus schools were forced to carry the burden of the new program. The NCLB Act eased processes of privatization, corporate takeover, or conversion to charter schools (Foster 2011, *n. pag.*). Foster thus views the NCLB Act “not so much by the failure of the schools themselves, but by the growing failures of the capitalist system, which now sees the privatization of public education as central to addressing its larger malaise” (Ibid.).

Lifelong Learning

These extreme processes of spurious “autonomization” also extend to precarious teaching contracts and a rise in internships for students. In the case of internships or “work-based learning,” the neoliberal restructuring of education goes even further. It traverses the fields of education and labor, and illustrates what Martin refers to stating that “[j]ust as we can draw parallels between the

result of this “emergency aid” was to claim that no exclusions were made regarding the students, and that they were welcome to the new center. This would have resulted in the displacement of local communities, i.e. the students who were now districted to an entirely different area. As public elementary schools in the USA are ascribed according to their district, if a child lives in a certain district they have to attend the corresponding school. Otherwise they either have to move, opt for home schooling, or private schooling. This surely had a gentrifying impact with wide-ranging consequences for the poorer communities and benefits for the shareholders in the venture.

traditional school and the factory, so we can between the dispersal of the factory into society as a whole and the dispersal of the school” (2008, p. 34). These processes are exemplified in the area of lifelong learning. Lifelong learning is another extreme example of exploitable “autonomized” knowledge production, which emerged from the appropriation of radical pedagogical practices by economic policies. It emerged within a context that supported its role in regulating the distribution and the new enclosures of knowledge that allow knowledge to become more easily packaged and commodified, and the overlapping valorization of life itself.

The idea that contemporary education is characterized by the move away from authoritarian forms of indoctrination and towards forms of self-directed or autonomous learning is perhaps the most powerful emancipatory ideology in this context. “Life long learning” is exemplary. [...] “life long learning” extends “meritocracy” to the whole of your life. Qualification is a receding horizon; its promise of maturity takes the form of infantilisation (Martin 2008, p. 33).

Whereas universities provide a vast supply of virtual and immaterial resources in cognitive capitalism, the transformations within such acknowledged institutions of education only comprise one angle of the knowledge economy. Lifelong learning represents a vast reservoir for the exploitation of cognitive resources from the complex area between living and working situations that traverses education and autonomous forms of knowledge production. Lifelong learning is comprised of formal learning, non-formal (on-the-job), and informal learning (life experience), and is regarded as encompassing an individual’s

entire life cycle, thus earning it the appellation “cradle-to-grave” learning. Lifelong learning has become an important part of economic agendas since the 1970s and emerged during the rise of corporate globalization, major oil and resource crises, the dissolution of the Bretton Woods Agreement, high unemployment levels, and new economic theories that developed in the face of those crises (Walker 2012, *n. pag.*). It was during that time that the pivotal UNESCO report, *Learning to Be* (1972), was published, which is where major links between lifelong learning agendas and globalization were already established (Faure et al. 1972, pp. 256–257).

Lifelong learning has been driven by various international organizations such as UNESCO, the OECD, the Council of Europe, or various initiatives within the Erasmus programs driven by the EU. It has been disseminated in forms ranging from on-the-job training in “developed” countries to being packaged as aid policies in “developing” countries, where it continues to function in a similar manner to this day. However, the early development of these perspectives took place following the emergence of radical grassroots practices in the 1960s, particularly during the 1968 international university movements. These movements introduced radical new forms of pedagogy as well as perspectives that analyzed the role of knowledge and education in all spaces and times of life (e.g. Ivan Illich or Paulo Freire). These perspectives, which challenged rigid university structures, were appropriated and later exploited as mainstream policy agendas.

By the early 1970s, these agendas had already taken the form of policies and programs. And as the initial adult education programs were formed on principles of

democracy, humanism, and community, lifelong learning programs became rooted in notions of liberal individualism (Walker 2012, *n. pag.*). This shift towards individualism also brought with it a new understanding of responsibility in relation to education and learning. Thus, a transition from education, in which one is taught, to learning, where one has the individual responsibility to obtain knowledge (Ibid.), signals a shift and dramatic reduction in liability and costs for educational institutions and the emergence of the self-disciplinary structure of lifelong learning. As this notion has developed against the backdrop of the corporatization of higher education, lifelong learning offers a form of (re-)inclusion into acknowledged practices of knowledge production for those who are excluded from systems of education.

Debates on lifelong learning were revived in the 1990s by the European Commission in order to strengthen its knowledge-based economy initiatives. This took place in agendas such as the Lisbon Strategy or the declaration of the European Year of Lifelong Learning in 1996. The late 1990s were a crucial time for European debates on knowledge, introducing both new lifelong learning policies as well as a massive wave of reforms in higher education. The more recent European Lifelong Learning Program, which integrated lifelong learning agendas into higher education, took a somewhat different turn by highlighting contemporary mobility goals in relation to desired increases in turnover, diversity, and innovation.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ The program lasted from 2007–13 and had the main goal of reaching three million student and professorial exchanges (Sayer & Erler 2012, p. 40).

In the context of lifelong learning, meritocracy replaces the role of austerity. Lifelong learning encourages workers to constantly acquire new and “transferrable skills.” James Lynch therefore maintains that lifelong learning provides the “unlimited scope for the further subjugation of [wo]man to the world of work” (1979, p. 6 quoted in Matheson & Matheson 2000, p. 230). These characteristics of lifelong learning have been presented in mainstream policy discourse as beneficial. For example, lifelong learning is considered to be a more horizontal and thus far more egalitarian and democratic system than the ivory tower university model. In addition, lifelong learning should increase social cohesion, tolerance, and improve income distribution (European Commission 2001, p. 8). Lifelong learning should also prepare workers to compete in a global economy. And because the concept does not require educators to be professionals, lifelong learning allows for a different range of knowledge production as well as employment. Another suggested benefit is that lifelong learning would provide a system of organization for the entire range of education and educational programs, which would allow for a simpler form of governance through “active citizenship” (European Commission 2003).

These “egalitarian” claims become obscured when examined alongside the developments in global knowledge economies. In other words, these programs provide opportunities for workers who are unable to attend institutions of higher education for gaining additional knowledge and skills. However, it also means that workers are constantly pressured to acquire new skills and knowledge for continuously adapting to the transformations of a global labor market. Thus, lifelong

learning directly links the constant acquisition of new knowledges to the labor market in cognitive capitalism. Furthermore, those who are unable to constantly engage in new learning processes become threatened with obsolescence. Therefore, “cradle-to-grave” learning represents lifelong inadequacy, making individuals only as “egalitarian” as their capacity for competition (i.e. meritocracy) in the shark pool of a changing global market. Lifelong learning thereby shifts not only adaptability but also more risk associated with global economic crisis to the worker.

Whereas European tendencies in lifelong learning policies attempt to syncretize formal education and the labor market, tendencies in the “Global South” have followed the logic of SAPs regarding the segregation of learning. On the one hand, universities in the “South” have become increasingly privatized and cater to elite strata of the population whilst introducing more and more foreign “branches” of “franchise universities” that have expanded from prominent universities abroad. On the other hand, a large portion of lifelong learning in the “South” tends to focus on basic literacy and the development of rudimentary skills rather than expanding or supplementing formal education.

Shahzad Mojab critically approaches the purportedly humanist aims of lifelong learning in the “South.” She does so by highlighting it as one extreme in a segregated knowledge system which functions as a necessary instrument in a transforming yet segregated global labor market. This labor market consists of a “disposable” workforce, at one end, and a stratum that may require periodic investment for its upgrading, reskilling, and retraining, at the other:

This complex process is happening, first, through the creation of a highly specialised workforce to serve the demands of the “knowledge economy”; and second, through structuring a workforce that is contingent, flexible, expendable, disposable and replaceable, in order to engage in shifting and more precarious, scattered, mobile forms of production relations made possible by technological advances and the rapidity of electronic capital flows [...] [and thus] the waste of the skilled labour force is endemic to the dynamics of the capitalist economy (Mojab 2009, pp. 8–9).

The dispensable extreme of the workforce, and thus of the knowledge economy that Mojab refers to, is elucidated by the European Commission report on lifelong learning, which states that: “Investment in human capital is important at all points in the economic cycle; i.e. skills, gaps, and shortages can certainly co-exist with unemployment” (Council of the European Communities 2000 cited in Kendall et al. 2002, p. 11). This statement supports the perspectives advanced by Moulrier-Boutang on cognitive capitalism regarding the role of “pollination.” Moulrier-Boutang maintains that in cognitive capitalism, wealth is produced indirectly through activities of pollination rather than in the production of material commodities alone (i.e. honey) (2011, p. 188). In this sense, networked communication and activities, the expansive application and development of knowledge, and innovative spillover or externalities can produce wealth. In other words: “There is work and activity everywhere, especially because the activity of the unemployed person, who has a rich and pollinating life [...] is directly producing wealth” (Ibid., p. 165). Therefore, lifelong learning continuously has the capacity – from

“cradle-to-grave,” during phases of unemployment, under the impact of crisis, or in impoverished areas – to capture wealth produced through knowledge well beyond formal institutions of education. As a result, an even higher number of people are contributing to the wealth of knowledge economies – or the “new wealth of nations” that has transcended the nation through postmodern, Postfordist, and neoliberal structures of new governance – despite the impact that these crises have had on their lives. Transformations set in motion to create knowledge-based systems that should purportedly support sustainable solutions to crisis have instead in many ways provided complex new technologies and structures for the displacement of crisis. This displacement will be further analyzed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

CONTEMPORARY EXTENSIVE

“NEW FRONTIERS”

Spatial transformations in structures of knowledge production have played a major role in creating extensive new frontiers and new forms of displacement for a capitalism in crisis. These recent transformations have advanced historical supranational models for increased turnover, mobility, and the perpetuation of intensive growth. And by encouraging and framing mobility within supranational borders and their respective border regimes, numerous new structures for regulating space-based transformations in knowledge-based systems have emerged. In this context, strategic porosity of borders exists alongside governance on a multiplicity

of levels from inter-university borders, to metropolitan borders, to national borders, to supranational borders. This chapter will focus on the latter, as the supranational level is transforming and colonizing global space in a comprehensive and novel way. Furthermore, this chapter will primarily focus on transformations in the European space, while additional international examples will be integrated in order to clarify the repercussions of the processes considered.

The strength of large population blocs was demonstrated in the various competitive races between the USA and the USSR during the Cold War. This combined strength exposed the capacity and even necessity for supranational constellations in approaching major undertakings that required greater costs and diversity of productive proficiency and knowledge (Sheehan 2007). However, the value of supranational cooperation was, above all, applied and established in Western Europe in transformations enabled by the financial restructuring undertaken by Bretton Woods institutions. This restructuring was followed by the supranational clustering of European nations for economic and military goals and the accumulation of natural resources. It was supplemented in more recent decades with developments in governance, border and migration regimes, and nuclear energy development within the EU.⁴⁶

46 The supranational formula for corroborative European recovery after WWII was the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) founded in 1952, consisting of Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, West Germany, and Luxembourg. The ECSC was supplemented in 1954 through the supranational organization for security and defense, the Western European Union (WEU), established by the European nations of the Capitalist Bloc allied with the USA and NATO members. Those systems were subsequently upgraded

The supranational EU has implemented new governance methods for regulating and encouraging its operations since its establishment in 1993. The main model of EU governance is the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). Established as a Lisbon Strategy apparatus, the OMC is based on voluntary cooperation of EU member states. Therefore, the EU is able to distribute comprehensive policies through “soft law” rather than direct regulation (Alexiadou & Lange 2007, p. 322). “Soft law” is encouraged through indirect forms of competition and discipline. Therefore, member states must draft their own individual proposals for meeting EU objectives for approval by the European Commission. This results in conformity and increased competition due to the self-initiative necessary for completing such indefinite tasks (Ibid., pp. 321–322). Consequently, ignominy amongst EU member states and fiscal discipline are some of the key drivers for implementing best practice reforms (de la Porte et al. 2001, p. 8). Hence, the OMC entitles individual member states to implement supranational policies on a national level, which are indirectly regulated by cooperative efforts for achieving common objectives. In that sense, the European Commission is not directly responsible for the implementation of policies, but rather assumes the tasks

with the establishment of the European Economic Community (EEC), which was constituted with the Treaty of Rome by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany in 1957. The two organizations established by the Treaty of Rome, the EEC and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), likewise expanded the two goals of the ECSC, establishing a unified economy and system for energy resource consumption. Furthermore, the EEC was the structural basis for signing the Treaty on the European Union in 1992. Thus, the EEC and Euratom were able to be consolidated within the EU in 1993.

of identifying major objectives, establishing standards and guidelines for benchmarking, overviewing systems for distributing pressure through comparison of the achievement of given benchmarks, and surveillance (Radaelli 2003, pp. 15, 26). Some of the key areas in which the OMC is applied are education/knowledge production, cultural policy, employment, migration, and social inclusion, though these areas have been expanding (Szyszczak 2006, pp. 493–494; Alexiadou & Lange 2007, p. 322).

Supranational Knowledge Economy Areas

In the area of knowledge production and education, the OMC has primarily targeted the supranational European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA). Their objectives also target a “European area of lifelong learning” (Commission of the European Communities 2001). In the EHEA, the OMC functions hand-in-hand with the strategic framework of Education and Training 2020 (ET2020),⁴⁷ providing common goals and methods for achieving outlined objectives. The ERA, on the other hand, has primarily been governed through initiatives set up by the Ljubljana Process.⁴⁸ These knowledge policies have been established at the EU level, but their implementation is carried out by individual states. This has also been the case with the Bologna Process (for the establishment of the EHEA from 1999–2010), in which each individual member state was made responsible for implementing

⁴⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm

⁴⁸ http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/cooperation/see/irppsah/ljubljanaprocess_EN.asp

its overall objectives, while being able to adapt these objectives to local conditions influenced by historical and economic structures or even protest actions. Variations can include differences in tuition fees, the level of cooperation with the private sector, or the level of austerity measures imposed, the financial role of the individual state or the number of students accepted per term (or other decision-making that is still left to individual universities) (Dobbins & Knill 2014, p. 12).

The European Commission has articulated this differentiation between national and supranational objectives through the following agendas: On a supranational level, the European Commission has the tasks of promoting mobility programs; promoting “the recognition of non-formal and informal learning,” i.e. lifelong learning; creating the framework for a youth employment program “through apprenticeships, stages or other work experience” that emphasizes the possibility of mobility; improving university and researchers’ mobility programs; and developing “the modernisation agenda of higher education (curricula, governance and financing) [...] by benchmarking university performance and educational outcomes in a global context”⁴⁹ (European Commission 2010, p. 11). The agendas assigned by the European Commission for implementation on a national level by member states are “to ensure efficient investment in education and training systems at all levels (pre-school to tertiary)”; “to improve educational outcomes, addressing each segment (pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational and tertiary) within an integrated approach, encompassing key competences

49 It is interesting to note that “modernization” is defined here as better benchmarking/standardization and governance.

and aiming at reducing early school leaving”; “to enhance the openness and relevance of education systems by building national qualification frameworks and better gearing learning outcomes towards labour market needs”; and “to improve young people’s entry into the labour market through [...] guidance, counselling and apprenticeships” (Ibid.).

These objectives outline key points delineated in chapter two, such as increased turnover through the reduction of study times, increased forms of standardization, the integration of lifelong learning, an emphasis on apprenticeships, and the development of new governance strategies. However, mobility lies at the core of the entire policy. Mobility plays such an important role in the European knowledge economy that, in reference to the ERA component of the knowledge economy, the European Commission maintains:

By 2020, all players will fully benefit from the “fifth freedom” across the ERA: free circulation of researchers, knowledge and technology. The ERA provides attractive conditions and effective and efficient governance for carrying out research and investing in R&D [Research and Development] intensive sectors in Europe. It creates significant added value by fostering healthy Europe-wide scientific competition whilst ensuring the appropriate level of cooperation and coordination. It is responsive to the needs and ambitions of citizens and contributes effectively to the sustainable development and competitiveness of Europe (2009b, p. 15).⁵⁰

50 The “appropriate level” of productivity within practices of and processes surrounding “free” movement is a key theme investigated in chapter four, i.e. how mechanisms of differential inclusion function within “open” spaces.

The free movement of knowledge within supranational knowledge economy areas is promoted through reforms that provide the compatibility of transferrable degrees such as the Bologna Process reforms, on the one hand, and through the development of exchange and mobility programs (or distance education/learning) as outlined above, on the other. European knowledge-based mobility goals have been supported through a variety of programs that focus on different ages and types of knowledge production. These originally consisted of the Lifelong Learning Program for students and teachers of tertiary education, the Comenius Program for pre-school, primary, and secondary level education; the Erasmus Program for students of tertiary education; the Leonardo da Vinci Program for vocational education and training; and the Grundtvig Program for adult education and lifelong learning. These have since become subsumed under the Erasmus+ program.⁵¹ Such regulated mobility programs within knowledge economy areas allow for a diversity of experiences within regions of differing linguistic and cultural heritage as well as an increased potential for innovative spillover.

The cognitive resources that a student, researcher, or teacher bring with them, enriching the spaces that they visit, are of great benefit to knowledge economies. However, those competences are also relevant with respect to the filtering of “desirable” mobility from “undesirable” mobility.⁵² Participation in mobility programs is filtered through processes of differential inclusion.

⁵¹ <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/>

⁵² The methods of quantifying such skills will be outlined in more detail in chapter four.

These mechanisms of filtration consist of the free and encouraged mobility of citizens within the designated knowledge economy areas, the limited movement of foreigners holding student visas or temporary work permits for teaching, or the exclusion of migrants that are not granted access to these areas. An examination of the space of the EHEA can elucidate these various levels of differential inclusion, which are distinguished according to whether they have citizenship in signatory states of the Bologna Declaration and the EU, whether they have citizenship in signatory states of the Bologna Declaration but not EU member states, and those with citizenship in neither category. There are currently 50 signatories of the Bologna Declaration, which has expanded multiple times from the original 29.⁵³ The states that are also members of the EU or Schengen Area allow their citizens access to the “freedoms of the EU” and are thus able to move freely and have access to the job market.

However, those states in the EHEA that are not members of the EU are all signatories of the European Cultural Convention and Council of Europe (except for Kazakhstan and Holy See),⁵⁴ thus allowing their citizens partial access to residence, movement, and employment. Those states which belong to neither the EHEA nor the EU allow their citizens access to the comparable degree system implemented by the Bologna Process through (primarily) mobility programs. However, they allow only very limited access to residence, employment, and movement which are monitored according to bilateral

53 <http://www.ehea.info/members.aspx>

54 <http://hub.coe.int/>

agreements and regulations. For example, citizens of the states of North Africa, Central Asia, and the Middle East can gain easier access to European higher education through the mobility program, Tempus (World Education News & Reviews 2007),⁵⁵ despite not being signatories of the European Cultural Convention. Moreover, “[a]ccording to the Bologna Process Conference Berlin 2003, there is no perspective to integrate these countries [non-signatories of the European Cultural Convention] into the EHEA” (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2010, p. 6).⁵⁶

Europe has had an aggressive approach to advancing its knowledge economy through the establishment of the complex series of knowledge-based spatial areas mentioned above. These areas consist of mechanisms that can exploit knowledge production across their entire given supranational spaces as well as the brain drain resulting from filtered international mobility. However, similar initiatives have emerged in other supranational world regions such as Latin America, Australia-Asia Pacific, or the Middle East-North Africa region. These constellations do not represent the only worldwide attempts at building strong knowledge economies. Nevertheless, they are significant because their structures resemble the models and objectives set forth by the EU more closely than those initiated by individual states such as China, India, South Africa, or Russia.

55 <http://www.wes.org/ewenr/07apr/feature.htm>

56 These last two paragraphs drew from the findings in the article written by Eduard Freudmann and myself (2010), “Fortified Knowledge: From Supranational Governance to Translocal Resistance”: <https://globalstudies.trinity.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/DokuzovicFreudmannGrznicWKO3.2.pdf>

Historically, Latin American higher education has undergone many transformations similar to European university reforms.⁵⁷ The emerging Latin American knowledge economy area has developed following the establishment of a more homogenized system of higher education across Latin America. It has introduced a variety of mobility programs throughout the region as well as between Latin America and other regions such as the “hemispheric” approach of the US 100,000 Strong in the Americas initiative⁵⁸ or the European EU-LAC (EU, Latin America, and Caribbean) Common Area of Higher Education (EU-LAC Declaration 2006, p. 16). Through such interregional mobility programs, the Latin American knowledge economy area is able to grow stronger by competing and exchanging with other supranational knowledge economy areas.

Like Europe, Australia has also developed a very aggressive approach to developing its knowledge economy. Apart from supporting these aims through the growth of the knowledge export “industry” outlined below, Australia has also introduced new homogenizing quality assurance structures and regional mobility projects within the Asia-Pacific area. These developments have

57 Most Latin American universities were originally state-run institutions with low or no tuition fees “following the European tradition” (Balán 2013, p. x). After students and educators attempted to reform universities, culminating in radical student movements in the late 1960s (Ibid., p. xiii), radical new liberalization policies encouraged an increased decentralization and privatization of higher education and an increase in private institutions and partnerships (Ibid., p. xiv). However, these transformations have also encouraged a recent wave of student protests against the increasing for-profit, privatization, and segregation of higher education, e.g. in Chile from 2011–13 (Quilodran & Vergara 2012, *n. pag.*).

58 <http://www.100kstrongamericas.org/>

resulted from a series of proposals made by the Ministers of Education representing 27 of the Asia-Pacific regional nations at a preliminary meeting in 2006 where the Brisbane Communiqué was issued. One of the major proposals regarded the establishment of a system and common higher education area similar to and compatible with the Bologna Process (Brisbane Communiqué 2006, p. 2).

Knowledge economies for building regional growth have also become a major focus in the Maghreb, and more broadly, the Middle East-North Africa (MENA) region. In contrast to the Latin American and Australia-Asia Pacific models, the MENA regional initiatives have not placed as strong an emphasis on mobility, emphasizing the role of sustainability instead. Abdelkader Djeflat, author of the World Bank report “Building Knowledge Economies for Job Creation, Increased Competitiveness, and Balanced Development” maintains that “[n]ever before has a theme taken such an important proportion in the eyes of policy makers as knowledge economy in the Mena region” (2006, p. 4). The report supports the dual role of knowledge in the face of limited resources for providing alternatives to resource-based economies as well as the innovation required to confront them.⁵⁹ In addition, the report advances notions of lifelong learning by relating it to common cultural values and teachings of the prophet that support the

⁵⁹ The report states that: “While non oil countries find in it [knowledge economies] a natural substitute based on knowledge capital and brain power, the others find in it an ideal answer to the post-carbon era knowing the double risk of depletion and sharp fall in oil and gas prices on the international market beside the alternative energy resources which may bring down drastically world demand of fossil energy” (Djeflat 2006, p. 85).

“acquiring of knowledge from the cradle to the grave, and the quest for knowledge and science as [an] obligatory duty for every man and woman” (Ibid., p. 4).

Knowledge Exports

The combination of extensive and intensive transformations in structures of knowledge production have produced various exploitable “products” through the emergence of so-called “knowledge exports” and the knowledge export industry. There are several methods for defining knowledge exports, for instance, Canada has defined knowledge exports somewhat conservatively in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada report as “the provision of educational products and services overseas [...] including distance education, twinning programs, offshore campuses, joint degrees, and franchised courses and programs” (2007, p. 1). The report also emphasizes the role of mobility, stating that internationalization is a key asset in university revenue or an “alternative source of income generation” (Ibid., p. 1). According to the report, the demand for these products and services emerges from an increase in higher education and the consequent demand for it worldwide, “particularly in emerging and developing countries,” which purportedly overwhelms “weak” governments in meeting those demands (Ibid., p. 3). China and India are highlighted as the nations with the greatest demand for such programs (Ibid., p. 2).

On the other end of such a provision of products and services are the universities in “emerging and developing” nations, which “attract” various forms of

knowledge exports. This includes the establishment of franchise universities as subsidiary branch campuses in outlying nations, on the one hand, and the export of reform structures, on the other. Some examples of franchise universities are the American University of Dubai (originally a campus of the American InterContinental University in Atlanta, Georgia), New York University in Abu Dhabi, or the Singapore campus of Yale.⁶⁰ This tendency is exemplified by the expansion of US universities to India and China. As Indian and Chinese students comprise the largest number of foreign students in the USA, US universities have been petitioning for India to loosen its university regulations regarding tuition, salaries, and curricula to allow more US franchise universities to be established there, since there are already many franchise universities in China (Sengupta 2007, *n. pag.*). Therefore, referring to the potential of expanding US franchise universities to India, knowledge policy-makers refer to India as “‘the next frontier’ for American institutions” (Ibid.). These practices elucidate the “continental drift” that exists parallel to the development of strong supranational knowledge economy areas. Mezzadra and Neilson refer to continental drift with respect to “enormous production blocs,” such as NAFTA or the EU, which allows one to “‘find Morocco in Finland, Caracas in Washington, ‘the West’ in ‘the East’ – and so on in every direction [...] [as] the metamorphic paradox of contemporary power” (16Beaver 2005 quoted in Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 52). An alternative tendency that has developed from processes of

60 This is clarified by the “thirty-eight American schools [that] had sixty-five branches in thirty-four countries” by 2010 (Mills 2012, *n. pag.*).

circumventing regulations that limit franchise university expansion is the growth of partnerships and mobility programs with local universities. This tendency additionally supports international mobility programs.

Another type of knowledge export is the export of reform processes. This tendency grants access to the Bologna Process comparable degree system in “developing” nations of the EHEA’s “periphery” that have no potential for direct integration as they are neither signatories of the Bologna Declaration, nor EU member states or signatories of the European Cultural Convention. This practice is particularly problematic when it replaces exchange programs rather than functioning alongside programming already in place as it suggests that limiting international academic exchange with some nations is desirable. The consequences of such limitations are often more extreme measures such as emigration and subsequent brain drain when there is a lack of alternatives. Furthermore, the adapted adoption of the Bologna Process by “developing” nations is taking place with little consultation regarding major differences in the university systems at stake and is being pushed by international financial organizations such as the World Bank or UNESCO (University of Lubumbashi 2007, *n. pag.*). There are major complications in attempts of disjointed systems in diverse African nations in adopting a unifying model, particularly in the non-French speaking countries (Ibid.). Critics are thus worried about this process producing even more brain drain and segregation of higher education in Africa than already exists (Ibid.). This process, therefore, follows a pattern alarmingly similar to the implementation of SAPs in higher education in the decades leading to the emergence of the Bologna Process.

The establishment of franchise universities and the export of reform processes comprise how products and services play a role in knowledge exports. The Australian government, however, takes a more abstract approach to defining knowledge exports by additionally asserting that international students *are* “products” of/for knowledge export. This is clarified in a report that states, “In essence, export income from education services is the sum of income to the Australian economy generated from international students studying onshore in Australia [...] as well as income from education operations offshore” (Australian government 2008, *n. pag.*).

The benefits of attracting international students who pay higher tuition to institutions, which in turn build their reputations and prestige from statistics of international student enrollment, are immense. At a growth rate of 15% per annum in a context of only a 6% growth rate in the export of all other services from Australia, knowledge exports became “Australia’s third largest export industry on 2006–07 figures, behind coal and iron ore (\$21.9 billion and \$15.5 billion respectively), and the largest services export industry exceeding tourism (\$11.5 billion)” (Ibid.). With these initiatives Australia has fine-tuned its mobility programs to spearhead economic growth. This extra revenue clearly also supplements public disinvestment in education, thereby creating a “structural dependence” on knowledge exports (Neilson 2009, p. 49).

Ben Rosenzweig critically refers to these temporary contributors to Australian knowledge export economies as “guest consumers,” claiming,

The imperatives which generated these programs were not to find people who can be made to work, not to find hyper-exploitable labor, but rather people who can be made to pay. Of course, with the expansion of such economies, these guest consumers now form the basis of multiple economies – producing people defined not as essences or members of some occupational or cultural group, but as conflictually-constituted moments in an ensemble of social relations (2010, *n. pag.*).

International Student “Cash Cows”

The higher tuition fees that international students pay keep institutions and departments afloat in the face of increasing austerity measures. Some critics even claim that foreign student tuition may support increased cuts in funding. For example, former vice-chancellor of Warwick University in the UK, Susan Bassnett, claims that: “Universities have *colluded* with this situation for years and successive governments have turned a blind eye because it has enabled them to continue to cut higher education funding” (cited in Paton 2012, *n. pag.*). Furthermore, by underfunding institutions and forcing them to overcharge out-of-state or international students, public institutions are able to emulate for-profit institutions by bringing in additional profits at the behest of national (or supranational) policy-makers. Some of the key players in these processes have been the UK, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

In the UK, the more than half a million new incoming international students each year yield “£2.5 billion [...] in tuition fees alone” (Hartwich 2010, p. 8). In the

UK, where international students are charged nearly four times higher tuition, fees have ranged from between £7,450 to £35,000 for overseas students in the 2013/2014 academic year (PA 2013, *n. pag.*). Income from international students in the UK makes up approximately 10% of university funding, having doubled in the decade leading to 2011 (Paton 2012, *n. pag.*).⁶¹ In Massachusetts/USA, a new program for rewarding departments that recruit out-of-state students to enroll developed in the aftermath of budget cuts of 37% from 2008–10 (Folbre 2010, *n. pag.*). Canada, on the other hand, pursues *targeted* brain drain from China, Brazil, India, Mexico, Turkey, and Vietnam (Costa 2014, *n. pag.*). For this, the Canadian government created a C\$20 million stimulus package for doubling international students by 2022, predicted to bring in C\$10 billion in returns each year (Ibid.). In Australia, international students, regarded as supporting the development of departments and research projects, comprised one fourth of students (Narushima 2008, *n. pag.*), paying an average of A\$21,000 in tuition fees (Giannotis 2009, *n. pag.*). Moreover, the trend of cutting public funding to generate quasi-private profit becomes evident in the comparison of Australia's third and fourth-largest export industries, respectively education and tourism: tourism received nearly ten times more funding than

⁶¹ Universities in the UK now require a license to receive students from non-EU nations. Failure to comply with these standardizing regulations can affect their *ranking* and lead to losing or “downgrading” that license (making the given institution appear less attractive to incoming students and teachers). E.g., in 2012, the London Metropolitan University lost its license and left 2,600 non-EU students at risk of deportation and the loss of tens of thousands of pounds already invested (Clark 2012, *n. pag.*).

international education in 2010 (Craig 2010, *n. pag.*). In New Zealand, international students generate NZ\$2 billion annually and are often regarded as funding sources for new IT rooms or swimming pools (Ip cited in Tan 2010, *n. pag.*).

Policies that urge an increase in international tuition fees for generating wealth often put students on a one-way street, as many students that enroll in international programs are unable to finish due to their incapacity to pay the higher fees for an extended period of time.⁶² In other words, after generating profit for their host universities or knowledge economies, these students return to their country of origin with no degree, often highly indebted. Furthermore, the economic crisis of recent years is making it increasingly difficult for many students and their families to pay such costs. These consequences expose several processes of displacement. For example, brain drain and brain gain reveal a shift in cognitive capital – or a type of *cognitive capital flight*. Other forms of displacement take place through the compounding debt of students' families in their home countries and the reliance of loans in other countries (Verma 2013, *n. pag.*; Neilson 2009, pp. 47–48). Moreover, according to Sanmati Verma, reforms aimed at increasing numbers of international students assist in “softening the impact of higher education funding cuts” (Stratton 2010, p. 38 cited in Verma 2013, *n. pag.*).

⁶² E.g., in the US: “Less than 60 percent of first-time full-time students seeking a bachelor’s degree at four-year institutions in 2000–1 completed that goal at that institution within six years” (Folbre 2010, *n. pag.*).

Porous Frontiers

There are several perspectives from which to analyze the spatial configurations of supranational knowledge economies. For instance, the center/semi-periphery/periphery model of world-systems analysis is useful for examining the differential inclusion involved in the mobility structures of the EHEA. That model can help to elucidate three dominant levels of filtration: the signatories of the Bologna Declaration and member states of the EU (core), the signatories of the Bologna Declaration excluding member states of the EU (semi-periphery), and the level which includes neither but integrates cognitive resources and brain drain through mobility programs (periphery) (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2010, p. 3). However, there are other overlapping developments at play in these shifting scenarios as well. For instance, the logic of knowledge exports also exemplifies the existence of continental drift within transforming knowledge economy areas.

As many global divisions have become displaced and internalized by corporate globalization (Hardt & Negri 2001, pp. 334–335), more complex multiplicities of exploitation have emerged. For instance, Étienne Balibar outlines several overlapping globalizing models of “Borderland Europe” as the “Clash-of-Civilizations,” “Global Network,” and “Center vs Periphery” (2004, p. 23). He thus acknowledges the role of semi-peripheries as “frontiers for civilization” and emphasizes struggles between core and periphery in a global division of labor (Ibid., p. 10). However, he also criticizes this approach by claiming that it remains Eurocentric by maintaining the historical dominance of the core (Ibid., p. 11). Therefore,

the notion advanced by Mezzadra and Neilson of a “proliferation of borders” and a “multiplication” – rather than division – of labor, which destabilizes “grand divides” (2013, p. 85) is most suitable for describing the overlapping spaces and differential inclusions of the European knowledge economy. It integrates and critically approaches a combination of these perspectives by focusing on transitions and transformations, as developments in supranational knowledge economies are in fact polycentric and continue to take shape every day.

These various transformations have prompted the development of new *forms* of expansion and spatial reconfigurations which have overcome the spatial limits of modern expansionism by creating new shifting frontiers and modes of differential inclusion. However, the reliance of these new supranational areas on mobility introduces a factor for both strengthening knowledge-based areas as well as for destabilizing them. Thus, while radical measures of exclusion have emerged around the supranational borders of the EU, the simultaneous necessity for porous borders and systems of differential inclusion allow for unexpected “spillover” to result in radical transformations of the landscape which are caused by movements of people that transform the spaces that they occupy.

CHAPTER 4

THE COGNITIVIZATION OF MIGRATION

Contemporary motives for migration include fleeing from oppressive regimes, building or maintaining familial ties, cultural affinities, or simply a search for a better life. However, emerging factors such as ecological and economic

crises,⁶³ climate change, exile, and detrimental “development” policies have had a tremendous impact on the movement of people. Transformations in capitalization, including shifts to Postfordist labor, have also had a major effect on migration. And the expansive effects of climate change have led to the emergence of the figure of “climate refugees.” Some of these movements have occurred as displacement within state borders and some internationally. Such movements have resulted in new policies, stricter borders, and reconfigurations of governmentality and governance structures for preventing migration whilst supporting it through forms of differential inclusion.

In addition to considerable right-wing campaigns against migration in many parts of the world, migration is heavily exploited, providing a large labor force for the unskilled, manual, and low-wage work that comprises much of the foundation of advanced capitalism. These immigrants, often in situations where illegal work is their only option, become a scapegoat for justifying the existing anti-migrant rhetoric in the media. Simultaneously, however, border controls also act as a negotiating tool for bilateral trade agreements, supporting what Emanuela Paoletti describes as agreements for “more oil, less migrants” in the case of Italy and Libya (2009, *n. pag.*). Paoletti also outlines how migrant containment can be traded for development aid (*Ibid.*).

Several complex mechanisms have developed for filtering migration into supranational areas. This has

63 Whereas Spain was historically “Europe’s largest recipient of migrants” (Buck 2014, *n. pag.*), research now attests to these practices having “moved into reverse” (*Ibid.*). Moreover, this research estimates that the Spanish population will decrease by more than five percent in the following ten years (*Ibid.*).

consisted of a conglomeration of global players, such as transport companies, so-called “humanitarian” organizations, think tanks, and so on, making up what Serhat Karakayalı and Vassilis Tsianos call the “new art of governing migration” (“neue Kunst, Migration zu regieren”) (2007, p. 7). The various players in these mechanisms are significant as they are not limited by regulations such as the Geneva Convention or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which apply to nation-states. They are thus able to avoid the constraints of international law (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 181).

Cognitive Factors in Segregating Movement

Transformations in the labor market have also had a major impact on border regimes and how migration is filtered. “Desirable” and “undesirable” migration are regulated through complex modes of differential inclusion. Balibar thus maintains that these processes create structures which are able to “*attract and to repel* the migrants, which means installing them in a condition of permanent insecurity” (2004, p. 15). Recent modes of differential inclusion have begun to cater to knowledge economy goals and have thus extended to admissions policies and regulations within institutions of education.

Part of the process of attracting migrants for economic goals has taken place by specifically targeting students as knowledge exports. In other words, the establishment of recruitment programs abroad has helped to draw students to specific destinations. These are organized and advertised by the given destinations in an attempt to boost their knowledge economies. Australia

has been particularly aggressive in developing such recruitment programs, focusing above all on China and India. However, this has led to many students traveling to Australia under false pretenses imparted by recruiters (Verma 2013, *n. pag.*). “Students were *intended*, if not overtly promised, permanent migration on completion of their studies in Australia. An entire private education industry – not to mention, a greatly expanded Australian university and TAFE [technical and further education] sector – grew up in the shadow of this explicit promise” (Ibid.). Moreover, as a result of the mass wave of foreign students arriving in Australia, new mechanisms for filtering migration developed in 2011. Therefore, one of the major consequences of the massive recent boom in the Australian knowledge economy has been stricter migration reforms that target students and various other temporary visa holders (Ibid.). This illustrates the emergence of policies that enforce segregated forms of movement in which *mobility* is protected and supported by laws and policies, and *migration* is punishable by them (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2010, p. 6).

Complex filtration mechanisms allow a degree of flexibility to support the shifting needs of the market. This generally allows for filtered access to the job market, on the one hand, and exclusion from social amenities and decision-making processes, on the other, thereby leaving the areas of society in which migrants are allowed limited access “intact and discrete” (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 162). Moreover, a segregation between “skilled” and “unskilled” often leads to discrimination in equating legal migration with skills and education and “illegal” migration with a lack thereof (Ibid., p. 137). Mezzadra and Neilson thus regard geographic borders as

“essential to cognitive processes,” because “they establish the scientific division of labor associated with the sectioning of knowledge into different disciplinary zones” (Ibid., p. 16).

These perspectives represent a shift from older systems of regulating migration, involving quotas for filtering migrant labor power as an “import commodity” in order to supplement national labor market needs (Ibid., p. 102), to newer more “efficient” and flexible systems such as “just-in-time” and “to-the-point” migration (Ibid., p. 138). One method for tightly managing these processes takes place with points-based migration schemes.⁶⁴ In Australia, the government’s points-based system registry is able to profile skilled migration to fulfill labor market needs with the Migration Occupations in Demand List (MODL). By shifting according to the shifting needs of the market, the MODL has given Australia a significant thrust in the global competition of knowledge economies (Neilson 2009, p. 49). Universities thus work in close concert with the MODL, and various new programs and colleges have popped up to accommodate to and profit from vocations listed in the registry. In other words, “these colleges act as default migration agencies” (Ibid.). Many of these opportunistic emerging programs have also been linked to “scandalous” practices, such as passing or failing students based on profitability or fabricating scores,

⁶⁴ Mezzadra and Neilson trace this system back to “former settler colonies such as Australia and Canada in the 1970s as they moved from more racially based approaches to migration to ones that sought to match labor market needs to emergent social agendas of multiculturalism and integration” (Hawkins 1991 cited in Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 139).

attendance, and documents for satisfying necessary requirements (Ibid.).

Mezzadra and Neilson claim that such migration filtration systems play a key role in supporting the skilled labor necessary for developing cognitive capitalism (2013, p. 139). This is because the points-based system provides prospective migrants with applications that question their education, skills, and accomplishments, allowing for the filtration of applicants according to the current needs of the labor market whilst applying the logic of outcome-based standardization to disciplining movement. Moreover, the points-based applications also question “attributes that promise to facilitate the migrant’s productive integration into the social fabric” or “familiarity with national culture and values” (Ibid.). This supports cognitive capitalism’s demand that social activities be integrated into labor productivity (Ibid.).

Due to the relationships between formal knowledge and migration, education has become a major factor in migration today. “The situation is one in which education becomes the pretence for migration. There is a blurring of the categories of student and migrant. But the categories of student and worker also blur (in a sense other than the one in which studying can be identified as work)” (Neilson 2009, p. 50). Furthermore, this targeted filtration of mobility and migration, which supports and satisfies economic growth, takes on an even greater role on a global level. By imitating and homogenizing points-based systems for attracting talented migrants, knowledge economies are able to strengthen both their own autonomous positions as well as their positions within a global competition of knowledge-based economies (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 140).

Differential Inclusion through Fees and Debt

In the UK, the points-based system is employed for regulating non-EU student and teacher visa applicants. One of the key methods of regulation that it uses is a series of bureaucratic hurdles, which are often associated with varying fee levels. Some of these levels include the cost of visa applications (£145 as of 2010), proof of maintenance funds, or proof of a sum of money in a local bank account for supporting one's stay in the UK with external funds (up to £7,200 for a one-year master's degree as of 2010), as well as biometric data, ID cards, translations, photos, or other documents which can all add hundreds of pounds in fees (Hartwich 2010, pp. 5–6).⁶⁵ All of this material and data must then be gathered and coordinated with the UK Home Office. Additional non-financial regulations include the strict monitoring of visa holders by, for example, strictly monitoring their attendance (i.e. failure to attend lectures can lead to deportation) or even tracking students' whereabouts long after completion of their studies in the UK (Ibid., p 6).

Austria, in contrast to the UK, does not currently use the points-based system for regulating student migration. However, a number of financial filters limit access to higher education in Austria. After obtaining proof of acceptance to a university, which involves the costs and time necessary for the travel and potential visa costs, costs related to applications, entrance exams, or interviews at one or more universities, one must provide a

⁶⁵ Teachers visiting the UK also often have to pay thousands of pounds in legal fees (Hartwich 2010, p. 6).

number of additional documents.⁶⁶ The applicant must also provide proof of maintenance funds in a local bank account in the applicant's name. The sum of required maintenance funds should cover the student's estimated cost of living, thus students must also provide bills from their rent, utilities, and other major living expenses whereupon the immigration agent calculates how much they believe the student needs to sustain living costs for one year, generally amounting to approximately €7,000–8,000).⁶⁷ One must also provide proof of local health insurance and a rental contract in the applicant's name. The latter provision appeared in recent years and is very difficult to obtain, as most renters prefer employed locals to unemployed foreign students. It also generally involves higher rent than shared apartment rental. Applications also involve ever-rising processing fees.⁶⁸ After this whole process, students are only granted very limited access to the job market. Thus, these regulations are able to assure that a steady flow of money enters from abroad to finance students' lives whilst minimizing

66 These include e.g. proof that the applicant has no criminal record in their home country and proof of good health. The latter includes a list of diseases that one must be tested for, including illnesses that are not routinely tested such as the *plague* or *whooping cough*. This was my experience when applying for an Austrian student visa in Croatia in 2004. These documents often incur additional fees.

67 I have heard from applicants from Singapore and Israel that they required much higher sums of money (twice or even thrice the amount) and needed to show that the money was in a frozen savings account rather than an accessible checking account (thus preventing them from temporarily borrowing money).

68 This information was gathered through personal experiences with student migration in Austria along with additional details from the experiences of friends and colleagues. More information on visa applications can be obtained from here: <http://www.migration.gv.at/en/>

the capacity for students to root themselves and remain in the country after their studies.⁶⁹

In Australia, three tiers of student visas⁷⁰ are categorized by country of origin. They consist of four “levels” which determine the amount for applicants’ maintenance funds. Someone from a Level 4 country (e.g. India) must provide funds that cover travel, tuition, and living costs for three years, or A\$36,000 (Neilson 2009, p. 47). A Level 3 country (e.g. China) must only provide funds for two years. A Level 2 (e.g. Israel) must only provide funds for one year. And applicants from Level 1 countries (e.g. the USA) are exempt from having to provide evidence of funds (Ibid.). These examples illustrate the tendency for filtering applicants according to their capabilities of not only paying constantly increasing fees, but also for proving access to large sums of money that are regularly transferred (and transferrable) from outside of the given country to a local bank account (which incurs additional fees).

When these fees are piled onto other required fees such as higher tuition for foreigners or possible taxes, parking fees, student union membership, books, etc., many foreign students (or their families) turn to loans, consequently accumulating debt. In the case of Australian

69 These regulations change frequently and can become dangerous because there is no system for updating visa holders before extending their applications, e.g. late applicants are penalized having to restart their applications from the beginning from the applicant’s home country. This is so grave because for a while applicants were told to do their applications as close to the expiration date as possible since extension adds one year to the date of application not expiry.

70 These consist of the 572 visa for Vocational Education and Training, the 573 visa for Higher Education, and the 574 visa for Higher Research (Neilson 2009, p. 47).

foreign students, Neilson describes tendencies for not only taking out loans, but obtaining loans by “means of multiple mortgages on family-homes” (particularly in the case of India) or by liquidating non-cash assets as “most Indian students require about AUD 50,000 to successfully apply for study in Australia” (Ibid., p. 47). Furthermore, debts and fees often push many students to work (often illegally) while studying in an attempt to repay their families due to the pressures of displacing one’s debts onto others. That illegal work – which typically consists of unskilled jobs that are unrelated to their subjects of study – makes foreign students “deportable subjects” (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 156).

Spatial, Temporal, and Virtual Regulators

These processes of filtering, segregating, and regulating foreign students through fees and debt work hand-in-hand with instruments that regulate and govern spatial and temporal aspects of migration processes. This can involve an investment and loss of time due to application processes. For example, in the past many students suffered from losing most of their first semester due to visa application processes at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (myself included).⁷¹ On the other hand, it can also involve more abstract processes, which support practices of temporal and space-based differential inclusion.

⁷¹ The Academy has reacted to this by moving the entrance exam several months earlier thereby providing adequate time for application processing. This resulted from one of the demands made during the university occupation and protests of 2009–10.

Within the context of filtering migration for fulfilling the needs of the local labor market in globalized competition, Mezzadra and Neilson are correct in claiming that “it seems as if skilled and unskilled migrants occupy different universes of migration, living in parallel worlds where the experiences and political stakes of their mobilities are radically incongruous” (2013, p. 137). Monika Mokre articulates these “different universes,” maintaining that:

While, according to the Lisbon strategy, the EU aims at becoming “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-intensive economy,” tedious jobs in other parts of the economy (as well as in parts of knowledge production) are frequently carried out by people without the possibility to demand minimum wages and compliance with labor laws. This system is not only profitable for big enterprises but also for individual EU citizens – apartments are reconstructed and cleaned, relatives taken care of – and all this at very low costs. In this way, the contradictions of nationalist populism and supranational economic policies serve the implementation of neoliberal governmental strategies (2013, *n. pag.*).

National borders shape migration and thus inclusion and exclusion. However, with the emergence of new forms of governance and new regional supranational constellations, these borders have become displaced. New sets of borders overlap at different levels, while certain functions are pushed out to outlying areas. This can be seen in the EU’s numerous overlapping disciplinary and security institutions such as Europol, the Schengen Information System (SIS), and FRONTEX, which lie both within and beyond the geographic borders of the EU (Hess & Tsianos 2007, p. 29).

Due to the variations between OMC regulations in different states, those states at the external borders of the EU often have particularly harsh systems as they are expected to perform the role of the watchdogs of the EU. However, these border states also have the capacity to outsource their responsibilities beyond the EU to so-called “third countries” that do not belong to the EU or European Economic Area. Balibar describes these practices as “externalizing the camps” to quasi “auxiliary immigration officers (such as Ukraine, Turkey, Morocco, Libya, etc.)” (2004, p. 16). By outsourcing and displacing the responsibility for “illegal immigrants” to outside of the EU, these people are no longer protected by European regulations such as the Geneva Convention, but are instead subjected to conditions condemned by the EU and blame is transferred to those outlying nations.

These regulations create asynchronous dimensions of migration, which are temporally regulated and interrupted through “transit, prolongation, and acceleration” (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 149). Such temporal factors often leave migrants in erratic conditions in unexpected places. These times and spaces are additionally displaced through emerging technologies in migration regimes, which create virtual forms of regulation such as Eurodac. Eurodac’s “smart border” consists of a scattered dissemination of surveillance points that comprise a digital network as a virtual border (Kuster & Tsianos 2013, *n. pag.*).

These complex forms of spatial, temporal, and virtual displacement have led Mezzadra and Neilson to broaden the established notion of the international division of labor. With the notion of the global “multiplication of labor” (2008), they highlight the multifarious processes

involved in differential inclusion that allow for such diverse and variable constructions and divides. Mezzadra and Neilson thus assert that the term “multiplication” should, on the one hand, broaden the idea of an international division of labor that involves relations of dependence between “developed” and “developing” nations. On the other hand, they highlight the “multiplicity of overlapping sites that are themselves internally heterogeneous” (2013, pp. 45–46).

The multiplication of labor not only destabilizes the notion of rigid national borders, it highlights the potentiality of the manifold subjectivities of migrants. It provides a more diversified perspective on the temporal, spatial, and virtual elements at play in migration regimes today. It thus allows for a clearer understanding of the various overlaps created within contemporary cognitive capitalism such as those of student, worker, and migrant. These overlaps are sites of links between the cognitivization of labor and the cognitivization of movement as well as the “different universes” that emerge as a result of the proliferation of borders, differential inclusion, and the multiplication of labor.

CHAPTER 5

THE LIMITS TO CAPITAL AND NEW FRONTIERS

Recent transformations in structures of knowledge production have played a pivotal role in creating both extensive and intensive new frontiers as well as new forms of displacement. These new frontiers and displacements, triggered by crises or limits to capital, function hand-in-hand. In other words, limits to capital and crises comprise the forces that threaten the functioning of capitalism and prompt its transformation, adaptation, or renewal through seeking new frontiers. These limits consist of economic limits, material resource limits, or limits posed by social movements.

The cyclical transformations of the historical eras outlined in this book span from pre-modern / pre-dating modern capitalism to post-modern. In order to properly analyze such historical continuities, Istvan Mészáros proposes the notion of a “system of capital” (2010), or the commercializing system that has developed from pre-modern proto-capitalism to present-day capitalism in crisis. By analyzing this broader perspective, rather than focusing on modern or contemporary capitalism alone, he is able to question uneven developments of capitalization in different parts of the world, the failures of historical socialist regimes which he claims are the result of not fully breaking away from such a “system of capital,” and most significantly, potential alternatives to capitalism in the case of crisis or collapse.

Numerous theoretical perspectives have questioned how to approach the potentiality of capitalism’s downfall. Rosa Luxemburg’s theories, although highly

contested in her day, highlight many important transformations still underway today. On the one hand, her writings present capitalism as cyclical whilst being suspended atop its own internal anarchy – which can be understood as crisis in itself. It is thus extended, adapted, and made more flexible by credit, ultimately bound to collapse in on its own contradictions (Luxemburg 1900/1999). However, one of Luxemburg’s main concerns regarded how to continue sustaining capitalism within a given space without reaching a limit to resources, space, and means of production. Luxemburg thus understood imperial expansion as the necessary result of capitalism’s parasitic reliance on external markets. She maintained that these processes disable the independent development of outlying regions, thereby allowing the most advanced capitalist spaces to be less and less reliant on material resources (Luxemburg 1913/1951).

By combining the perspectives laid out by Mészáros and Luxemburg, not only can one observe a long history of capitalizing tendencies and links between capitalism and crisis but also between capitalization and colonization. In other words, capitalization or pre-capitalist commercialization rely on spatial expansion and have expanded as such before and during modernity. During postmodernity, or an age of “compressed space and time” (Sheehan 2007, p. 17; cf. Harvey 1992), spatial expansion and the capacity to overcome capitalist expansion’s limits have been transformed through temporal rearrangements. Therefore, in the case of Postfordist cognitive capitalization and the expansion of knowledge economies, intensive and extensive transformations have become intertwined. These transformations dominate areas previously regarded as marginal to the capitalist

market, such as knowledge and education, on the one hand, and they expand to dominate real spaces which are regulated through oppressive, bloody border and migration regimes, on the other.

These various intensive and extensive mechanisms allow the “new wealth of nations” to be proliferated by encroaching on countless spaces – real and virtual – and times of life, rearranging them in the process. These processes of seeking new frontiers have in many ways developed with and advanced historically colonial dimensions of capitalist expansion by emulating colonizing practices such as structural adjustment models, or implementing complex forms of differential inclusion and border and migration regimes around the fortified territories of knowledge economies. In this sense, Mészáros’s “system of capital” can be adapted to illustrate a “system of colonization” – that existed before, during, and after the recognized colonial era of the 16th to mid-20th centuries – for understanding such tendencies which reach beyond the theoretical framework of neocolonialism or coloniality (cf. Anibal Quijano, Walter D. Mignolo).

While proponents of knowledge economy growth and some theorists of cognitive capitalism maintain that knowledge-based growth provides a solution to the limitations and problems caused by industrialized material production, the various global crises – financial, ecological, food, water, oil, energy, etc. – can no longer be understood separately from one another. However, this is not to say that the term crisis can be taken for granted. Such rhetoric is used to govern us through fear, and a critical reflection of such notions is important when developing alternatives. For instance, various Neo-Malthusian perspectives have created fear and doomsday

theories.⁷² At the same time, the mainstream media and politicians have been able to use similar notions to stir populations to widespread panic by designating various actions as “crises.” This can be seen, for example, in the designation of the recent mass movements of refugees as “refugee crises.”

However, an *eco-economic* perspective on crisis, which refers to the unsustainable consequences of the delusion of infinite growth by focusing on causal links between economy and ecology (Gibson-Graham & Roelvink 2009, *n. pag.*), can be useful when developing alternative perspectives for dealing with the consequences of processes that displace economic crises into the environment and onto people’s lives. This is because it highlights relationships that point toward the material and spatial-temporal vectors of cognitive capitalism. These interrelations are of pivotal importance within a context in which Postfordist, “post-industrial” cognitive growth is regarded as providing the ultimate sustainable approach to resolving the “grand challenges.”⁷³ In other

72 Sasha Lilley thus criticizes such catastrophist tendencies, claiming that not only does fear paralyze people from taking action, it plays into agendas of the right (2012a, p. 3).

73 This spurious perspective on sustainability is exemplary of contemporary sustainability policies. Such perspectives depart from the Brundtland approach, defined in 1983 as economic development which does not compromise the environment, society, or future generations (UN World Commission on Environment and Development 1987). However, critics maintain that such a perspective on economic growth is paradoxical (Banerjee 2003; McLaren & Tristán, *n.d.*). In fact, Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee refers to such policies as “continuing the epistemic violence of colonial development” (2003, p. 174), as they frequently marginalize, erase, or appropriate traditional knowledges that Indigenous communities rely on and have relied on for thousands of years (*Ibid.*, p. 144). Moreover, the implementation of greener, cleaner energy – and the knowledge required to do so –

words, while questions of sustainable knowledge-based growth continue legacies of colonial “development” and the instrumentalization of knowledge for capitalization and expansionism, such tools can help to elucidate how these processes are merely displacing some of the significant crucial issues of our time.

In this regard, Maurizio Lazzarato employs Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s notion of “antiproduction,” or forms of production that degrade the resources they work with that are “inextricable from but are above all indispensable to capitalism” (2012, p. 154). In other words, by focusing on the consequences of these processes in contemporary forms of cognitive production, Lazzarato maintains that “[m]odern-day antiproduction (the antiproduction of the knowledge society, cultural capitalism, cognitive capitalism) has not only worsened the economic conditions of the vast majority of the population, it is also a subjective catastrophe” (Ibid., pp. 154–155). This progressive analysis of “antiproduction,” as that which causes eco-economic crisis by branching out *to* and *from* the most advanced tiers of capitalism and simultaneously causing detrimental consequences, is

does not resolve the issue of human rights abuses, or the *social* aspect of sustainability, and the destruction of the environment. Numerous examples have emerged around the world, although primarily in the “Global South” in recent years, of renewable energy sources (e.g. hydroelectric power, biomass, thermoelectric power, wind power, or solar power) being implemented with a complete disregard of human populations, the environment, and wildlife. Such disregard results in displacing communities and destroying their livelihoods, polluting the water, soil, air, and forests through chemical dumping from power plants or the general destruction of forests, water sources, and wildlife for their expansion. Massimo De Angelis thus claims that efforts to divorce access to resources from democracy become the dominant methods for hegemonic sustainability policy (2008, p. 13).

precisely the point of departure of this book and the link between its two parts. It is also important to highlight that these most “advanced” tiers of capitalism identify only the *tip of a vast iceberg* of global capitalist production and labor (Mies 1986, p. xi), thus ignoring a wide range of overlapping realities subject to Fordist labor paradigms or pre-industrial labor.

Whereas these various crises – real or fabricated by the media or politics – have created destructive conditions of antiproduction, there is another side to such limits to capital. In other words, the forces created through social movements can also generate limits to capital just as powerful as the very crises of capitalism. Such movements will play a major role in elaborating alternatives to these crisis-driven transformations and their various detrimental displacements in the remaining chapters of this book.

Translocal Nodes of Social Agency

Various struggles have emerged around the world in reaction to the displacement of capitalist crisis into the institutions of knowledge production and the lives of students, learners, and educators. The California university occupations have accordingly stated that “we are the crisis” (*After the Fall: Communiqués from Occupied California* 2010, p. 1),⁷⁴ while the Italian “Anomalous Wave” claimed that “we won’t pay for your crisis!”⁷⁵ Knowledge-based

⁷⁴ <http://www.afterthefallcommuniques.info>

⁷⁵ The Anomalous Wave was a large protest movement against educational reforms consisting of schools from primary to tertiary level, which primarily spread across Italy in the fall of 2008. Major emphases of this protest wave were self-education and *autoformazione*, which

struggles such as these have fought to reclaim space, time, and resources, attempting to recover commons in the face of complex relationships between public and private. They have demanded socially just modes of development and emancipation from the grip of capital as well as equal rights for knowledge-based migrants.

While they have drawn from and developed historical struggles, knowledge-based struggles of recent years have in many ways been part of a “movement of movements.” That is, they comprise constituent nodes within the broader Global Justice Movement. Linking the potentialities of constituent power⁷⁶ to the utopian aims of the Global Justice Movement and the many nodes of which it is comprised, Antonio Negri claims that “what is striking in the movements from Seattle to today is that they no longer speak of taking power, but rather of *making* power, *of creating another power*, and whilst everyone knows that this is utopian, they also know that it has become necessary and realistic due to the vertigo of

referred to self-growth for critical thinking (Benino 2009, *n. pag.*). The movement consisted of marches, occupations, and roadblocks. Cf: Anomalous Wave, (20 Nov 2008), “The Anomalous Wave so far: The Education Rebellion in Italy (October–November 2008)”: https://jaromil.dyne.org/journal/documents/anomalous_wave-eng-nov09.pdf Some major university-based collectives which emerged from the Anomalous Wave are Uniriot and Unicommon. See: <http://www.uniriot.org>; <http://www.unicommon.org/index.php>

76 The notions of “constituent” and “instituent” power have played an important role in critical theory around social movements, the articulation of critique, and the development of perspectives regarding institutions and institutional critique. While constituent power consists of collective social forces, instituent practices apply those forces to create alternative spaces to the structures and institutions of the state and capital against which such practices are critical. Cf. Raúl Sánchez Cedillo’s use of the terms *instituto* and *instituire* (2007, *n. pag.*).

the current epochal transition” (2003, *n. pag.*; emphasis added).⁷⁷ Furthermore, Lazzarato differentiates these movements from previous generations, claiming,

For example, the event of Seattle no longer refers to class struggle and the necessity of taking power. It does not mention the subject of history, the working class, its enemy capital, or the fatal battle that they must engage in. It restricts itself to announcing that “something possible has been created,” that there are new possibilities for living, and that it is a matter of realizing them; that a possible world has been expressed and that it must be brought to completion. We have entered into a different intellectual atmosphere, a different conceptual constellation (2003, *n. pag.*).

Many of these more recent knowledge-based movements have developed new forms of translocal networks and new modes of communication⁷⁸ through, among other older methods, the use of new technologies.⁷⁹ Struggles have also expanded beyond their original spaces of contention. In other words, while struggles against the transformation of universities, the commodification of education, or SAPs have taken place for decades since the late 1960s, more recent movements have expanded to different spaces

⁷⁷ Cf. the slogan of the World Social Forum: “another world is possible.”

⁷⁸ Various perspectives on translocality emerged with debates on globalization, however, the perspective I refer to here was developed by Banerjee (2011) regarding the emancipatory potential of dispossessed and displaced persons that transcends nation-state borders and global capitalism through the exchange of knowledges, experiences, strategies, and resources.

⁷⁹ S. A. Hamed Hosseini credits the movement as emerging from the complex conditions and increased connectivity that developed in different parts of the world after the Cold War (2009, pp. 21, 25).

and have linked to broader areas. These have included precarious or unemployed academics, undocumented or unrecognized labor, migration, or traditional rural workers of non-industrialized communities. As a result of linking these perspectives, movements are able to become stronger, develop new modes of communication, and learn from one another's experiences. In this sense, individual nodes of struggle do not represent a unified revolutionary class. And the emphasis on nodes also implies no central leadership. These nodes take into account differences (Dipesh Chakrabarty 2000, Sandro Mezzadra 2012), ruptures (Astrid Messerschmidt 2008), the autonomy of migration (Vassilis Tsianos/Dimitris Papadopoulos 2007), and incommensurabilities (Eve Tuck/Wayne K. Yang 2012) in space, time, cultures, and belief systems and assemble them translocally for emergent/constituent action.

Such grassroots struggles have been able to create a different kind of limits to capital than those caused by capitalist crises. They have thus also created new frontiers – not as new frontiers for capitalist expansion but as alternative modes of living – collectively envisioning new worlds and alternative new realities through common strategies of creating “counter-power.” By practicing counter-power or creating “different worlds,”⁸⁰ these actions aim for fundamental structural change.⁸¹

⁸⁰ In reference to the perspectives developed by *Colectivo Situaciones* and Lazzarato respectively.

⁸¹ Gibson-Graham quote Michal Osterweil, stating that: “By asserting and creating multiple other ways of being in the world, these movements rob capital (or the state) of its monopoly and singular definitions of time, space and value, thereby destroying its hegemony, while at the same time furnishing new tools to address the complex set of problematic power relations it confronts us with from particular and embedded locations” (Osterweil 2004, p. 8 quoted in Gibson-Graham 2006, p. xx).

This perspective on “counter-power” has been developed by the Argentinian militant research collective, *Colectivo Situaciones*, through the use of the Spanish term *contrapoder*.⁸² The collective elaborates their position, stating,

As far from institutional procedures as it is from ideological certainties, the question is rather to organize life according to a series of hypotheses (practical and theoretical) on the ways to (self-) emancipation. To work in autonomous collectives that do not obey rules imposed by academia implies the establishment of a positive connection with subaltern, dispersed, and hidden knowledges, and the production of a body of *practical knowledges of counter power* (Colectivo Situaciones 2006, *n. pag.*).

Movements around debt abolishment, migration,⁸³ self-education, and the transformation of modes of living and learning from below comprise significant perspectives and translocal nodes for challenging and providing obstacles to knowledge-based policies and their spurious aims of “sustainability.” And these various translocal processes highlight and delineate the displaced underbelly of transformations in systems and institutions of knowledge production by exposing the

82 By using the Spanish word, they are able to articulate a more precise definition of the term, referring to the work of Baruch Spinoza, since there are two words for power in Spanish: *poder* and *potencia* (Colectivo Situaciones 2006, *n. pag.*). Using *poder* for its static, constituent, representational strength, *Colectivo Situaciones* applies and develops *contrapoder* through their militant research (Ibid.).

83 This includes the very movements of migration itself, social and political movements by and for migrants, as well as the alternative transnational family and community networks that support migration by providing the “social capital” for “autonomous dynamics of migration” (Mezzadra 2010, *n. pag.*).

material vectors of these processes through their given social, political, and migratory movements. The experiences outlined in part II of this book are examples of such perspectives.

PART II
EMANCIPATORY GRASSROOTS
PERSPECTIVES

CHAPTER 1

CO-RESEARCH, SELF-EDUCATION, CO-DETERMINATION

The tendencies outlined in part I of this book illustrate a rather grim horizon for education and its potential with respect to sustainable immaterial production. Some examples make it appear as if there were no alternatives to these stifling and disastrous transformations. However, this is not the case. These rather bleak perspectives have resulted from the appropriation of resistance, grassroots actions, protests, alternative proposals for teaching and learning, and radical attempts at subverting educational systems. In other words, transformations to structures and institutions of knowledge production have not simply emerged from the world of policy, they have been prompted by struggles. While these processes of appropriation present major obstacles for grassroots practices, a deeper examination of such transformations exposes the underlying wealth of actions, knowledge, and perspectives created by those struggles. And some recent movements, built with critical awareness of processes of appropriation, have developed substantial methods for reclaiming knowledge, spaces, and resources. Some of these strategies consist of co-research, occupation, blockades, or hijacking formal knowledge.

Processes of co-research have played an important role in recent knowledge-based movements. These practices have developed traditions spanning from Karl Marx's workers' surveys of the 1880s through to the

Italian *operaist* workers' inquiries of the 1960s and 1970s, radical feminism of the 1960s and 1970s, and the participation action research⁸⁴ that departed from the Freire school (Malo de Molina 2004a,b). These various influences have strengthened the shifts from the interrogation of research subjects to the collaborative self-reflection of subject-researchers for self-empowerment. They have also strengthened shifts from examining the conditions of the factory to the social factory,⁸⁵ incorporating new forms of unrecognized labor and exploitation. Some contemporary strategies of co-research include “*workshops* and collective reading, [...] the production of the conditions for thinking and disseminating productive texts, [...] the generation of circuits founded on concrete experiences of struggle and in nuclei of researcher-militants” (Colectivo Situaciones 2006, n. pag.).

The co-research that developed within the struggles in which I participated was dispersed through actions that included working groups, the invitation of guests and lecturers who could contribute to the struggles through

84 Participation action research (PAR) became strongly “linked to popular education and grassroots activism in the midst of anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolutionary movements,” particularly in Latin America and South Asia, strengthening “social struggles in rural areas” (Malo de Molina 2004b, n. pag.).

85 Raunig traces the origins of the term “social factory” to the Italian autonomous Marxist movement (*autonomia*) during the 1970s. The *autonomia* referred to this “social factory” as the *fabbrica diffusa*. This term was introduced to identify the “exodus of the workers from the factory,” which influenced the transformations in labor of the following decades (Raunig 2009, n. pag.). Feminist theories such as Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James also refer to the social factory as a space with the capacity of being appropriated by capital as well as supporting the subversive social potential of women’s invisible work (1972, p. 11).

their theoretical perspectives or personal experiences rather than “specialists”; the organization of plenums, local, and international meetings; various reading groups; collective text production; collective translation; collective press statements; the establishment of online platforms that distributed materials produced by participants as well as updates regarding the goings-on and events of the struggles and occupations; the organization of protest marches; and the documentation and dissemination of events and lessons learned through struggle in order to contribute to further strengthening future struggles. It is also important to point out that these practices constitute co-research insofar as the production, documentation, and dissemination has been carried out by the participants in order to contribute to their political aims or struggle.

In the case of Vienna, the “squatting teachers” also worked together with students to develop strategies or share material on radical pedagogies or policies that pertained to common struggles. These processes thus straddled the border between university education and self-education. Each of these activities has played an important role in the development of the knowledges, experiences, and material presented in chapter two, and will be described in more detail in the following sections. Co-research plays an important role in this book as it should also serve as a platform for chronicling past experiences and for contributing to the perspectives that further support these struggles in the future. This is because documentation has played an important role in struggles and in developing alternative perspectives within knowledge-based movements.

Cooking up Occupations

The strategy of documentation within occupations or as a form of co-research proved significant as it not only allowed different struggles to learn from one another. It also helped to prevent the problems that emerged when new people joined struggles, often repeating mistakes regarding decisions that were already learned to be problematic or counter-productive. Thus, chronicling became a way of creating a loose map of experiences that participants could refer to, adapt, or append. This was one of the lessons learned in Vienna, and it clarifies the aims of the Zagreb *Filozofski Fakultet* occupation for writing *The Occupation Cookbook*. This section will elaborate the inspirational model of co-production of *The Occupation Cookbook*, which documented and clarified lessons learned from grassroots democratic structures in plenums and university occupations.⁸⁶

The Occupation Cookbook emphasizes the use of a *cookbook as a strategy*, “not a manifesto or a proclamation, an open letter or theses,” but instead, “[o]ne is invited to the kitchen and not on the stage of world history” (Buden 2009, p. 14). While the protestors in Zagreb had the main demand for “free publicly financed education on all levels available to all” (Ibid., p. 17), the university occupation was controlled by students in a way that did not impede the regular operation of the university (aside from the conducting of regular classes,

⁸⁶ I was not directly involved in this occupation in Zagreb, but was informed by it and was in communication with its participants through various collectives that I participated in in Vienna such as the research project *creating worlds*: <http://eicpcp.net/projects/creatingworlds/files/about/>

which was halted and replaced with alternative structures). During this time, the institution was opened to the public by the protestors, who encouraged the public to engage in open plenums. The structure, organization, and lessons learned from these plenums comprise the bulk of the *Cookbook* and are broken down into analyses of how minute-taking and recording of plenums was performed, how moderation was performed, the use of security guards, and the use of technicians for setting up microphones, speakers, computers, and projectors for projecting the minutes onto the wall live. Their plenums (and the ones in Vienna alike) were generally proposed and announced via mailing lists. Furthermore, various problems or conflicts that arose were described in the *Cookbook* as well. These consisted, for instance, of various practices for preventing attempts to “privatize the plenum” by speaking too long (The Occupation Cookbook 2009, p. 35).

The *Cookbook* also describes how the forms of grassroots democracy that developed through these plenums and occupations provided a fundamental contribution to struggle that representative democracy has failed to deliver. According to the *Cookbook*, grassroots democracy is “a direct consequence of the unfulfilled promise of representative democracy. When the representative democracy is not fulfilling its promises, a directly democratic decision-making becomes a security measure and a reminder of its fundamental meaning – a specter that does not stop to haunt” (Ibid., p. 78). The protests and occupations in Croatia were also significant for elucidating various processes such as “integration” taking place at the borders of the EU (at the time, Croatia was awaiting approval for EU membership, which ultimately took

place on July 1, 2013). Tuition fees were depicted by the government as an indisputable part of the nation's "modernization" process (Ibid., p. 76). Thus, the *Cookbook* claims that "the student fight for the right to free education should be understood as part of a more comprehensive struggle to defend the interests of the majority, and not as a particular and selfish aberration, as some media and politicians are trying to present it" (Ibid., p. 78).

Since the time of the Zagreb *Filozofski Fakultet* occupation in spring 2009, other struggles in Croatia and abroad, including workers' struggles, mass protests against government corruption, or global days of action, such as the October 15th Global Day of Action (O.15),⁸⁷ have used models very similar to the guidelines outlined in *The Occupation Cookbook* for facilitating communication within assemblies.⁸⁸ However, these guidelines worked alongside hand gestures, sign language, and digital technology as well as other unique models which emerged for simplifying communication within protests, occupations, or transnational meetings. These practices were also broadly distributed throughout different parts of the world.

Communication Strategies

Many of the knowledge-based movements of recent years across Europe, the USA, Australia, and parts of Latin America, Asia, and Africa have been in exchange with one another through the use of digital technologies,

⁸⁷ <http://www.peoplesassemblies.org/2011/06/united-for-global-change-o15/>

⁸⁸ This claim comes from personal experiences of witnessing public plenums within protest actions that followed the same guidelines.

publications, and through transnational meetings and protest actions that were centered around plenums or plenary organizational structures.⁸⁹ In order for plenums or large protest actions to be comprehensible on a local level, and especially on a transnational level, a code of guidelines for communication developed. The resulting actions and modes of communication represent an emerging *new language* made up of a multiplicity of unique languages and strategies. This represented an additional structure for grassroots democratic decision-making processes and non-violent direct action.

This new language consists of various gesticulations borrowed from sign language, as visual interventions were easier to interpret within large assemblies than audial forms – which can instead become a cacophony of voices.⁹⁰ Guidelines for limiting speaking times have also been important as they allow more people the opportunity to speak. Furthermore, instead of extending the times of plenums and meetings, working groups were encouraged for dealing with specific issues that needed extra time, so as not to fill the plenum. Those working groups were to subsequently report back to the plenum with the results of their individual meetings.

Communication within large assemblies has been fine-tuned through the successes and failures of the

89 Latin America, Asia, and Africa have been linked to Europe and Australia to a lesser degree, instead predominantly being linked on a regional level.

90 Some of the major signs include *agreement* or *veto*, the latter of which is important as it allows the critical intervention of someone who has a grave disagreement with a potentially problematic decision that the others overlooked. Other signs include directly *commenting on the last statement* before one's turn to speak or urging a *speeding up* of statements, which is related to a limitation of speaking times.

experiences of struggle. However, crucial organizational tools for communication across distances have developed in and through digital and social media. As actions often took place very quickly and sometimes with legal pressure, live updates through platforms such as Twitter or the Indymedia ticker have been helpful. Facebook also provides a platform for organization and simple mobile phone text messages are often the most effective for quick communication.⁹¹ Other web platforms or mailing lists have provided virtual archival spaces for the collection and dissemination of documentation, the sharing of common materials for collective drafting, or announcements from struggles, thus providing platforms for processes of co-research. For example, the Edu-factory mailing list provided an efficient and frequently used space for informing movements about one another, their actions, postings, and research. Accordingly, the Edu-factory describes their platform as an “autonomous network to spread news and materials, to share texts of militant research among different struggles and temporalities, to organize ourselves within and against the global university” (Edu-factory [mailing list] 2010).⁹² The Edu-factory mailing list and website are thus part of their aims for establishing a Global Autonomous University.

However, while these common guidelines for communication can overcome many obstacles, these practices – particularly the use of technologies – limit the participation of those who do not have access to such

⁹¹ Cf. Sokari Ekine’s (Ed.) *SMS Uprising: Mobile Activism in Africa* (2010) for accounts of the potentials of cell phone technology for social movements.

⁹² <https://www.mail-archive.com/cyberinternational@ml.free.fr/msg01164.html>

technologies. At the same time, those who have access to them participate in a traceable form of communication, creating an ambivalent relationship between social media and legal repression. On the one hand, activities can be disseminated quickly and people can be updated about police or potentially violent situations such as encounters with unexpected mobs of far right-wing hooligans. On the other hand, such technologies trace a history of those who took part in specific activities and when and where they did so – such data trails have been used by the police to incriminate activists.⁹³ Therefore, forms of communication within protests and occupations have often reverted to simpler modes. For instance, individuals memorize contact information for lawyers or other aid services. In addition, police threats and legal limitations have prompted innovative ways of overcoming repressive challenges. One such example is the “human microphone,” which became a common practice within the Occupy Movement when laws limited certain decibels of communication or when the police cut off access to electricity and thus access to microphones for public communication.⁹⁴ The method of the “human microphone” involves a type of “broken telephone” of passing messages through a crowd for information or decision-making. This way, noise complaints and even technological limitations can be evaded.

⁹³ See e.g. the case of the 3 (later 4) students arrested in Vienna whose hard drives and other technological devices were confiscated by police and used against them in court (Freies Medium Ottensheim 2010): <http://fm5ottensheim.blogspot.com/2010/07/anti-repressionsdemo-in-wien-12-juli.html>

⁹⁴ Cf. the video and lesson on using the human microphone at Occupy Wall Street (Frank & Sergeev 2011): http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2011/10/video_a_brief_lesson_on_using.html

CHAPTER 2

DOCUMENTING STRUGGLES

The Academy of Fine Arts Vienna

The Academy of Fine Arts Vienna played a major role in the wave of university protests and occupations across Europe from 2009–10. These protests primarily emerged as a reaction to the restrictions imposed by the Bologna Process, which neared its fulfillment in March 2010 – a date chosen to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the University of Bologna, the first modern university. The pre-history of the occupation of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna involved many activities organized by a small group of people in which I was part. It changed members and names as it changed focus over the months/years from 2006–09. During the early years, our small group began expanding a library archive in the PCAP class and began organizing reading group meetings. This core group used the name “no-manden” at that time. Various processes of exchange with other reading groups and self-education collectives, which resulted from travels with the class to other cities and countries, led us to new material and new approaches. This included a trip to the Performing Arts Forum (PAF) in St. Erme, France, where we met members of TkH (*Teorija koja hoda / Walking Theory*) from Belgrade in 2006.⁹⁵ The material that we read at the

⁹⁵ There we, the participants, discussed issues concerning autonomous educational processes and projects, and began reading texts on “universal teaching” (Rancière 1991) and radical pedagogy as well as material regarding the financial crisis and its relationship to higher education and the theory of cognitive capitalism. These early

time focused on radical pedagogies and theories, but we also began to read policy papers that clarified the changes taking place in the university system. After realizing the urgency of the situation, our primary focus shifted to the Bologna Process and the organization of practical actions. The student union of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (*Österreichische HochschülerInnenschaft*) gained interest in some of these actions and joined as well. Afterwards some of the actions shifted to the space of the student union with the introduction of the Tutorium Project. With the incorporation of new people, the group began a longer process of expansion and change.

We developed more targeted actions as developments in the reform processes created greater urgency. One such action was spurred by a presentation by the Minister of Science and Research at the time, Johannes Hahn (now member of the European Commission), on his universities tour in March 2008. That tour was supposed to advertise the appeal of the Bologna Process reforms to universities in Vienna. The first university on the tour was the Academy of Fine Arts. Some of the main points he outlined were “autonomy,” “increased mobility,” and placing the “person at the center” (*Mensch im Mittelpunkt*).⁹⁶ Presenting skewed versions of notions which are enforced by laws that create, prohibit, and make migrants precarious due to the exclusion and creation of even greater and more powerful elites, Hahn ironically also claimed that it was necessary to build a

readings culminated in a discussion and presentation at *Dietheater* in Vienna one month later, entitled “Politics of Education in Neoliberal Global Capitalism/Disagreements on Knowledge.”

96 For a .pdf of the Ministry’s pamphlet from the event, see: http://www.tuwien.ac.at/fileadmin/t/tuwien/docs/news/Unitour_1.pdf

stronger elite, because “elites are a necessary part of any democracy.” In reaction, we, the students who staged an intervention during the event, created a counter-flyer to pass around during the presentation, which outlined facts about the precarious situations in which non-EU students have to live and survive in Austria and the EU. During the following weeks of Hahn’s tour across Vienna, many demands were made by numerous universities’ student unions for his resignation.⁹⁷

As more people became involved, subsequent actions took the form of artistic flyers, statements, performances, posters, publications, and discussions. The Academy’s student union supported these processes by printing flyers and material for various events, discussions, and readings.⁹⁸ In addition, students from the Academy of Fine Arts began meeting with students from other universities in Vienna, for example, the active students in the International Development program of the University of Vienna, who had been dealing with similar topics, focusing in particular on the changes brought forth with the *Universitätsgesetz 2002* (the new Austrian “Universities Law”). Thereafter, new actions were planned, including the organization of workshops and invitations of guests and guest speakers. During the *Woche der freien Bildung* (week of free education, May 26–30, 2008),⁹⁹ actions such as readings in bank lobbies took place, involving students from various universities. At that time, readings shifted to discussing the

⁹⁷ <http://www.nachrichten.at/nachrichten/ticker/OeH-Wahl-Harsche-Kritik-regnet-es-fuer-Minister-Hahn;art449,188973>

⁹⁸ This continued to be the case later during the occupation when the student union was renamed the “*Dezentrale*” (de-central).

⁹⁹ <http://www.freie-bildung.at/>

GATS,¹⁰⁰ Marx's *Grundrisse*, and other material that examined the transformations taking place from an economic perspective.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, some of these reading groups moved to the virtual venue of Skype in order to include international participants working on similar topics from locations where homogenizing university reforms had already taken place, who could give accounts of their experiences.

This exchange of knowledge was useful as new processes were underway at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, which made it a priority for students to intervene in political decision-making processes before it became too late, as the reform processes also intended to disassemble democratic process. These spaces included the Curricula Commission, the Senate, and the newly introduced Quality Management System, which began shortly after Minister Hahn's presentation. The first Quality Management workshop (May 2008) included members of the private quality assurance company, Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance (AQA), and teachers and administrators of the Academy.¹⁰² Three students were

100 The 1995 World Trade Organization's *General Agreement on Trade and Services*.

101 During this phase, we branched off into sub-groups to focus on different texts, including material by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Marx, John Barker, Silvia Federici, George Caffentzis, Massimo De Angelis, Tiziana Terranova, Marc Bousquet, Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, David Harvey, David Graeber, and Stewart Martin, as well as policy papers such as the GATS or the Bologna Declaration.

102 One of the major goals of the Bologna Process was the implementation of a Quality Management System in all institutions of higher education (Egger-Subotitsch et al. 2010, p. 6). Quality management (QM) was proposed and implemented following the mandates of the 2003 Berlin Communiqué (ENQA 2009, p. 5). QM generally consists of a QM agency and/or quality manager and an external peer review which verifies the effectiveness of the system

also allowed to attend as “representatives” of the student union. The workshop consisted of abstract managerial methods that made it very difficult, if not impossible, to speak freely. After several days, it became clear that this “invitation” merely created a façade of pseudo-democratic decision-making rather than a genuine platform for discussing the improvement of the quality of the institution. The workshop in no way integrated the positions or disagreements of the students, thus making the final result appear as if all participants had consented to the process and the transformations that would follow. This prompted us student “representatives” to write a statement about the absurdity of legitimizing such a process, which we read to all participants upon withdrawing from the workshop, thereby attempting to remove the student body’s pseudo-consent.

Shortly afterwards, teachers – initially consisting of some of those involved in the Quality Management workshop – joined our research and actions. This new constellation used the name Initiative for the Re-Democratization of Educational Institutions (IRDEI).¹⁰³ This new, enlarged group had greater influence on the political structure of the university on various levels and it began organizing new actions for reaching that goal

(Ibid., p. 27). The institutions could run this process themselves in Austria, but had to do so at their own expense or they could adopt the suggestions of the Ministry of Science and Research and allow for management by a private contracted company. In the case of the latter, the institution receives ministerial funding for their structural reforms. This information was disseminated at the QM workshop by AQA.

103 Cf. the interview with members of IRDEI (2009): <http://kulturrisse.at/ausgaben/022009/oppositionen/praxis-von-unten-einfluen>

by informing students and faculty about the changes that were approaching. Some of these actions consisted of interventions into the Open House (*Rundgang*) in January 2009, with, for example, a critical audio piece that presented facts about the reforms and a series of presentations and discussions intended for all of the classes of the Academy.¹⁰⁴ In these discussions, we from IRDEI presented facts about the reforms and handed out material including a glossary we created from our previous project materials that outlined key notions that have a double meaning such as “autonomy” or “mobility.” During that time, students showed some interest and some joined our efforts, but IRDEI still remained a small group for several more months as it was difficult for people to believe that such a big shift could take place after the long historical legacy and structure of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna.

This changed several months later with the drafting of the *Entwicklungsplan* (Development Plan) and the *Leistungsvereinbarung* (Budget Agreement), a significant process in the reform of Austrian universities that takes place every three years. These two mission statements are the key steps in formally agreeing on a set of output-based objectives in exchange for a decided sum of ministerial funding. The former lays out a proposal while the latter is the resulting binding document. Perhaps due to the increased debate in the Curricula Commissions, Senate, and elsewhere, the President of the Academy presented the process as if it were participatory, inviting teachers and students to give suggestions

104 These “rounds” never made it to all of the classes because of time limitations, on the one hand, and numerous professors who did not support our goals, on the other.

and feedback. While our primary goal at the time was rejecting the B.A./M.A. system, the President had already proposed to integrate it by 2010 as part of the Development Plan. Our objective was, therefore, to create a list of proposals that simultaneously outlined the consequences of similar reforms in other parts of the world until then. Subsequently, a list of suggestions we (a subgroup of IRDEI) outlined developed into a thick draft in itself. That draft circulated throughout all of the departments and the student union with new amendments being added to it by the students and teachers of each of those departments. It was then handed to the President with the suggestion of using it – or at least integrating as many of its points as possible – during the ministerial negotiations. The President subsequently gave only very few vague responses, leaving the students and teachers clueless regarding his position or intentions regarding the draft.

The vacuum created by the President's silence increased the students' and teachers' disappointment. Consequently, a spontaneous public meeting was called in the assembly hall on October 20, 2009, where 200–300 students and faculty attended to demand that the President state his position regarding the proposal as well as his decision on what he would submit to the Ministry. A statement was read out detailing the collapse of democratic decision-making in the university and the protestors demanded that the President carry out his obligation to represent the institution during the negotiations the next day. Subsequently, a declaration was read out, which highlighted solidarity with all protestors against the commodification of education worldwide. However, as the President avoided giving a

clear response to the demands yet again, the students and faculty present declared the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna occupied until the demands were to be met.

Two days later, a group of the occupiers went to the Ministry of Science and Research to protest the negotiation of the Budget Agreement. That protest march then continued to the several other universities in Vienna presenting what had taken place regarding the negotiations that affected all universities (as all the negotiations took place at the same time). This encouraged many other students and teachers to join the protest march and instate their own occupations. The march concluded in the massive assembly hall of the University of Vienna and the declaration of its occupation by protesters. The size of the hall and the size of the student population of the University of Vienna influenced media attention significantly. The protest march, which began a protest wave, resonated internationally. The Austrian wave of university occupations was significant, because there had been protests and short-term occupations in other countries before then, but they were difficult to sustain independently. Thus, when a dense number of Austria's universities were simultaneously united in struggle, other protests were able to reemerge in acts of transnational solidarity, additionally enabling new occupations to develop. The density of those occupations was so significant that an online map was created to track them.¹⁰⁵ By November 25, 2009, just over one month after the occupation of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna began, 76 universities across Europe had been occupied (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2009, p. 6).

105 <http://www.tinyurl.com/squatted-universities>

The astounding momentum with which those occupations took place was only rivaled by the cross-border solidarity among them. This included transnational solidarity as well as joint actions that brought together not only students and teachers, but also practitioners of different occupations and the unemployed. This wave was especially dense in Italy and Austria, but more and more actions were rapidly taking place during that time all across Europe. It was of great significance in Austria,¹⁰⁶ and came as a surprise to many people there. Furthermore, the atmosphere that emerged from the occupation of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna stood in stark contrast to the doubt and disinterest that so many people had expressed before then. Similar situations were also described to me by activists in other countries regarding their own occupations. Many of the university occupations lasted for several months.

One of the central structures common to the various European university occupations was the coordination of regular plenums. These occupations also created a space for various experimental activities and forms of learning. They invited workers and the homeless to use the spaces and fed the participants in open soup kitchens. Decentralization played a major role in the occupations for various reasons. For example, the significance of non-hierarchical decentralization was demonstrated as it made repressive actions by police or

106 There were claims that a protest and occupation movement like that had not taken place since occupations in the 1970s in Austria. However, positions such as Raunig's (2000) suggest that the strength of these movements was the result of the civil society structures that were established (also within culture) in 2000 in reaction to the rise of Jörg Haider and the far right-wing FPÖ.

administration difficult, having obscured any recognition of who specifically to target or precisely how. Furthermore, decentralization was demonstrated through the emergence of working groups (*Arbeitsgruppen* or AGs), in which a tremendous amount of information and materials were produced, with each working group able to focus on a different space or mode of dissemination for their co-production and co-research. Working groups in Vienna focused on specific goals, ranging from cooking, cleaning, translating and drafting statements, and researching policies, to battling different forms of discrimination that either existed within the university structures such as racist migration policies or other forms of discrimination that surfaced among participants during the protests and occupations.

One working group in Vienna (of which I was a member) that dealt with such structural discrimination was the *AG Migration und Antirassismus* (Working Group on Migration and Anti-Racism). It emerged from the necessity of confronting structural racism. It also confronted the problems occurring during the occupations such as situations where Muslims were booed off of public stages or women were discouraged from presenting their statements publicly due to threats or derogatory and sexist remarks (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2009, p. 6).¹⁰⁷ To this end, we wrote statements demanding the right to free movement for *everyone*, not only citizens of the EU, and free tuition for *everyone*. The latter is of great importance because when the government later complied with the demand for abolishing tuition,

107 Women also experienced sexual assault when spending nights in university buildings during the occupation. There was thus another working group dealing with the issue of sexual discrimination.

it did so only for citizens of the EU, conditioned by certain time-to-completion restraints.¹⁰⁸ Non-EU citizens still have to pay tuition and in a higher amount than citizens had to pay before it was removed. Furthermore, the measures implemented for university autonomy and deregulation also allowed universities to individually decide how much tuition foreign students would be charged.¹⁰⁹

The co-production and co-research of working groups contributed significantly to the original goals of the university occupations. Reflecting on how this was achieved, one of the participants of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna occupation, Eva Egermann, maintains that “[s]olidarity and collective euphoria created the energy required for an unforeseeable amount of work that needed to be done” (Amir et al. 2010, *n. pag.*). She elaborates, stating,

These occupations not only succeeded in unleashing a broad debate over educational policies, but also enabled the re-politicization of many areas and uncontrolled spaces. This intensity and eruption created absurd situations of teaching and learning and alternative practices of knowledge; a community of teachers and students, we might say, united by a defined goal: to subvert the structures of the university (Ibid.).

108 Cf. the project description by the group for the Soho in Ottakring festival, including the presentation on university reforms I gave during the event: <http://www.petjadimitrova.net/kooperationen/Soho.html>

109 Cf. how the President of the University of Technology Vienna suggested the nominal tuition of €10,000/year shortly afterwards, (OTS 2010): http://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20100413_OTS0010/tu-wien-rektor-bin-fuer-studiengebuehren-von-10000-euro-pro-jahr

The implementation of tuition fees, one of the original motives for the protests in Austria, encouraged slogans like “rich parents for everyone.” However, with time, the relationship between the commodification of knowledge and the university as a “factory of knowledge,” or between the global economic crisis and the transformations of the university became major foci within the protests. Thus, demands became more abstracted such as: “We demand not only an end to the commodification of education. We demand an end to the exploitation of all spheres of life” (Teachers and Students of the University of Vienna and Academy of Fine Arts Vienna 2009, p. 5).¹¹⁰ Another common slogan that resonated throughout the protest wave in Vienna was “*internationale Solidarität*” (international solidarity). On the one hand, while awareness of the university reforms brought an increased awareness of global capitalist conditions that displaced crisis and crisis management, debt, and austerity measures into universities. It also brought an awareness that these (primarily Bologna Process) reforms were part of a process that transcended nation-state borders for creating the space of the EHEA, which corresponded with the borders and differential inclusion of “free movement” of the EU.

Struggles became strengthened across shifting borders as communication developed between university protesters in the EU and those outside of the EU, who had experienced very similar reforms, such as

110 The translation from German is my own; the original quote reads: “Wir fordern nicht nur einen Stop der Ökonomisierung der Bildung. Wir fordern einen Stop der Ausbeutung in allen Lebensbereichen.” This is from the *Joint “Statement” by the University of Vienna and the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna* of 27 October 2009.

Croatia or Serbia (potential EU member candidates). This transnational emphasis became evident in the course of the actions organized from March 11–12, 2010 during mobilizations enacted a counter-summit, called “Bologna Burns,” against the celebration of the European Ministers of the “opening” of the EHEA during the Budapest-Vienna conference. The transnational counter-summit consisted of a series of presentations and discussions in various spaces of occupied universities and several actions in the streets, including a massive protest march and road blocks aimed at preventing, or at least hindering, the arrival of the European Ministers to the location of their celebration, the Hofburg Palace. On the first day of the official Bologna Summit, which took place in Budapest, attempts were made to block the railroad tracks (Dokuzović & Freudmann 2010, pp. 8–9). At the same time, a massive protest took place during which people read out their statements and demands on a large portable stage in Vienna. This also included statements by the *AG Migration und Antirassismus* regarding the freedom of movement of international students. The end of that protest action then went into motion as a protest march that disseminated to clogging the major arteries leading to the Hofburg Palace, where the Summit was to be held in Vienna, effectively delaying its commencement.¹¹¹ Each of these events included participants from all over Europe.

111 For information on “Bologna Burns” and a video instructing how to “clog” the arteries leading to the Hofburg, see: <https://globalhighered.wordpress.com/tag/bologna-burns/> or <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2010/bologna140110.html>

Transnational Expansion of Knowledge-Based Struggles in Europe

The increase in forms of transnational protest, which was exemplified by the Bologna Burns counter-summit against the opening of the EHEA, included numerous other meetings on the topic of the transformations and commodification of education and knowledge. However, just as the university occupations expanded to include workers or the homeless, these large meetings began focusing on specific issues rather than continuously creating “counter” events as reactions to parallel hegemonic events. Subsequently, the meetings began examining issues regarding the commodification of knowledge and education beyond the implementation of the Bologna Process. For example, the “Commoniversity: Doing Politics with Knowledge in the Transformations of the Global University” (2010),¹¹² which took place in Barcelona from November 25–27, 2010, organized by *Universidad Nómada*, *Traficantes de Sueños*, and *Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía* (MNCARS), was a meeting organized for a smaller group of approximately 30 participants. It was intended for the concentrated inquiry and discussion of concrete goals through a series of talks and workshops. My participation, as a member of the *creating worlds* research project, involved presenting the practices of co-research of the project on the panel “Research Networks: Networks and the Production of Knowledge as Institutent Practice.” The panel examined the potentiality of Marxist workers’ inquiry in contemporary extra-institutional research networks and anomalous institutions. It

¹¹² <http://commoniversity.wordpress.com>

questioned which forms of political action function within Marxian network-institutions, what perspectives exist for co-research in the face of crisis, and how co-research can support practices of self-education.

The other participants presented around 20 projects from different parts of Europe during the days of discussion, or “European encounter” of anomalous universities, “which attempt to rethink political action in relation to the struggle around knowledge, following the closure of the cycle of mobilizations known as the ‘anti-bologna movement’ or, in the rest of Europe, as the ‘anomalous wave’” (Commoniversity 2010, *n. pag.*). Topics of a global autonomous university, self-education, the student-worker, cognitive capitalism, debt, the valorization of knowledge, conflicts in the university, and co-research were discussed. The specific presentations and workshops took place in cultural institutions such as the Virreina Palace or the Pati Manning and various squatted community centers. The discussions and workshops thereby also examined the impact of cultural and artistic spaces on universities and knowledge production in order to work out “prototypes for the institutions of the common” (Ibid.). Participants determined main goals for the future, including the establishment of a European self-education network and the acquisition of technological tools for establishing such a network, structures for intervening in the crisis, and the development of co-research aimed at finding common political affinities in Europe to “set in motion a process of anomalous invention in the field of self-education” (Ibid.). Thus, anomalous universities were placed against the backdrop of creating a space of common knowledge in order to question not only the relationship between

crisis and education but also to question where and which potential self-education may have.

Whereas the Commoniversity meeting consisted of a smaller group of individuals, it planted the seed for a massive event in Paris a few months later, from February 11–13, 2011. Following the meeting in Barcelona, one of my co-panelists who represented the Edu-factory collective, Jason Frances McGimsey, began a discussion among Edu-factory members to encourage a continuation of the meetings. Paris was selected as a central location, as it was easily reachable for most people in Europe. However, it is also a space with a strong historical legacy of colonialism, which inherently included and attracted participants from outside of Europe, Tunisia in particular. This was significant as preparation for the Paris meeting took place during the height of the uprisings in Tunisia and the Maghreb, and resulted in future collaborations and meetings of activists.

The invitation for the meeting in Paris, entitled “For a New Europe: University Struggle Against Austerity,”¹¹³ was sent out over the Edu-factory mailing list, to which hundreds of students, researchers, academics, and activists from around the world had subscribed. It was then reposted to other websites and mailing lists. Thus, attendance was far greater than originally anticipated, so that over 300 participants squeezed into the lecture halls of the University of Paris in Saint Denis for the meeting. A preliminary call stated that:

Following the collective consensus of last years’
“Bologna Burns” meetings in London, Paris and
Bologna and this years’ “Commoniversity” held

113 <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/edu160211.html>

in Barcelona, Edu-Factory and the Autonomous Education Network join the call for a European meeting for all groups who are involved [in] this common fight to create a powerful network of European university struggle and beyond (Edu-Factory 2011, *n. pag.*).¹¹⁴

Attendance was greater than expected because individuals and collectives from numerous countries saw the meeting as an important opportunity for connecting with other struggles, learning from them, and discussing action in their given locations in the coming months. The opening panel on the first evening, “Struggles in the Crisis: Experiences of Resistance against Austerity,” introduced the different participating individuals and collectives and their struggles in order to build a stronger network over the following days. The remainder of the meeting was organized into three main simultaneous discussion tables moderated by participants. This was meant to allow for a deeper understanding of the specific topics.¹¹⁵ A series of many smaller self-organized workshops with numerous focal points took place afterwards. The meeting concluded

114 There were certainly many more transnational meetings on related issues that emerged from 2010–11 that are not outlined here since the main examples outlined here refer to the specific struggles and events in which I participated.

115 One of the discussion tables was moderated by organizers of that meeting (McGimsey and Gigi Roggero), one was moderated by an organizer from the Barcelona meeting (Joan M. Gual), and the third was moderated by me. The three large discussion tables, each consisting of around 100 participants, focused on University Transformations: Free Access vs. Privatization, Corporatization, Meritocracy (which I moderated); Autonomous Education, Self-Education, Free School: New Practices in Alternative Education; and Precariousness, Debt, Welfare: Towards Commonfare.

with a massive plenum. Each discussion table thus articulated proposals to be presented at that final plenum.

At the discussion table “University Transformations: Free Access vs. Privatization, Corporatization, Meritocracy,” we, the participants of the workshop I moderated with the support of Anna Curcio, shared experiences from the various (trans-)localities of the participants along with specific problems that arose within the struggles in their localities.¹¹⁶ Financial limitations caused by tuition fees and the introduction of neoliberal market logic in universities were main issues. For example, students from Turkey stated that the average student debt was €4,000 compared to the average income of €300 per month (or €3,600 per year). They also spoke of extreme police brutality in their struggles, including the hospitalization of a pregnant student beaten by police. Participants from other countries spoke of the introduction of strict quality assessment, striving towards “excellence,” and increasingly prevalent slogans such as “learn to earn” or “separate the sheep from the wolves” regarding neoliberal policies of exclusion. Our conclusions included the need for articulating a position towards the state within the new constellations of public-private partnerships and crisis-related fiscal discipline, the need for creating common spaces for bringing teachers and students together in a common struggle, and the desire to raise the questions of university struggles to the whole

116 I took notes of the various participants’ statements on a whiteboard during the discussion table. These notes were then compiled on a computer to be presented at the final plenum and to be distributed on the new mailing list that resulted from the meeting. These notes were presented at the plenum by the participants, primarily Anna Curcio.

of society as questions of a common good of society. Other suggestions included desires for creating a motto and a name for this new network, and creating strategies for bringing “counter-information” to a broader public in the face of corrupt corporate media.

At the final plenum, the notes and conclusions from each discussion table were presented. Many people agreed that this new constellation of participants required a new name and several were suggested. Subsequently, a vote ensued and the name “Knowledge Liberation Front” (KLF) was elected by the majority at the plenum. Moreover, the suggestion for a new journal was introduced. This took the form of *Knowledge Against Financial Capitalism (KAFCA)*.¹¹⁷ The students from Turkey also handed out a questionnaire during the three-day meeting requesting information for documenting the struggles of different movements for the creation of an anthology book, which was published in 2011 as *Gerçek, Yıkıcı ve Yaratıcı* (“True, Subversive, and Creative”).¹¹⁸ Furthermore, several people spoke at the plenum with spontaneous suggestions primarily regarding calls for new meetings in different cities, and it was agreed that a new mailing list would be created along with a call for new transnational days of action against banks, debt, and austerity measures and for the free circulation of knowledge and people. The latter played an important role in developing the meeting that would take place in Tunisia later that year (2011).

117 <http://www.edu-factory.org/wp/kafka-n-2-15o/>

118 The book was edited by Ferda Dönmez Atbaşı, Yalçın Bürkev, and Damla Öz. It includes a paper I wrote documenting the events of the occupation of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (“Lessons Learned: Struggles against the Commodification of Knowledge, their Appropriation, Oppression and Knowledges of Dissent,” [2011b] pp. 375–384).

A final statement was subsequently issued by the organizers and sent to the participants of the Paris meeting via the new KLF mailing list, which outlined lessons learned and future intentions, declaring:

We, the student and precarious workers of Europe, Tunisia, Japan, the US, Canada, Mexico, Chile, Peru and Argentina, met in Paris over the weekend of the 11–13th of February, 2011 to discuss and organize a common network based on our common struggles. [...]

In fact, over the last few years our movement has assumed Europe as the space of conflicts against the corporatization of the university and precariousness. This meeting in Paris and the revolutionary movements across the Mediterranean allow us to take an important step towards a new Europe against austerity, starting from the revolts in Maghreb.

We are a generation who lives precariousness as a permanent condition: the university is no longer an elevator of upward social mobility but rather a factory of precariousness. Nor is the university a closed community: our struggles for a new welfare, against precarity and for the free circulation of knowledge and people don't stop at its gates.

Our need for a common network is based on our struggles against the Bologna Process and against the education cuts Europe is using as a response to the crisis.

Since the state and private interests collaborate in the corporatization process of the university, our struggles don't have the aim of defending the status quo. Governments bail out banks and cut education. We want to make our own university – a university that lives in our experiences of

autonomous education, alternative research and free schools. It is a free university, run by students, precarious workers and migrants, a university without borders (Knowledge Liberation Front 2011a, *n. pag.*).¹¹⁹

The emphases on migration and the border regime emerged as a result of events that took place during the meeting. Those events involved students from Tunis and Gambia who tried to attend the meeting but were refused entry into Europe. The participants thus organized a spontaneous protest action in Paris. However, of the entire group of Tunisian students, a few were able to attend. One of them presented the situation at the final plenum and announced that concurrent to the meeting, new insurgencies had begun in Tunisia. A declaration of solidarity was then announced and an acknowledgement of a common struggle against the corrupt state and its collusion with corporate interests was identified. Subsequently, the decision was made that the next major meeting would have to take place in Tunis in order to highlight a common struggle across the Mediterranean regarding not only the commodification and corporatization of knowledge and education but also national and supranational border regimes that perpetuate exclusions of knowledge and education.

A statement was also subsequently issued and sent on the KLF mailing list by the “Madrid autonomous university collectives,” who were not able to attend the Paris meeting. They emphasized that:

¹¹⁹ <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/edu160211.html>

The first thing we talk about is the international example that these days is shown in the Arab world (mainly Tunisia and Egypt), which we complement with Latin American models of Ecuador, Venezuela and Bolivia. In such remote regions of the planet we observe the keys that are opening up possibilities for the social change which we aspire to.

In these examples, which emerge from the first line of conflict and politics we see some subjects which had been considered secondary in social change until now [...] by studying this situations we intend to unravel the guidelines that led students, neighborhood movements, unemployed youth, women groups and so on [...]

At this moment, we can say that all these societies are at a more advanced level than European and North American are in the sense. They have managed to subvert the discipline of late capitalism, which imposes anomic social relations based on isolation and individual solutions. These societies have created a common identity that allows them to stand as a political subject capable of generating constituent events in history (Madrid autonomous university collectives 2011, p. 1).¹²⁰

The Paris meeting thus initiated a large-scale shift among European knowledge-based activists and their organization of transnational meetings to a transcontinental struggle that focused on the relationships between the university and structures of exclusion, primarily those

120 The letter (24 Feb 2011) is signed by the following collectives: *AU Contrapoder*, *Colectivo Rise up*, and *Uep-ei*. See: <http://reallyopenuniversity.wordpress.com/2011/02/24/letter-from-madrid%E2%80%99s-autonomous-university-collectives-for-the-paris-meeting/>

within border and migration regimes. Furthermore, they expanded beyond examining the relationships between knowledge and capital to approaching the links between the state and corporations and education and migration today. This gave rise to new perspectives on cross-border solidarity.

Transcontinental Solidarity across the Mediterranean

From December 18 to January 14, 2011, the world watched as Tunisians protested against the immiseration, government corruption, extreme censorship, increasing unemployment, and rising costs that dominated their lives under the political rule of President Zine el-Aidine Ben Ali which had lasted for 23 years. The protests emerged following the self-immolation of 26-year-old Mohamed Bouazizi on December 17, 2011. Student movements and organizations of unemployed and precarious academics played a major role in instigating the protest actions and occupations. Nearly four weeks of protests and occupations led to the ousting of Ben Ali on January 14, 2011. An influential strategy in the process was the occupation of the Casbah, the square in the old pre-colonial part of Tunis (the Medina), surrounded on all sides by representative government buildings. During the occupations, the balconies of the government buildings were claimed by the people and converted into public kitchens and stages for communal decision-making and for the production of materials and information to disseminate among the

people.¹²¹ Those protest actions spurred other similar actions in the region, from Egypt to Libya, inciting the Arab Spring across the Maghreb and Mashreq.

From February 20 to March 9, the so-called “second Casbah” (the second occupation of the Casbah) took place. This involved a new occupation in reaction to the corrupt “new” reshuffled (old) government that replaced the Ben Ali regime, which was in fact infiltrated with Ben Ali’s minions, thus making living conditions and “democratic” structures hardly any different than before Ali was ousted. This second occupation was characterized by the entrance of the army in a less violent disciplinary role than the (unaccompanied) police presence of the “first Casbah.” In addition, the protesters were able to organize their actions more precisely following the lessons they had learned in the “first Casbah.” Thus, while many workers and protesters from outside of Tunis had to return to their daily lives and personal struggles after the “first Casbah,” the more focused core that drove the “second Casbah” signaled a shift from popular to political struggle in the sense that labor unions and other organizations played a dominant role.¹²²

Many of these organizations of youths, unemployed academics, and labor unionists expressed statements criticizing the lack of a future in the context of not only a dictatorial regime but also its collusion with global

121 During the *Réseau de luttes* meeting in Tunis, the organizers took the participants on a walking tour of the areas that had been occupied, clarifying to us the strategies and difficulties in dealing with the spaces that they had used.

122 This paragraph as well as the next one are comprised of testimonials by participants of the occupation and organizers of the *Réseau de luttes* meeting made during the walking tour of the city.

capital and supranational financial institutions, namely the IMF and World Bank. They saw this collusion as the structural basis for the continued oppression of Tunisia's citizens through the undermining and seizing of public amenities instead of the support of health and educational systems that would have the potential for rebuilding the nation. This was particularly relevant for people living in remote rural areas, who not only tended to suffer the most under the regime, but also faced economic disadvantage as a consequence of the revolution or their participation in it.

Following the insurgencies, world governments and organizations supported the protests for various reasons. This included the EU's supranational and national governments, which have historically made various agreements with the Ben Ali regime regarding migration regulation in exchange for bilateral trade agreements. This way, the EU "recruits the Maghreb countries for the role of 'advance guards,' calling on them to fill the function of dams holding back the flood of African migrations" (Bensaâd 2006, p. 16 cited in Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 172). The Mediterranean Sea provides a critical border between the EU (and thus also the EHEA) and Africa, where people have been forced to travel in boats which capsize, leaving bodies washed up on the coastline as the result of attempts to begin new lives or escape old ones.

After the Arab uprisings, promises by France and other European states for support and solidarity to the former-colonial African states were challenged by mass migration to Europe, which proved these promises to be empty. This situation was exemplified when over 300 Tunisian exiles arrived in Paris on April 28, 2011 after

first entering the EU through the Italian coastal city of Lampedusa. McGimsey describes how French authorities made exerted efforts to prevent the exiles from crossing into French territory. As exiles nevertheless arrived, police made mass arrests that were followed by a man-hunt. These people were able to remain in Paris with the help of local organizations, namely the *Front de Libération Populaire Tunisienne* (FLPT), the *Coordination des Intermittents et Precairs* (CIP), and the KLF (McGimsey 2011, n. pag.). The Tunisians subsequently created their own block in the May Day march through Paris on May 1, 2011. That evening, over 200 migrants from Tunisia and local activists occupied a building in Paris to symbolically take space and expose the contradictions of the political statements of support for Tunisians against the backdrop of police repression, thus creating a “material transnationalisation of the radical democratic movements that began this spring in Maghreb and the Middle East” (Ibid.).

Those events caused activists to highlight major commonalities between the statements made by North Africans and Europeans – as well as other continents – regarding the necessity of struggle. Those statements expressed shared experiences, including the loss of common and even public resources, financial disciplinary measures such as austerity cuts, and increasing precarity, particularly among youth who faced fewer and fewer prospects for their futures. This was reflected in the growing trend of youth from the EU emigrating to other nations seeking employment opportunities, as so many Tunisian youths had fled the country looking for a better future abroad, challenging promises of the EU for free movement.

In an attempt to link these commonalities, the transnational, and indeed transcontinental, meeting entitled *Réseau de luttes* (network of struggles), invited activists, individuals, and collectives who were interested in participating in a process of exchange to learn from each other's struggles. The call made by the Tunisian organizers read:

For about ten years, an unprecedented contestation against the economic domination of the world has mounted and, each time, shown a common face: the revolutionary youth. From Argentina in 2001 to Tunisia in 2011, passing through the Palestinian Intifada of 2002, the revolts in the working class neighborhoods of France in 2005, Greece since 2009 – prefiguring the crisis in many European countries – but also Bolivia, Spain, Mexico, Mali, Burkina Fasso, Senegal, China, Iran... Front lines against capitalism and its dictators have been opened in many countries.

Since December 17th, 2011 a rapid acceleration of the international movement has begun in a region where no one expected the emergence of such a force: the Arab world. From Tunisia to Yemen, a revolutionary wave that has not stopped spreading is disturbing all the hierarchies imposed during the postcolonial period. [...] This revolutionary process released in Tunisia put the theories of the end of history, the end of ideologies... the end of revolutions... in crisis. The Tunisian revolution, the first “postmodern” revolution, shows once again the possibility that a people conduct its own struggle and organize itself for and by itself, outside of the dominant world's bureaucratized and co-opted institutions.

This is why Tunisia, the starting point of the current revolts should become a meeting place for all those that want to build a new society (Network of Struggles – International Meeting in Tunisia 2011, p. 1).¹²³

In preparation for the meeting in Tunis, research trips were organized by the KLF in order to meet and learn from the Tunisians and to unite conflicts across the Mediterranean. The first research trip took place from May 14–17, 2011. Several activist organizations that focus on migrant struggles, abolishing borders, and anti-racism were also invited to join the process and the subsequent meeting. During and after the research trips, statements were posted on mailing lists and websites by the KLF and *noborder* groups, as was a collective statement. These statements informed of the stimulating social processes and told of the remaining oppressive structures in Tunisia. A statement of the KLF outlines the goals of the research trip:

We will go to Tunisia to fight, together, against European borders and for the free circulation of people and knowledge. We will go to Tunisia to make Tunisia our university. Without aesthetics of revolt or the ambiguous veils of humanitarian causes and supposed solidarity, we want to learn what it means today, in Europe, to do as has been done in Tunisia (2011b).

The research trip, which took place after the Tunisian revolution and resignation of Ben Ali, was met with challenges due to the transitional government's

123 “Why an International Meeting in Tunisia?” statement sent on the KLF mailing list (28 Aug 2011): <http://www.infoaut.org/index.php/english/item/2757-why-an-international-meeting-in-tunisia>

continued corruption and excessive uses of force and discipline that were still being practiced months after the revolution. For instance, the main Avenue Habib Bourguiba of the *nouvelle cité* (the “new” part of the city built during French colonialism), where most of the protest marches took place, was still surrounded by police, military tanks, and cordoned off with massive coils of barbed wire extending from one end of the city to the other. A disciplinary curfew was imposed at 9 p.m. by cutting off electricity, and any suspicious activities such as larger groups of individuals congregating publicly, which were suspected to be spontaneous protests or politicized meetings, were suppressed by paramilitary groups and police in civilian gear armed with knives. Extreme media censorship was also imposed. Thus many Tunisians were and are still struggling for a continuation of the revolutionary process.¹²⁴

Despite the difficulties, extremely fruitful exchange took place during the research trip in May. For instance, the *noborder* groups were able to visit an autonomous organization that assists Libyan refugees (Knowledge Liberation Front 2011c).¹²⁵ And members of KLF met with various activists and organizations, including the *Front de Libération Populaire Tunisienne*, in order

124 Consequently, due to the potential danger of a major transnational meeting for participants, the Tunisian organizers postponed the planned dates several times in order to guarantee the participants’ safety. However, while acts of police violence had decreased significantly, the mentioned disciplinary practices (barbed wire, presence of military tanks, heavy police presence) were still in place during the meeting in late September/early October 2011. Due to safety issues, I attended the meeting but had canceled my attendance to the previous research trip at the last minute after hearing of an affiliated activist being raped and beaten by police a few days prior.

125 <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/klf180511.html>

to prepare for the transnational meeting later that year (Knowledge Liberation Front 2011d). In addition, the Mediterranean Precarious Connections sent a statement on the KLF mailing list emphasizing the significance of migratory struggles in a common struggle across the Mediterranean.

That joint statement highlights how the mass migration that followed the Tunisian revolution was able to temporarily disable the EU border regime. The statement outlines the involvement of various institutions and organizations in revolutionary actions. However, it also emphasizes the role of autonomous networks of squatters, bloggers, and unemployed youths and academics. It also draws lines between the precarious in Europe and North Africa and emphasizes the potential of a common struggle “*for the free circulation of people and knowledge, against the corporatization of education systems, precariousness and the regime of national borders*” (Mediterranean Precarious Connections 2011, n. pag.).¹²⁶

Furthermore, the activists of the Mediterranean Precarious Connections aimed to gather information and experiences in Tunisia in order to initiate a debate on the abolition of the visa regime across the Mediterranean for the free circulation of people and knowledge. Their statement also critically examined claims declaring the Maghreb and Mashreq uprisings as a new global movement. The authors denied these claims, defending that the movement emerged as a local tradition, which linked to global conditions and configurations that strengthened those movements, inspiring other insurrections in

126 <http://bordermonitoring.eu/files/2011/08/mediterranean.precarious.connections-de.pdf>

other parts of the world as opposed to marking a new homogenous phenomenon. Other insurrections have been stimulated by the sharing of information through new media technologies that have transmitted these actions on a global level (Ibid.).

Following the learning processes and correspondence over mailing lists, the transcontinental meeting, *Réseau de luttes*, took place from September 29 to October 2, 2011, and was very precisely planned and politically articulated. Detailed registration forms, airport pickup, and accommodations were provided by the organizers. They only requested a €15 donation to partially reimburse all of their own efforts and contributions, which were part of a conscious strategy to avoid any sponsorship or intervention from any state or corporate sources. In addition, the Tunisians insisted on a complete departure from representative politics and the divergence from party organization. This reflected an emerging tendency among the revolting youth in Tunisia. Therefore, every part of the meeting was completely self-organized, self-financed, and self-sustaining.¹²⁷ The organizers were mostly young students in their early to mid-twenties. Some of them were studying in Europe and shared their experiences. For instance, one organizer even had problems with returning to study in France after the meeting, because of the expiration of a student visa during that very meeting.

127 In contrast, other organizations were financed through various means. E.g. the KLF meeting was supported in small part by the University of Paris, and the participants financed their travels to Paris a number of ways, i.e. university department funding, research projects, individuals paying out of pocket, etc. Various other meetings in different spaces were also sometimes financed by cultural funds or project-based grants.

The first day consisted of a plenum of the individuals and group delegates. The plenum and the beginning of most of the meetings took place at the Cultural Center of Tunis. The main days of the meeting were organized into several concurrent workshops on four major themes: For the Free Circulation of People; Beyond the Political Economy of Precarity, Debt, and Unemployment; Knowledge and Culture; and New Forms of Organization and Collective Intelligence.¹²⁸ Each theme was broken up into several focal groups, which then met in different parts of Tunis or even in other cities relevant to the topics of discussion. For example, the workshop on migration (For the Free Circulation of People) took place in Hammam Lif, a city known for being the center of mass emigration. Participants were shown the “Hamman Lif airport” – a bridge where emigrants jump onto passing Europe-bound ships. Meeting spaces in Tunis included rooms of the universities or even walks through the city to outline where insurrections took place in order to give a better idea of the remarkable and complex spatial occupation of the Casbah. The final day consisted of a presentation of the results and decisions from the workshops along with the drafting of a final common declaration and the organization of a central website. A declaration for organizing and engaging in future meetings was also made, the next of which was the global day of action on October 15, 2011, referred to as “O.15.”¹²⁹

128 I split my time between the Knowledge and Culture and the For the Free Circulation of People workshops, contributing to the statement of the participants of the latter group.

129 I attended protests that day in Zagreb. For information on the translocal actions, see: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jyziG5b-UuBE>

The O.15 day of action was proposed at the Barcelona Hub meeting from September 16–18, 2011. The Barcelona Hub Meeting was in part a consequence of the Paris meeting earlier that year and the subsequent series of transnational meetings and conferences on related issues, which were decided concurrently, including the one in Tunis.¹³⁰ These meetings spurred and developed plans for other actions such as new occupations. Other major events taking place around the same time and afterwards included a series of *acampadas* (encampments) across Spain from May 2011, the occupation of Syntagma square in Greece in June 2011, and various other squares in major cities. Then, on September 17, 2011, Occupy Wall Street began in New York, initiating the US (part of the) *Occupy Movement*. O.15 was therefore in the midst of these events. It marked the outset of the occupation action, *Boj Za* (“fight for”), of the stock exchange in Ljubljana, and actions in countless cities around the world. In the following months and years, new actions continued to take up these forms such as the Taksim Square occupation in Istanbul in May 2013.¹³¹ Many of these occupations of public squares were inspired by the revolutionary actions in the Maghreb and Mashreq, and gained impetus from joining a wave of united actions.

130 I was not able to attend the Barcelona Hub meeting, but received this information via the Edu-factory and KLF mailing lists and was in contact with participants who informed me about the meeting.

131 I did not participate in this list of actions (from the Spanish *acampadas* to the Taksim Square occupation). However, this list includes the actions that informed my practice during this time. For example, participants in the occupation of the stock market in Ljubljana included participants from the Tunis meeting, who subsequently informed us (participants of the Tunis meeting and members of the KLF mailing list) in detail of the events.

The *Réseau de luttes* meeting marked a node in a networked set of translocal encounters taking place across the world. It was a significant moment in the shift in European university movements from transnational collaboration in Europe to a transcontinental/translocal movement that went beyond the university. It questioned the very role of the transnational in the supranational area of the EU that restricts movement for individuals in dire need of asylum. Furthermore, the meeting primarily focused on a common struggle against the combined oppression of the state and capital by sharing common experiences on the commodification of knowledge and other spheres of life as well as practices of migration and exclusion. It played a major role in bringing together new alliances and creating awareness of the interrelatedness of crises, conflicts, and struggles which strengthened future grassroots political actions.

The Lokavidya Jan Andolan

During the Tunisian meeting, I received information about a unique call that had been circulating on the Edu-factory mailing list for participation in the “First International Conference on *Lokavidya Jan Andolan* (LJA – People’s Knowledge Movement),” a meeting convening around the mass movement for people’s knowledge at the *Vidya Ashram* in Sarnath, India from November 12–14, 2011.¹³² The *Vidya Ashram* was founded in 2004 as a space for discussion, volunteering, research,

¹³² <http://www.vidyaashram.org/index.html>. In the years prior to the meeting in 2011, members of the *Vidya Ashram* had contributed to Edu-factory’s publications and mailing list, which introduced interesting perspectives on commons and common knowledge.

and storing an expansive archive for the LJA. One of the main themes of the work of the *Vidya Ashram* includes *taking down the walls of the university* (2009b)¹³³ as a strategy for sharing knowledge across borders and using that knowledge to challenge such borders. However, while India has seen substantial growth in the knowledge sector as one of the fastest-growing economies in the world, negative repercussions of this growth have surfaced in society. Due to the similarities and extreme character of these repercussions and their impact on the development of the LJA, I believed that learning from the perspectives of the radical movement of people's knowledge could provide a broader scope regarding translocal cross-border, cross-sectional solidarity – or solidarity that transcends national borders, which attempts to consolidate various struggles taking place around the world that are interconnected with tendencies of the cognitivization of capitalism and its global crises.

Lokavidya is a compound Indian term consisting of *lok*, meaning *people* or *the world*, and *vidya*, meaning *knowledge* in its broadest form, including skills, experience, culture, struggle, and so on – or that which is not only produced within the confines of recognized institutions of knowledge production. *Lokavidya* can be understood as a lived/living knowledge which develops from day-to-day experiences, struggles, and challenges in the world as a people's common knowledge: a *living knowledge* or *living learning*. It includes the knowledge of peasants, artisans, displaced persons, and Indigenous

133 Cf. <http://reallyopenuniversity.wordpress.com/2011/02/23/walls-of-the-university-must-come-down/>

persons alongside institutionalized education or other spaces where knowledge is produced. According to members of the movement, it is a term that, while coined by participants in the movement, is easily understood and identified by people across India as something they inherently have. The foundation for understanding *lokavidya* is elaborated by one of the founding members of the *Vidya Ashram*, Sunil Sahasrabudhey, who claims,

Ordinary life in fact is that vast bed where knowledge is produced hourly, daily. Ordinary life [...] presupposes no technology, no religion, no state, no university. People constantly produce new knowledge based on their genius, experiences and the needs of everyday life. There has perhaps never been a greater source of knowledge than ordinary life. [...] Here the life of the majority is just ordinary life. No air travel, no Internet, no electricity for half the day (Sahasrabudhey 2009, p. 43).

Sahasrabudhey theoretically contextualizes this statement, maintaining that “[i]f we see this in a deprivation framework, we will be led to development theories; if we see this in an exploitation framework, we will be led to theories of radical social transformation” (Ibid.). This perspective, which highlights the detrimental consequences of “development” advanced by not least the World Bank or IMF, is key to understanding the point of departure of the LJA. In other words, a struggle which focuses on lack advances financial compensation as its endgame, thus remaining dependent on national and supranational policies that oppress impoverished populations through the very logic of standards-based

definitions of lack.¹³⁴ It also perpetuates competition among its people. However, by shifting the perception of lack and accompanying jealousy, depression, and insecurity perpetuated by the logic of capital to highlighting what people are endowed with, despite, or even as a result of these experiences, people can become empowered through the collective use and exchange of their skills, talents, and knowledge. The LJA departs from this shift in the perception of knowledge production by instead placing *lokavidya* at the center of a unified struggle in order to radically reconfigure the understanding of knowledge, development, solidarity, borders, and access. From this perspective, the LJA attempts to unite a wide range of struggles for socially equitable access to basic human rights.¹³⁵

134 This is important as various displaced or disenfranchised persons have experienced that financial compensation is not an adequate replacement for a loss of livelihoods as it does not provide a long-term solution. Furthermore, communities that have suffered from displacement, who lived as farmers or who refused to adapt to the dictates of an advanced capitalist society, are left with no substantial options after financial compensation runs out.

135 Discussions around *lokavidya* can be traced back to 1995. “The development of the concept of *lokavidya* and generally the focus on *vidya* in socially and politically significant aspects of life” emerged as a central concept for discussion and emancipatory thinking and learning processes with the work of three organizations, the *Mazdoor Kisan Niti* of Kanpur, the *Patriotic & People Oriented Science and Technology (PPST) Foundation* of Chennai, and the *Nari Hastakala Udyoga Samiti* of Varanasi as well as the context of the Congresses of Traditional Sciences & Technologies of India taking place in 1993 in Mumbai, 1995 in Chennai, and 1998 in Varanasi (Vidya Ashram, *n.d.*). This originated from “A Dialogue on Knowledge in Society” by *Lokavidya Samvad*, Varanasi, and *Indigen Research Foundation*, Pune, January 2004: <http://www.vidyaashram.org/history.html>. These meetings were followed by the production of various publications on the topic. The notion of *lokavidya* was further discussed within the workshop of the 2004 World Social Forum in Mumbai,

The “First International Conference on *Lokavidya Jan Andolan*” of 2011, where I ended up being the only non-Indian participant, was attended by over 300 individuals and collectives from social movements, academia, peasants, fisherfolk, weavers, artisans, artists, and others who attended and presented their activities, interpretations of *lokavidya*, and their ideas for how to put it to use. The conference was structured in a very different way than the meetings I had participated in prior to it. The entire conference took place outdoors under canopies and the discussions lasted from the mornings into the night. There were no parallel workshops or events. All talks took place in the yard behind the *Vidya Ashram* buildings, which was openly accessible from the street, and all talks were played over loudspeakers in the street in front of the *Vidya Ashram* for passersby to potentially become involved. Consequently, many locals spontaneously attended and took part in the exchange. All meals were free for everyone and were prepared by the members of the farmers’ unions, and were served in the large adjacent field.

The first two days of the conference were organized around the struggles that underlie and make space for *lokavidya* and the strategy and organization of the LJA with representatives of collectives presenting their struggles. There was a very strong presence of the *Bharatiya Kisan* (Indian farmers’) *Union* among other rural workers. The third day focused on the relationships between

entitled “Dialogues on Knowledge in Society,” organized by the *Indigen Research Foundation* of Pune and *Lokavidya Samvad* of Varanasi. The *Vidya Ashram* was subsequently founded later that year for continuing the pursuit of discussing, developing, and expanding the notion of *lokavidya*.

art, culture, and knowledge production (*lok-vidya* and *lok-kala*),¹³⁶ and media and philosophy in the movement. The final discussion articulated certain demands, namely reservations (similar to affirmative actions) for women, one job for every household, and the recognition of *lokavidya* as the fundamental point of departure for receiving (and demanding) equitable rights and access. The final statement (later distributed on the mailing list and posted online) announced that:

Specially discussed were the ideas of dignity and prestige of *lokavidya*, displacement from land, habitat and work, jobs to everybody on the basis of *lokavidya*, control and availability of national and natural resources, a law ensuring a fundamental right to livelihood based on *lokavidya*, the possibility of a *lokavidya*-media and LJA in continuity with the movement for *Poorna Swaraj* (comprehensive self-rule)¹³⁷ during India's freedom struggle.¹³⁸

The LJA claims that organizing their struggle along Gandhian notions of *Poorna Swaraj*, which transcend the nationalistic ideas that have fractured the left in India since independence, is necessary. This has been

136 *Kala* means "art," thus *lok-kala* corresponds to *lokavidya* as the people's production of art and culture. Within the LJA, there are specific groups that focus on these relationships as a strategy. Chitra Sahasrabudhey plays a major role in organizing these actions, with a large number of women and women's groups mobilized to this end.

137 *Poorna Swaraj* refers to the Gandhian non-violent perspective that developed during India's anticolonial struggle against the British. This notion is of great importance regarding the role of violence in contemporary struggles.

138 For the statement, see: <http://lokavidyajananandolan.blogspot.com/2011/11/report-lokavidya-jan-andolan-conference.html>

taking place in part through the building of small (trans-) local and interconnected *Vidya Ashrams*, which function in a way similar to the *Adivasi* (“original inhabitants” / Indigenous) structure of *Panchayats*, or (trans-)local self-governments.¹³⁹ Through translocal meetings, such as the conference in Sarnath, strategies from plenums and movements in other parts of the world (e.g., the human microphone of the Occupy Movement), strategies of cultural production, or digital databases are all discussed as relevant formats for adoption in their own struggles as well as within the increasing communication with activists elsewhere. This is because it has become clear that there are not only many similarities between these different struggles, but these tools also help to aid struggles against local, national, and global forms of corruption and oppression simultaneously, which is becoming increasingly necessary within contemporary global landscapes of struggle.

The conference also integrated an improvised panel on international struggles. I was asked to speak on that panel with Jai Sen¹⁴⁰ and activist and physicist Surendran K. Karippadath. That panel was chaired by Mohini Mullick. Translations into Hindi were provided by participant (and *Vidya Ashram* and Edu-factory member), Avinash Jha.¹⁴¹ With the difficulty of representing

139 *Panchayats* organize communal decision-making processes through regular meetings of the community members. They function in a way similar to that of a plenum.

140 Sen is one of the organizers of the World Social Forum and founder of the India Institute for Critical Action: Centre in Movement [CACIM]: <http://www.cacim.net/twiki/tiki-index.php?page=CACIMHome>

141 For photos and summaries of the daily talks, see: <http://loka-vidyanandolan.blogspot.com/search?q=lina+>

“the international perspective,” I simply gave an overview of the various strategies and struggles around knowledge I had participated in and the lessons learned from linking different struggles across borders. I spoke of the marginalization caused by the commodification of knowledge and the various slogans that developed, representing perspectives for solidarity within the movements that emerged in recent years such as “reclaim the university,” “reclaim your brain,” “we won’t pay for your crisis,” or “we are the 99%.” I attempted to relate the notion of *lokavidya* to these perspectives as this was also a motivation for my attending the conference.

Interesting contributions and interventions were made by the public in the subsequent discussion. Parallels were drawn between the situation in India and World Bank and IMF interventions in education and various related social struggles in Latin America and Asia. Overlapping perspectives of native and Indigenous peoples in the Americas and in Asia were also discussed, particularly regarding contemporary struggles and the impact of crisis on their lives, livelihoods, and struggles. The notion of the 99% was criticized by individuals who, while not disagreeing with the notion of the 1%, questioned the role of placing “the rest,” which also consisted of relatively wealthy and corrupt managers who had been affected by the crisis, into one pot with the most impoverished people. The role of international meetings for learning from struggles that had similarities but also vast differences and the possibility of creating common platforms for sharing knowledges and uniting struggles were additional topics of discussion.

After the conference in Sarnath, I planned the rest of my time in India with the conference organizers and

other participants. I subsequently traveled to Singrauli, Kolkata (formerly Calcutta under British rule), and Delhi to meet with numerous individuals and organizations. Each of those trips clarified different perspectives of a larger context. The many conversations were both extremely useful for understanding some of the transformations I had experienced and researched in the USA and Europe, while helping me to grasp the extremely specific and local nature of the struggles to which I was introduced at the same time. The consolidation of these experiences helped me to understand the notion of *loka-vidya*, its importance for local struggles, and its potential for translocal solidarity.

For the Singrauli trip, I was accompanied by four members of the *Vidya Ashram* and the *Bharatiya Kisan Union*. We traveled together to and throughout Singrauli by car. Singrauli is a region which was carved out as a new district in 2008 in order to cordon off the mineral-rich area for industrial access.¹⁴² Singrauli is thus generally regarded as the “energy capital of India,” despite most of the residents having very little access to electricity (Greenpeace India Society 2011, p. 1). Upon arriving, we met with several activists and stayed at the space of the *Srijan Lokhit Samiti* (People’s Struggle for Justice in Singrauli),¹⁴³ an activist organization that assists people suffering from displacement caused by industry. We met with numerous displaced families in the area to learn about their experiences and to discuss the potential of the concepts presented at the conference in Sarnath. The people told us about outrageous

¹⁴² <http://singrauli.nic.in/abtsing.htm>

¹⁴³ <https://lokhitsamiti.wordpress.com/>

violations on local, state, and global levels by bureaucrats, government officials, and institutions such as the IMF or World Bank that had resulted in immense environmental damage, the displacement of entire populations, brutally violent discipline of peaceful protest, and a complete removal of access to formal education and healthcare. We also visited villages almost entirely made up of women following the deaths, arrests, or suicides of the men who lost their livelihoods or challenged local authorities. The contours of this situation, which exists to varying degrees in many parts of India and many parts of the “developing” world, were illustrated so clearly given the added magnitude of the “energy capital” of one of the fastest growing economies in the world.

The stories that local residents shared with us illustrated the notion of knowledge meritocracy in a radically different form than I had experienced it in European struggles. Villagers stated that their access to basic utilities or amenities was based on evidence of knowledge. In other words, rather than advancing one’s employability through the meritocratic acquisition of recognized knowledge, they needed to prove the value of their existing knowledge in order to gain access to basic rights. This is “evidenced” through the help of a standardized system created to quantify what defines knowledge-based “merit.” Because this rubric defines basic merit according to possession of a high school pass or proof of literacy,¹⁴⁴ illiteracy was constructed as evidence

144 These forms of marginalization are echoed in other parts of the world and thus also in the social movements that have emerged around them. E.g., one of the main motivations for Freire’s radical pedagogical practices was to bring literacy to people in Brazil who were excluded from “participating in the political process as voters”

of an individual's "lack of merit," thus leaving an illiterate person without potential for employment. This integrated system of standardized ranking thus excludes a large part of the Indigenous *Adivasi* population by default, a group of people who also suffer the most from industrial expansion and "development" through the loss of their land and livelihoods resulting from displacement. On the other hand, however, proof of merit merely limits displaced individuals to temporary access to manual and unskilled labor with no options for sustainable work or livelihoods. The demands for social recognition of *lokavidya*, therefore, became all the more explicit in a context where recognized, commodified knowledge becomes the currency for negotiating human rights.

There have been different waves of resistance against these conditions in Singrauli. However, mass actions have dwindled since the 1980s and 1990s when activists from other cities had taken interest in the area. Additionally, smaller actions initiated by individuals, families, or small groups of people have been disciplined very violently, which has led to protest actions either taking place on a very large scale or as a few small, isolated actions. Nevertheless, residents have been looking for new strategies for mass organization. On the last day of our trip, a meeting took place in a local displaced persons' community center in order to understand, articulate demands, and discuss mobilization around the notion of *lokavidya*. The meeting was attended by various community members, heads of

due to their illiteracy (Kahn & Kellner 2007, p. 435). In other words, "Freire's campaign, then, was an educational venture designed to transform peasants into citizens, significantly broadening the electoral base of the jobless, landless and working poor, while empowering them to begin to speak and demand attention for their issues" (Ibid.).

families, and activists, including myself. We concluded by declaring that the first meeting in a continuous practice of organizing weekly meetings in that space every Saturday for discussing how to apply the notion of *lokavidya* for communally building new perspectives. Several months later, another (*lok-*)*vidya ashram* was built in Singrauli¹⁴⁵ where activists have continued with regular meetings, research, and actions. This has consequently strengthened local awareness, solidarity, and resistance.

During my time in Singrauli, I began to grasp the lessons I could take away from my experience there. However, it was difficult to envisage how I could participate in the local struggles during my relatively short visit or from abroad. So when asking the local people how I could help to contribute to the struggle from a distance, I was unanimously asked to write and inform people in other parts of the world about their experiences. I have since published these accounts in print and online. This work should also provide a platform for disseminating those experiences and supporting and contributing to the movement on a translocal level.

After Singrauli I traveled to Kolkata, the widely acknowledged “intellectual capital of India.”¹⁴⁶ The various experiences there highlighted an additional facet of the complex local situation whilst clarifying connections to very similar processes and conflicts in different parts of the world. There I met with students, professors, philosophers, and activists to discuss the history of the left in

¹⁴⁵ <http://lokavidyaashramsingrauli.blogspot.com/>

¹⁴⁶ The following paragraphs are comprised of accounts from both older and younger generations of activists, i.e. those who related to the original movements that sympathized with Maoism as well as contemporary positions. They will thus remain unnamed.

India and the related problems that activists face today. The Communist Party of India (CPI) has had a major influence on the left in India since its formation in 1925. Following numerous fragmentations of the CPI during the 20th century,¹⁴⁷ the left suffered dramatically in the 1990s, bringing many of the activities of the left to a deadlock. This was influenced by the weakening solidarity between international communist movements as China converted to a capitalist economy and the USSR collapsed. The 1990s also witnessed the heavy implementation of neoliberalization processes and structural adjustment, which limited the capacity for mass organization as much as it created a necessity for it. Subsequently, “right-wing communists,” who supported neoliberal policies, entered the parliament, “being openly on the side of capital and the state” (Giri 2009, p. 471).

The left grew more disappointed in the face of expanding corruption, exploitation, land-grabbing, debt

147 One of the major historical conflicts of the CPI resulted from disagreements with Gandhi’s Quit India Movement on how to force the British out of India. While Gandhi and his supporters gained huge popularity at the time, managing to successfully end British rule in 1947 through tactics of non-violence, conflicts between the Hindu and Muslim populations and the establishment of the state of Pakistan forced Gandhism to rapidly lose its popularity. The CPI subsequently grew in popularity, however, relations with the USSR and China and the Sino-Indian War of 1962 led to the emergence of various factions over the following decades. One significant event that led to the strongest radicalization of CPI factions was the Naxalite uprising of 1967 in Naxalbari in northern West Bengal. That uprising emerged as a result of the economic and resource crises of the 1970s that caused far-reaching struggles against feudal landlords for access to land and food among peasants and landless *Adivasis*. That uprising was supported by armed Maoist communists as well as many radical urban academics and students from Kolkata. However, it was stamped out brutally by police and state forces and has imprinted both peasant struggles and the Indian left since.

bondage to global capital, and the widespread commodification of public and common amenities. Consequently, in 2004 the CPI (Maoist) formed as an armed splinter group and illegal underground organization of the consolidated political vanguard. The CPI (Maoist) revived Maoist strategies from the 1960s and 1970s of uniting with and supporting rural communities and defending them from police repression. However, this has been carried out through violent armed attacks. And as Maoist presence has been used by police to justify the increased police brutality and preemptive police occupations of public institutions such as *schools* (Ray & Sanhati Collective 2010), the left has in many cases become stigmatized in the media as exclusively Maoist and violent, thus polarizing and fragmenting activists even more. The Maoists, labeled as the “single largest internal security threat” in India today (Giri 2009, p. 464), thus clearly pose a problem for the stigmatized and amorphous left. Gandhism, on the other hand, has celebrated most of its acclaim outside of India in recent decades with few non-violent paths remaining for people’s movements within India. This complex context creates a necessity for alternative non-violent movements such as the LJA, thus making their aims all the more significant.

The situation was further elaborated to me while speaking with university activists in Delhi (the next and last city I visited in India) at the Delhi University (DU). At the DU, I interviewed members of the New Socialist Initiative (NSI), who told me about a radical wave of reforms. Many people see those university transformations as the systematic depoliticization of the university, because students and teachers have so much difficulty

taking on the increased workload that resulted from semesterization in the decreased time allotted to them. Those transformations and the introduction of tuition fees have resulted in increased competition, individualization, and the emergence of a greater elite in the student body. Thus, according to NSI, the historical link between the university educated and the rural communities in India has practically been severed and the political potential of the university has been structurally minimized. However, many protest actions have been taking place in recent years across India. Members of the NSI explained that teachers' strikes at DU did not last long, though, as their salaries were suspended. The teachers' union subsequently contested that suspension by taking the cases to court. This led to a deadlock, because once such a case is in the courts nothing can be done in terms of protest or mobilization as it would be considered *contempt of court*. However, groups such as the NSI have focused on alternative methods of giving talks and printing publications in order to expose important issues regarding university transformations.¹⁴⁸

The discussion with members of the NSI culminated in a debate about differential inclusion and exclusion, regarding, for example, poorer working students from rural communities, working classes, or lower castes who were de facto excluded when night classes were removed. They used these examples to pose the question of how to include people excluded from, for example, *industrialization* – as is the case in much of rural India – or other forms of extreme exclusions such as illegalized migrants,

¹⁴⁸ E.g. their magazine *Critique*: <http://nsi-delhi.blogspot.com/search/label/Critique%20Magazine>

boat people, displaced persons, “erased” persons, and so on, in a united struggle for an open university. They thus asked: *What could the notion of a truly inclusive or autonomous university look like? And how can those excluded from, for example, industrialization not only take part, but also have a voice in becoming part of the process of setting up such an inclusive or autonomous university?* We concluded that these questions are essential to pose in our universities, autonomous knowledge-based practices, and knowledge-based struggles across the world.

Challenges and Contradictions for Struggles

Federici (2012) claims that many of the contemporary movements against the commodification of knowledge have developed from a history of struggles in the “Global South,” primarily Africa, against similar reforms made by SAPs. Federici thus maintains, as does this book, that an understanding of historical struggles from different parts of the world can provide insight for contemporary and future struggles. In the same vein, this chapter has presented various struggles that allow a mapping of the numerous challenges that they were faced with. The following section will expand the scope of those challenges by shifting its focus to internal challenges which have in many cases stifled such knowledge-based struggles.

Discrimination among people within movements, such as the instances outlined earlier regarding university occupations in Vienna, can explicitly filter or de facto exclude participation in struggles. In the case of Vienna, experiences of sexism but also racism, anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia multiplied as struggles became more

popular (both in the sense of population and being fashionable). As a consequence, women became reluctant to sleep in occupied spaces, many minorities became reluctant to speak on stage, and some individuals simply stopped attending events. As it took so much energy and free time to participate in the movement, such obstacles often pushed people to their limits.

Religion was also divisive in terms of both playing a role in discrimination as well as creating separate factions that connected their specific foci to religious beliefs. Class division was another major issue in struggles, existing on many different, overlapping levels. For instance, on a local level, class divisions can often be defined through income or education. However, on a transnational level, class divisions can include the transformations that are part of processes of migration, allowing the role of national borders to challenge solidarity among participants. In other words, a migrant student who receives money from their home country has different privileges than one who must work parallel to their studies.

Thus, while differences exist between those non-migrant students who do and do not have to work to finance their studies, the non-migrant and the migrant experience very different circumstances as the migrant often must resort to illegal, degrading labor or forms of labor for which they are highly overqualified. Simultaneously, migrant students must keep their grades up to prove they are promptly and successfully progressing through their studies. Working students – migrant or not – thereby often do not have the capacity or the time to attend regular plenums or protest actions. Migrant working students also run the risk of exposing their

situations, which additionally deters them from speaking publicly or risking police intervention by participating in various activities. Students with families are also limited in regard to time and resources for participation. The risk of arrest is also more difficult in the case of students with dependents.

These conditions were very present in the university occupations in Vienna. The large number of migrants in Austria exposed contradictions regarding the privileges of students in a country with a strong welfare state and a plethora of scholarships and financial aid opportunities for citizens. However, while the commodifying reforms have progressively taken time, space, and resources away from all faculty and students, more students (in Vienna, and certainly elsewhere) had the capacity for some level of participation before these reforms. And regular participants were able to spend large amounts of time organizing struggles. As segregating reforms have taken this capacity away and introduced methods of depoliticization, the class divisions (which existed prior to their implementation) between those who could participate regularly and those who could not have become exacerbated and increasingly exposed. Consequently, a large number of students became invisible and unheard to an even greater degree within struggles through these indirect forms of exclusion.

However, these forms of exclusion are still different than some of the forms that existed in, for instance, the struggles in India. In some of those cases, individuals and entire communities living in non-industrialized areas were excluded in ways that prevented willing, able-bodied citizens from participating. Those students in India suffered from the conditions of internal

migration, which has different repercussions from international migration, thereby subjecting them to additional forms of isolation and exclusion. In such complex circumstances, whether in India or elsewhere, demands for free education can become paradoxical if they only include a small privileged group. This is why the contradictions between mobility and migration have been important to expose and why groups such as the *AG Migration und Antirassismus* in Vienna articulated demands for free education for *everyone*, beyond discriminatory, structurally racist filtration mechanisms.

Another major challenge regarded the role of access, which was closely linked to questions of division and discrimination. While individuals became invisible or unheard in different contexts, technology was thought to provide an alternative platform for expression. In many situations, that was the case. It allowed a quick exchange of information or a platform for publishing statements. On the other hand, more extreme issues, such as threats through surveillance of technologies, were also a big issue. Furthermore, these technologies have additionally segregated participants into those who can afford such technologies and those who cannot (or choose not to use them). On a local level, this often perpetuated individualization by promoting certain ever-present representatives of struggle. On a translocal level, it exposed an entire global digital divide.

The role of representation was a major point of antagonism in struggles, particularly in Tunisia where a general disdain of corrupt authority figures and institutions that stemmed from corrupt governments and capital prompted uncompromising self-representation.

However, even self-representation in a plurality of voices can become difficult.¹⁴⁹ For instance, *The Occupation Cookbook* particularly criticized attempts to “privatize the plenum” (2009, p. 35). This was a frequent issue in many localities. This included the occupations in Vienna, when some individuals rejected guidelines for decentralization by leaping in front of television cameras to make subjective statements. In addition, the possibility of everyone being able to speak in public plenums did not necessarily give everyone a voice. The question of disabilities emerged, in addition to questions regarding the role of language, or simply even skill or personality types. Furthermore, the constant presence of certain individuals in the media often perpetuated notions of leadership, which went against the goals of the struggles. This was often accompanied by strong personalities butting heads and competing on behalf of movements through the organization of bigger simultaneous actions, bigger meetings or better star speakers, which all contradicted the aims of the struggles. As the occupiers in *The Occupation Cookbook* claimed, grassroots democracy was a necessary outcome of the failures of representative democracy. Thus, a true *people’s* movement cannot support individual representatives or leaders.

Moreover, the notion of “revolutionary subjects” comes into play. Problems of scientific inquiry or even

149 The problems of representation and the necessity for self-representation have certainly played an important role in various historical struggles, e.g. the feminist movement, but specifically the Black feminist movement in the USA (cf. Patricia Hill Collins, Angela Davis, bell hooks, The Combahee River Collective), or Indigenous and de-/anti-colonial struggles around the world (cf. Frantz Fanon, Edward Saïd, Leela Gandhi, Subaltern Studies Collective) to name only a few.

colonial anthropological thought processes can be reproduced during the theorization of grassroots political actions. Struggling subjects can be viewed under a microscope, resulting in perpetual theory production that has little to do with lived experience, participation, or the perspectives, needs, and demands of those involved. Through such processes, struggles are appropriated for private and independent interests.¹⁵⁰

Appropriation can also take place on various levels with the potential danger of depoliticizing and neutralizing subversiveness in the process. Just as notions of “autonomy” or practices of radical pedagogies have become appropriated and perverted, many protest actions in Vienna were used to support the branding of the given university. They were also used to benefit ministerial negotiations, which produced outcomes that contradicted the demands of the protestors. These tendencies are elaborated by Stephen Shukaitis, who claims, “[t]here are numerous programs as well as institutions [...] who constantly turn their ‘radical image’ into an improved bottom line while all the while operating on a solidly neoliberal basis, strangely enough without this seeming to sully the luster of their radical credentials” (2009, p. 2). Gigi Roggero expands this notion, maintaining that:

Chandra T. Mohanty points out that oppositional knowledges are caught permanently between radical challenges and the risks of cooptation. Specifically, the institutionalization and capture

150 This is one of the reasons why it has been important for me to repeatedly emphasize the role of participatory co-research here as opposed to merely studying movements as an academic researcher (which is certainly not limited to being a negative practice in itself either).

of oppositional knowledge is intrinsic to the governance model, fully developed in the corporate universities [...] This model allows a degree of self-managed knowledge, separated from struggles, and compatible with the maintenance of market logic: its profit motive and units of measurement. So, it is a form of differential inclusion of alternative experiences, deprived of their autonomy. From this point of view, governance is a response to the student and “precarious” movements, an attempt to reduce them to stakeholders (2007, *n. pag.*).

Another important point of criticism regards the very notion of occupation and its relationship to historical and contemporary colonialism. Strong challenges have come from Indigenous First Nations activists who have pointed towards the difficulty in referring to a necessity for occupation or reclaiming what was once public or common in a context in which occupation, seizure, displacement, and extinguishment built the national formation within which they are struggling (Goldtooth 2012; Montano 2011; Tuck & Yang 2012; Yee 2011). Tuck and Yang emphasize that demanding a “redistribution of wealth” and commons, particularly in the case of land and natural resources, highlights that these demands are made on stolen, already occupied land, for instance, in the case of the USA (2012, p. 23).¹⁵¹ Furthermore, the authors challenge how the Occupy Movement supports the struggle of the 99% against the 1% who own most of the wealth. By showing that 0.9% of the inhabitants

151 As a reaction, some occupied cities such as Oakland have seen the call to “Decolonize Oakland’ rather than re-occupy it” (Tuck & Yang 2012, p. 26).

in the USA are Indigenous and 99.1% are settlers, they radically shake up the 99 to 1% relationship (Ibid., pp. 23, 27). These Indigenous positions claim that a struggle with aims to be truly inclusive and subversive against the political and economic powers of oppression, must communicate with communities that have continuously suffered from the extremity of the same logic of oppression. A struggle ignorant of the fundamental structures being fought against will inevitably be paradoxical and lead to a repetition of forms of oppression and exclusion along the same lines it created. This perspective extends to Indigenous and marginalized people all over the world: tribal peoples, forest dwellers, landless or stateless people, Roma and Sinti, erased, displaced, illegalized people, refugees or other people similarly excluded from dominant hegemonic systems. This form of inclusion is what the LJA has been putting into practice in India. Similar practices and perspectives must be put into practice in other movements elsewhere in order to sustain truly inclusive struggles that do not repeat some of the numerous forms of discrimination, exclusion, or contradictions within movements such as those outlined above.

CHAPTER 3

LIVING LEARNING

Lokavidya provides a crucial perspective in India where a large part of the population has been made refugees in their homeland as a result of displacement and internal migration. In this context, knowledge is not only quantified for becoming commodified; it is also instrumentalized to promote processes of exclusion

beyond the realm of education or employment within cognitive capitalism. Furthermore, *lokavidya* presents an important alternative within the context of grassroots movements that have reached an impasse in historical and contemporary conflicts between armed struggle and abandoned non-violent Gandhism. However, the notion of *lokavidya* not only presents an alternative. By departing from the perspective of *capacity* rather than *lack*, it builds a greater foundation for a struggle built and inherently based on constituent strengths. It, therefore, allows for more flexible solidarity across borders or facets of struggle as it focuses less on competition among have-nots by reinforcing itself instead through a strengthening, self-empowering, and self-perpetuating exchange of shared knowledges as capacity and potentiality. Due to the potentiality of this perspective, the LJA and *Vidya Ashram* maintain that “a radical intervention in the world of knowledge is a necessary condition for a radical transformation of society.”¹⁵²

The notion of *lokavidya* has deeply enriched my theoretical and political understanding of the role of knowledge as a constituent and instituent force across borders, economic sectors, institutions of education, and thus as a transformative form of cross-sectional solidarity. My understanding of *lokavidya* as a theoretical perspective was significantly developed through practical, lived experiences and encounters with movements, primarily the LJA. And my understanding of movement practices was further expanded through a variety of theoretical viewpoints from struggles, including *contrapoder*, radical pedagogy,

152 <http://www.vidyaashram.org/>

co-research, translocality, feminist ecology, or social justice. This progressive, lived process has informed and given form to the multifaceted perspective I am proposing here as *living learning*. In order to clarify this notion, the following paragraphs will revisit materials from movements, actions, events, and practices in the various translocalities outlined above to assemble perspectives that comprise the notion of living learning.

Some notions that play a major role in defining living learning are self-education, self-determination, life itself as the source and location of learning/knowledge, and placing the poorest at the center for demands for rights based in knowledge – not as a plea for elevating the have-nots to the haves, but as a recognition of the capacity and contribution that such knowledges have in communal processes of self-empowerment. Perspectives on self-education played a major role in, for example, debates at the Commoniversity meeting regarding practices of creating common spaces, virtual or real, for collectively resisting the exploitation of knowledge in institutions of education. These recurring emphases on self-education and life-based knowledge¹⁵³ and their power for constitutively battling crisis-ridden enclosures of knowledge often primarily focus on the transformations caused by the cognitivization of capital and the precarization of labor and education. However, they also

153 Life-based knowledge has been expanded from various theoretical perspectives, e.g. Donna Haraway's feminist approach to reflexive "situated knowledge" which questions standpoints and experiences, or Gloria E. Anzaldúa's approaches to "survival tactics" that are comprised of experiential knowledges, or embodied knowledges emerging from the "autonomy of migration," "which is primarily sustained by cooperation, solidarity, the usage of broad networks and resources, [and] shared knowledge" (Papadopoulos & Tsianos 2007, pp. 230–231).

shift the focus away from the walls of the university, tuition fees, or concrete policies to a perspective that is less reactive and thus inventive in its approach to the relationships between life and knowledge and the way in which capital encroaches upon that relationship.

Roggero elaborates on the relationship between life and knowledge by outlining the central role that knowledge plays in the relationship between the living labor of workers and the dead labor of machines for Marx. Roggero argues that cognitive capitalism strives to create enclosures for the exploitation of knowledge. He thus refers to “living knowledge” as a new paradigm of living labor in cognitive capitalism (Roggero 2009, *n. pag.*). However, movements such as the LJA use phrases like “living knowledge,” “living learning,” or “people’s knowledge” instead to refer to a state of empowerment, not a new form of exploitation. In doing so, they radically shift their approach to these exploitative conditions by not allowing them to paralyze their actions. Instead, the LJA focuses on the constituent force or counter-power of lived experiences, which in many cases includes traditional, Indigenous, or Fordist structures that function parallel to Postfordist cognitive capitalism in, for example, the context of India.

The LJA’s perspective resonates with Foucault’s notions of “knowledges from below,” “subjugated knowledges,” and “hierarchically inferior knowledges” (Foucault 2003, p. 7), which incorporate memories of struggles to allow for a critical “insurrection of knowledges” against the narrow perspectives of institutionalized knowledge (Ibid., p. 9). Feminist and postcolonial perspectives also make major contributions to this perspective. For example, Nikita Dhawan refers to scenarios in which

feminist activist theorists work together with feminized subaltern individuals by drawing on an epistemic approach that revisits the strong divisions in thought processes between European Enlightenment-based knowledges and unrecognized “traditional” knowledges (2009, pp. 56–62). And various postdevelopment or postcolonial scholars such as Arturo Escobar, Wolfgang Sachs, or Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee have written about the importance of local, traditional, and alternative knowledges for building just notions of development. For instance Sachs views “new commons,” or new self-determined ways of living that are expanded through learning based in culture, interactions, and experiences, as challenging economic and political systems (2010, pp. 17–19). Escobar contends that local and traditional knowledges and culture provide more equitable perspectives on development for “non-Western” peoples (1995, pp. 215–216). Banerjee, on the other hand, emphasizes how movements that share knowledges, experiences, and strategies with other struggles create new forms of translocal resistance against unjust “development” (2011, p. 324). Movements such as the LJA have taken this one step further to claim that lived knowledge should be placed *at the center* of knowledge-based struggles as the source of self-empowerment and the basis upon which to demand rights and reclaim space.¹⁵⁴

Another radical movement for human rights that shares many of the goals and features of the LJA, which

154 Here I must acknowledge influential conversations that took place in Sarnath on the notion of shifting knowledge to the center rather than acknowledging it as a major component of struggle which took place with Sunil Sahasrabudhey, Avinash Jha, and B. Krishnarajulu.

emerged along similar notions, is the *Abablali baseMjondolo* (literally, “shack dwellers”) of Durban, South Africa.¹⁵⁵ The *Abablali baseMjondolo* has developed since the mass Kennedy Road Protest on March 19, 2005 in Durban.¹⁵⁶ Self-education has played a major role in the struggle of the *Abablali baseMjondolo*. It has allowed individuals to gain access to university materials, legal know-how, theoretical texts on collective organization,

155 While I did not travel to Durban or contribute directly to their struggles, I have fervently followed their actions for a number of years, primarily on the Pambazuka News mailing list, and have been in communication with some allies of the movement over the years.

156 During this protest, around 750 people blocked the major six-lane Kennedy Road and several other main roads in the city near the area deceitfully promised to them for housing (Pithouse 2006b, p. 110). This was done in reaction to the limitations caused by various slum clearance programs that were displacing people, which “dates back to the pre-apartheid period, when there was a policy to remove the urban informal settlements from city centres to allow for gentrification of the areas” (Ekine 2009, *n. pag.*). The *Abablali* demanded that the state allocate land for housing rather than hand it to developers and corporate interests. They also developed demands for more humane living conditions as they had no access to sewage, water or other “public” services (Mdletshe cited in Pithouse 2006b, p. 110). The protest resulted in the arrest of several of the participants, referred to as the *Kennedy Road Fourteen*. This included juveniles, which brought the case considerable attention. The members of the movement decided to represent themselves in court as a strategy for avoiding legal representation by the state which they did not trust (Pithouse 2006a, p. 23). This led to various conflicts with authorities, who, in many cases, turned away members of the *Abablali baseMjondolo* because they did not speak English. Consequently, the movement placed a major focus on learning the *language of repressive policies*, i.e. not only English but also the neoliberal jargon of the World Bank and other local and global aid organizations that were shaping their lives (Ibid.). Regular meetings employing grassroots democratic decision-making have taken place since then. The movement of several hundred people has since joined other rural and displaced communities in the region for mobilizing a few hundred thousand supporters (Ibid., p. 7). They have also received much support from academics particularly from the University of Kwazulu-Natal.

and material from other movements.¹⁵⁷ As a result, the protesters have become heavily involved in legal processes,¹⁵⁸ and some (albeit minimal) demands have been satisfied, such as the installation of portable toilets in their settlements (Pithouse 2006b, pp. 124, 136, 139).¹⁵⁹ Moreover, beyond the empowering processes of community-based self-education, these activists too have placed knowledge at the center of their struggle, claiming that “struggle is our school”¹⁶⁰ and inviting the participation of activists into their *protest universities*, with invitations, for example, to join the “University of Kennedy Road” (Abahlali 2006, *n. pag.*).¹⁶¹ The *Abahlali baseMjondolo* thus claim that “it is not only that we are protesting against something that is wrong, we are trying to teach, to teach everyone – our struggle is an invitation to the world to come and learn from us and with us” (Figlan et al 2009, p. 39).

An approach that has been shared by both the LJA and *Abahlali baseMjondolo* is the *infiltration* of universities for teaching the community. This practice took place with the experimental series of discussions among movement militants from the *Abahlali baseMjondolo* and the Rural Network at the University of KwaZulu-Natal

157 See the *University of Abahlali's* website: <http://abahlali.org/university-of-abahlali-basemjondolo/>

158 See e.g. the case against illegal eviction here: <http://www.seri-sa.org/index.php/19-litigation/case-entries/189-abahlali-basemjondolo-and-30-others-v-ethekwini-municipality-and-others-cato-crest>

159 However, those toilets have even been removed to discipline protest actions in later years (Majavu & Sapa 2010, *n. pag.*)

160 See e.g. the speech “This Is How We Do it” in New York by community member, Mzwakhe Mdlalose, on 21 Apr. 2012 at the Foundry Theater; <http://abahlali.org/node/8731/>

161 <http://abahlali.org/university-of-abahlali-basemjondolo/>

in Durban in 2009. Several members of the movements were sent as delegates to take part in the Certificate in Education (Participatory Development) (CEPD) program by introducing their experiences and collectively discussing new perspectives to bring back to their movements. This experiment was supported by financial donations of members of the communities. They published a book consisting of those discussions, entitled *Living Learning*, in 2009.¹⁶² During the *Living Learning* discussions, participants questioned how to take advantage of knowledge in the university in order to bring it back to the everyday lives and struggles of the community. This perspective departed from the idea that “[k]nowledge is thus considered neither private property nor the means for private advancement; it is to be a shared endeavor that begins by shifting the geography of reason by putting ‘the worst off’ at the center” (Gibson 2009, p. 11). The practices of the *Abablali* take a radical position on founding experimental autonomous universities and “hijacking”¹⁶³ knowledge from increasingly exclusive universities. They also create a bridge between the two by expanding perspectives as they attempt to *bring down the walls of the university* as suggested by the LJA.

162 The term expands the term “living politics” by S’bu Zikode, a key vocal figure and President of the *Abablali baseMjondolo* movement. He defines the term as that which “*starts from the places we have taken. We call it a living politics because it comes from the people and stays with the people. It is ours and it is part of our lives. ... It is the politics of our lives. It is made at home with what we have and it is made for us and by us*” (2008 cited in Figlan et al. 2009, p. 5).

163 This perspective on hijacking is similar to Harney and Moten’s notions of *Undercommons* (2009), which refers to stealing from the university just as the university steals from and exploits students and faculty.

The perspectives of the LJA and *Abablali base Mjondolo*, which question and transcend university knowledge across social spaces of struggle, contribute significantly to the notion of living learning I am advancing here. One of the ultimate goals of this book has been to find ways to empower struggles through the integration of an exhaustive range of inclusive knowledges. This departs from questions raised by the NSI in Delhi, the necessity for genuinely inclusive struggles in, for example, European movements, and needs for consolidating strategies and connecting the experiences and knowledges of struggles from different parts of the world. This point of departure has been expanded through perspectives developed within the LJA – as well as its overlaps with the publication *Living Learning* – which demand an inclusion of lived knowledges, placing the worst-off at the center of a common struggle, and placing *lokavidya* at the center of a more comprehensive struggle for rights.

Living learning is the radical politicization of everyday life and common knowledges as social spaces of knowledge production. These spaces comprise translocal nodes within the living production of knowledge, which integrate institutions and other spaces for the creation of new forms of solidarity and socially just and equitable practices. Living learning departs from the knowledges and experiences of those most in need rather than the tip of the iceberg of knowledge producers by creating cooperative, constituent, translocal, self-determined processes of sustainable and egalitarian knowledge-based transformations. It thus shifts these knowledges to the center of struggles, empowering them through shared strengths. These perspectives, as well as the emancipatory practices of self-education, translocal knowledge exchange,

university “hijacking,” and the redistribution of resources and the demanding of rights based in the constituent counter-power developed through these processes have informed my adoption of the term *living learning*.

The Contradistinctions between Living Learning and Lifelong Learning

Unlike the industrial society, the knowledge society does recognize lok[a]vidya. But lok[a]vidya is recognized only in order to economically benefit from it. In fact, the relation that knowledge society constructs with any knowledge is essentially one of economic exploitation. Knowledge society is built on the integration of any knowledge by economic exploitation (*Vidya Ashram* 2009a, p. 167).

This quote refers to the exploitative potential of knowledge through the appropriation and co-optation of subversive knowledges within the cognitivization of capital. While these practices encompass formal education, they also extend to the area of lifelong learning. Lifelong learning appropriated radical community-based pedagogies in the 1960s and 1970s and continues to appropriate, among others, practices of living learning through the appropriation of traditional and Indigenous knowledges promoted as “no cost alternatives” to formal education (Federici 2000a, p. 86). The concept and practice of living learning has developed in radically different ways than lifelong learning, and drawing the distinction helps to highlight socially just and equitable perspectives in contrast to the austerity and economic crisis-driven policy perspectives of lifelong learning.

Whereas knowledge-based policies have played a major role in the development of lifelong learning policies, their resulting displacements have influenced living learning in a very different way by informing strategies for collective growth through developing knowledges of struggle. Thus, while lifelong learning provides a space for re-inclusion following exclusion from institutions of education, living learning provides spaces for unconditional inclusion from a wide range of segregating and marginalizing policies and exclusions.

Living learning has been part and parcel of struggles ranging from those against austerity measures to struggles for basic existential needs, and has re-articulated and created self-determined histories, knowledges, arts, and cultural practices. Such knowledge-based movements have formed strategies for survival, common support, and knowledge sharing. Thus, while reforms in education have attempted to homogenize and erase knowledges – and transformations of capital(ism) have forced many to abandon their local, communal or Indigenous knowledges – collectives or movements such as the LJA are trying to not only fight to preserve such knowledges but to mobilize them for making demands and conceiving of new worlds.¹⁶⁴

Lifelong learning is regarded as the *individualized* responsibility of all citizens, especially regarding “active citizenship.” In contrast, living learning perspectives have formed *collective* approaches to learning and knowledge production within contemporary conditions of marginalization. Living learning, however, not only emphasizes the role of collective organization; it develops

164 In the sense represented by the Zapatistas, the Global Justice Movement, or Lazzarato (2003).

new constellations in the face of contemporary challenges that have resulted in entire communities being displaced or entire schools being evacuated. This collectivity thus lies at the center of living learning practices. Moreover, the question of the role of citizenship as a responsibility or right in relation to the acquisition or acknowledgement of knowledge arises – especially within a context of the competitive global knowledge economy, which is fueled not least through processes of filtered knowledge-based immigration. Thus, where lifelong learning places an emphasis on the role of knowledge acquisition as the responsibility of “active citizens,” living learning emerges from the knowledges that develop through processes of exclusion, exploitation, and hence also through processes of migration.

Furthermore, lifelong learning places the management of economic crisis at the center of its policies, whereas living learning places the struggles of the poorest and the most marginalized and disenfranchised at the center its practices. Lifelong learning departs from the management of and purported aim of resolving economic and various crisis-related issues and insufficiencies – in the broader economy but also in the production of insufficiency and lack through the imposed lifelong acquisition of skills – while living learning departs from a position of capacity and self-empowerment by mutual growth through the exchange and integration of diverse perspectives from translocal struggles.

While these comparisons should not present living learning and lifelong learning in a dichotomous relation, such differentiation is nevertheless important for understanding the gravity of the conditions they represent. There are certainly also overlaps among practices of

living learning and lifelong learning. On the one hand, through the appropriation of practices of living learning, lifelong learning is inevitably deeply saturated with variegated forms of subversive practices. On the other hand, as living learning approaches knowledge from a broad perspective (integrating institutional and life-based knowledges, etc.), it also inevitably brushes up against and even overlaps with some processes of lifelong learning.

Moreover, while claiming that an egalitarian recognition of knowledges should be the basis for human rights and for a right to livelihoods for all, living learning reflects an altered mirror image of the perversion of radical pedagogies that lifelong learning represents. Living learning demands a redistribution of social and common wealth on the basis of the recognition of equal knowledges, whereas lifelong learning agendas manage to filter and expropriate profit and innovation from traditionally unrecognized knowledge while leaving producers of such knowledge behind through the frames inflicted on people by these practices and through frames of citizenship, selected mobility, or increasing debt due to all-encompassing austerity measures.

Whereas the redistribution of wealth envisioned within the framework of lifelong learning policies is thus not socially just or equitable, living learning proposes an entirely different social imagination. It is based in placing knowledge and an egalitarian recognition and sharing of knowledge into the center of society and struggle – rather than economy (or knowledge transformed into cognitive capital) and its incorporated exploitative structures and competition among individuals. Furthermore, living learning identifies an equitable perspective

that does not rely on the exploitation of “others,” the destruction of resources, the annihilation of space, or the loss of livelihoods.

Living Learning and Basic Income

Another area in which perspectives of living learning can make a significant contribution is that of basic income as proposed by proponents of the theory of cognitive capitalism. Perspectives on basic income elaborated by Andrea Fumagalli and Stefano Lucarelli (2007, 2008) and Moulrier-Boutang (2011) have highlighted the contradictions in the relationship between cognitive and financial capitalism. The three pillars of cognitive capitalism¹⁶⁵ delineate the necessity of financial markets as pivotal to the enclosure and dissemination of cognitive capitalism. Thus, financial markets are regarded as the “pulsing heart of cognitive capitalism” (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008, p. 20) or a “necessary evil” for cognitive capitalism.

Accordingly, Fumagalli and Lucarelli contest the stability of cognitive capitalism, introducing two important elements into debates, the role of precarity and the diminishment of positive externalities¹⁶⁶ (2007, p. 4). Moreover,

165 “The role of financial markets as motor of accumulation from the financing side of investment and as hinge upon which wealth distribution mechanisms depend”; “the generation (learning) and the diffusion (network) of knowledge as the main source of capitalistic valorization on a global scale”; and “the decomposition of the work force on international scale following the valorization of individual subjective differences in a context of cognitive division of labor (the process of precarization and for controlling cognitive excess)” (Fumagalli 2010, p. 62).

166 “[A]ctions that result in gains or losses for third parties (apart from the parties to the transaction)” (Moulrier-Boutang 2011, p. 23).

they claim that the higher the level of constraint on intellectual property rights and knowledge enclosures is, the lower its capacity will be for diffusion through networks – the very foundation for its production (Fumagalli & Lucarelli 2008, p. 5). This is where a basic income or guaranteed social income comes into play as a method for stabilizing and compensating cognitive production. This includes knowledge production that is not recognized as traditional “work” or which is produced during periods of uncompensated unemployment that nevertheless produces wealth (Moulier-Boutang 2011, p. 165).

The perspective of basic income also describes a major demand made by movements for living learning, which differs significantly from theories of cognitive capitalism.

In their consideration of basic income, theorists of cognitive capitalism generally agree that “we are precarious because capitalism needs us to be, so they should pay for it” (Federici 2006, *n. pag.*). However, this perspective focuses on cognitive capitalism alone, not taking into consideration the broad industrial, pre-/non-industrial, agrarian, resource-based foundation that the “tip of the iceberg” of cognitive capitalism is built upon (Mies 1986; Federici 2006). Movements for living learning, primarily the LJA, present a different perspective capable of approaching the complexities of the global multiplication of labor. Living learning thus demands an egalitarian redistribution of wealth for envisioning knowledge-based societies of a different kind, independent of or beyond structures of financial capitalism or new governance models.

LJA’s demands for basic income are based on the egalitarian acknowledgement and treatment of knowledges

(i.e., *lokavidya*). This perspective – which contributes greatly to the notion of living learning – does not measure knowledge according to its value on global financial markets. It instead understands knowledge as a fundamental part of life and considers the exploitation of living labor within and beyond financial or cognitive capitalism. Living learning also acknowledges the various translocal differences in and divisions of labor that influence and are influenced by transforming economic and social relations. Furthermore, living learning incorporates an understanding of the gender divide and feminization of labor. It does not create an exclusive perspective that disregards the global digital divide or the global multiplication of labor.

An equally distributed unconditional basic income based on an equal acknowledgement of human knowledges and their various contributions to society – rather than cognitive capital – would satisfy demands by struggles for living learning in different parts of the world without the loss of livelihoods that fuels destructive capitalist expansion. Moreover, the distribution of such a notion on a global level would challenge global divisions of labor and income disparity and would create a radical shift in global economic processes and translocal practices. Living learning thus acknowledges the productivity of General Intellect¹⁶⁷ as well as the manifold forms of labor which are made invisible from reproductive to non-industrial labor, in turn creating a socially just structure that does not create a hierarchy of “development,” but rather respects how different egalitarian

167 General Intellect is elaborated in Marx’s *Grundrisse* as “the general productive forces of the social brain” (1939/1993, p. 694). It has played a major role in immaterial labor theory.

knowledges and their productivities maintain social processes that contribute to a capitalist system – which is, in its current form, unsustainable.

CHAPTER 4

POINTS OF CONTENTION AND POTENTIALITY

The preceding chapters took on the task of debunking claims by policy-makers that immaterial, cognitive labor and a knowledge-based economy are the solution to eco-economic crisis. By examining tendencies and strategies of displacement that mimic and follow classical patterns of capitalization and its colonial dimension, various material and spatial-temporal vectors of these processes and their consequences were outlined, including migration, differential inclusion, rankings, and austerity, among others. However, one of the chief tools for criticizing these conditions, the theory of cognitive capitalism, could also benefit from more critical contributions from other perspectives. As theories of cognitive capitalism harshly denunciate the transformations that cognitive capitalization imposes on workers' lives, they also neglect the displaced consequences that expand far beyond the working conditions of those comprising the most advanced tier of capitalist production.

Critical contributions to theories of cognitive capitalism have been made from feminist, postcolonial, and other critical theories over recent years. Thus, I limit my overview to perspectives that approach displacement and the displaced material conditions of immaterial production. Mezzadra maintains that one of the main criticisms

of theories of cognitive capitalism regards international divisions of labor. That is, many theories de facto exclude workers engaged in Fordist and pre-Fordist modes of production, which comprise an immense basis for labor forms around the world (Mezzadra 2012). Furthermore, Federici refers to “the tremendous leap in technology required by the computerization of work and the integration of information into the work process [that] has been paid at the cost of a tremendous increase of exploitation at the other end of the process” (Federici 2006, *n. pag.*), stating,

There is a continuum between the computer worker and the worker in the Congo who digs coltan with his hands trying to seek out a living after being expropriated, pauperized, by repeated rounds of structural adjustment and repeated theft of his community’s land and natural sources.

The fundamental principle is that capitalist development is always at the same time a process of underdevelopment (Ibid.).

By approaching cognitive capitalization from this perspective it becomes clear that there are parallel developments and processes of capitalist production that rely on a continual destruction of the environment and the continual exploitation of labor for material production. By not explicitly integrating these points, critical theories can in some ways contribute to further displacing these realities from view and weakening forms of solidarity across these divisions by precluding a comprehensive understanding of these inter-relations.

It is no coincidence that the quotation above is from a major proponent of reproductive labor theory. Whereas immaterial labor theory and theories of cognitive capitalism have thoroughly analyzed the feminization of

labor within transformations of structures of knowledge production,¹⁶⁸ there has been little analysis of the feminization of poverty at the other end of the spectrum.¹⁶⁹ Another major recent phenomenon that has received little attention in debates on cognitive capitalism is the feminization of migration (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013, p. 104). Federici claims that by ignoring women's roles in processes of capitalist production within the analysis of Postfordist labor forms, not only is a fundamental source of capitalist accumulation disregarded, but a key element in unifying resistance is as well. Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James maintain that women's roles in the relationship between the home and the community or production within factories, schools, offices, and so on, are interlinked. They claim that when viewing the "community as a productive center and thus a center of subversion, *the whole perspective for generalized struggle and revolutionary organization is re-opened*" (Dalla Costa & James 1972, p. 17). Referring to Maria Mies's iceberg analogy, Federici maintains that the entire structure of global capitalism cannot be properly analyzed when only viewing the pinnacle of its achievements, and that it furthermore creates a hierarchy of struggle by privileging a small classification of workers and their production. "This means it is not a theory we can use to build a truly self-reproducing movement" (Federici 2006, *n. pag.*).

168 Roggero describes the feminization of labor as not only "the mass entry of women in the labor market, but first of all to the becoming productive of the relations, affection, care attitudes, once confined in the reproductive sphere and historically determined as feminine" (2007, *n. pag.*).

169 The feminization of poverty describes the phenomenon of two-thirds of the world's poor over the age of 16 being made up of women (Bureau of Census 1976 cited in Pearce 1978, p. 28).

Thus it is clear that there is still very much to learn from feminist theory today.

Theories of cognitive capitalism that support the development of a knowledge-based economy could also stand to benefit from crisis theories with view to questions regarding material limits to growth and the transition to an immaterial economy. Whereas these theories extend from Marxist perspectives on limits to capital, on the one hand, and (some rather problematic) Malthusian perspectives on limited planetary resources, on the other, it is the contemporary and self-critical hybrid perspectives that hold the most relevance today. Lilley (2012) contextualizes such hybrid notions in the present by defining two tendencies within left catastrophism. She describes determinist catastrophism along Luxemburg's argument of the inherent instability of capitalism, where it should eventually approach collapse because of a limit to resources and the inability to function on its own, and voluntarist catastrophism as the more classical Marxist argument of the potential of a revolutionary class engendering collapse (Lilley 2012a p. 6). Since capitalism is still active and functional in times of crisis, Lilley maintains that we need to think of new alternatives for opposing capitalism while it is operational rather than focusing on imagining courses of action in its "inevitable downfall" (Lilley 2012b).¹⁷⁰ Such perspectives can contribute to theories of cognitive capitalism by highlighting their emphasis on the causality between the economy and ecology and the importance of analyzing the conditions of economic growth despite the "failures" and "unproductive" life of

170 See Lilley's talk on the radio show "Zombies, Labor, and Catastrophism" (12 Nov 2012b); <http://www.againstthegrain.org/program/626/mon-111212-zombies-labor-and-catastrophism>

capitalism and its displaced consequences for the populace, including unemployment and precarity.

Divergent Spatiotemporal Universes

In a critical analysis of the role of cognitive capitalism within postcolonial capitalism, Mezzadra (2012) attempts to unsettle the power structures that have emerged with new knowledge economy areas by highlighting the instability of their spatial and temporal configurations. In other words, by challenging the rubric of center and periphery – as well as “Global North” and “South,” and “First” and “Third Worlds,” – with the insight that ruptures and imbrications of exploitation and accumulation play a major role in capitalist transformations, Mezzadra has attempted to transmute global developments along various axes, not only of temporal advancement of capitalization (or modernization). With Federico Rahola, Mezzadra asserts that “a plurality of historical times and thus of forms of dominance and practices of liberation has always been a structural trait of capitalism outside the West” (2006, *n. pag.*).

From this vantage point, consisting of these manifold perspectives on heterogeneity, Mezzadra asks “how many histories of labor?”¹⁷¹ He thus interrogates “different historical and geographical constellations of capitalism” (Mezzadra 2012, *n. pag.*). He does this in order to challenge contemporary theories of transformations of capitalization, primarily theories of cognitive capitalism,

171 This is the title of his 2012 essay which analyzes Chakrabarty’s critique of historicism in *Provincializing Europe* (2000).

by destabilizing their past and present through a diverse multiplication of spatiotemporal elements. In this context of multiplication, “the image of the present that can be extrapolated from postcolonial criticism: a time in which the ensemble of pasts that modern capitalism has encountered in its course re-emerges in disorderly fashion, in a sort of ‘universal exhibition’” (Mezzadra & Rahola 2006, *n. pag.*). Mezzadra’s ideas thus help to elucidate the claims advanced here that the spatiotemporal constellations generated by knowledge economies as an attempt for sustainable development in the face of eco-economic crisis support a small fraction of the world’s population directly suffering from these crises. These constellations simultaneously create transformations that perpetuate many existing problems and create new ones (e.g., border control, indebtedness, etc.), displacing crisis rather than ultimately resolving it.

Mezzadra and Rahola’s notions of “ensembles of pasts” (2006) “encounters between histories” (Mezzadra 2012) or “disorderly reemergences” (Mezzadra & Rahola 2006) as a “universal exhibition” (Ibid.) not only represent a radical prospect for criticizing modernity and capitalization. I believe that this interspersed of times and spaces can allow for a kind of puzzle play where pieces representing histories, times, and spaces can be reorganized in an infinitude of undefined ways. Such an explosion of spatial and temporal axes into a mass of spatial and temporal *nodes* of living learning not only has destabilizing possibilities, but can also potentially be reassembled in various constellations for examining displaced vectors of capitalization, which have become increasingly abstracted through processes of neoliberalization, governance, and corporate globalization. These translocal nodes can be observed as

coordinates of social agency – in space, time, cultures, and belief systems, informal labor and the hidden workforce, the space-times of migration, alternative and radical pedagogical practices, and the colonial dimension of the cognitivization of capital in relation to the eco-economic crisis – for assembling translocally for emergent/constituent action. In this way social movements can create counter-power, which can consequently force transformations of capitalization in the direction of potential alternative new frontiers with the creation of new worlds. Therefore, it is contributions made by real lived experiences – not only from those working within cognitive capitalism – that both shed light on concrete displacements, consequences, and impacts of the current transformations of capitalization and which can unsettle them.

Conclusion

At the “First International Conference on *Lokavidya Jan Andolan*,” there were various theoretical debates and questions about what exactly *lokavidya* was, how it could be theoretically clarified, how it could be used, and by whom. Simultaneously, a large number of peasants seemed to have a clear idea of what it was, which rights to demand with it, and how to communicate through it. Nevertheless, one of the main agreements regarding the definition and role of *lokavidya* maintained that *lokavidya* is difficult, if not impossible, to outline precisely. *Lokavidya* does not define one perspective, as it is *living*, and thus constantly in motion, adapting to the needs, knowledges, capacities, and transformations of societies. It exists by living, changing, and transforming. And the moment it defies

the needs of the societies of which it is a part, and is used to appropriate their knowledge against them or to exploit them, it is no longer *lokavidya*.¹⁷² In this same vein, this book does not claim to have a clear formula for what (*lokavidya* is or rather) living learning is, although it is a central perspective here. The notion of living learning advanced and articulated within the previous chapters represents my own composite formulation of the demands, theories, perspectives, and practices of various knowledge-based movements which have informed my work through participation. From that point of departure, I have outlined some theoretical perspectives in order to produce and contribute to a political process. Thus, this work should create a living document of various actions, notions, conflicts, challenges, and perspectives that have been fluid, living, transforming, and moving with life in order to contribute to and strengthen such processes.

To this end, I have highlighted the following points of contention that have emerged in communities and struggles that have been directly or indirectly affected by the growth and transformations caused by the cognitivization of capital within a context of eco-economic crisis. These points include: receiving a living wage based on (the acknowledgement of) living learning and its contribution to social (and economic) growth; opening autonomous and translocal spaces (real and virtual) for sharing knowledge and for the collective exchange of

172 This notion, which exists among participants in the LJA, follows a logic similar to the proposal made by Fumagalli and Lucarelli regarding the life cycle of knowledge from *tacit*, to *codified*, to *exploited codified* (2008, p. 4) as well as Rullani's perspective regarding the loss of the integrity of knowledge through processes of normalization, transformation, and commodification (2011, pp. 10–11).

knowledges and experiences; reclaiming rights based in social participation in living learning (rather than citizenship); and prioritizing the experiences that comprise the foundation (of the iceberg) of both production and struggle rather than the tip of the iceberg.

Despite its fluidity and transformative nature, living learning can be considered a starting point for envisioning social transformation around knowledge. In other words: “If we grant that there is no hierarchy among various locations of knowledge in society and that all kinds of knowledge have a role to play in the reconstruction of society, the grounds for non-hierarchical solidarities across many boundaries is prepared” (Vidya Ashram 2009a, p. 167). Therefore, with an acknowledgement of equal knowledges, through a sharing of knowledges as commons – not commodities – in an egalitarian way on a translocal level, and not as an appellation or reform of cognitive capitalism, the foundation can be created for a transformation in the way we think about knowledge. And a refusal of the structures of a destructive system of capital, cognitive or otherwise, can exist within communities that place knowledge at the center of their struggles and developments. Thus, solidarity beyond economy, beyond competition, beyond lack, and beyond divisions, which places capacity, knowledge, its own reproduction, its most disadvantaged, and its interconnected crises and struggles at the center of a common knowledge-based process for truly sustainable change can grow and reproduce itself through knowledges of struggle, survival, exclusion, repression, and marginalization for building alternative new worlds.¹⁷³

173 This also supports notions proposed by feminist economists regarding solidarity economies and capacity-based perspectives, e.g. Gibson-Graham (2006, p. 145).

The living knowledges and experiences that have emerged, and are constantly developing as a result of the living conditions that have developed through the transformations and cognitivization of capitalism – such as shifts in migratory processes, indebtedness, evacuation of industrial areas, gentrification, displacement of rural communities, and many, many more – are each impacted by attempts at making their existence invisible. However, it is precisely these processes and the collective constituent strength of the experiences and knowledges of struggle that expose, elucidate, and challenge such contemporary transformations of structures of knowledge production every day, exposing displaced spatiotemporal coordinates through their own movements and actions. In this sense, living learning is constantly unsettling the reproduction of these practices and relations.

So how can this be of use for people involved in institutions of education? And what does it mean for struggles in radically different translocalities with incongruities in living experiences? Following the perspective of living learning, the university only serves us when it is linked to everyday life and the knowledges created within daily struggles. Likewise, no one form of knowledge should be placed above another form. In other words, autonomous movements and educational institutions can learn from one another and thereby strengthen each other by exposing different angles of various contemporary realities. Thus, at a time when we are fighting for what the university means, what it can become, or simply fighting to prevent its complete transformation into another area destroyed by financialization, the lessons from struggles for living learning – the knowledges of survival, of transformation from below – become all the

more relevant. Just as it is impossible to clearly define what constitutes living learning at a given time aside from a set of aims and practices, due to its constantly shifting living form, I do not know if these lessons will bring me back into the knowledge-based struggles in the university or in the fields, but I have learned that both can benefit from each other. And conscious efforts in hijacking, in undercommons, in tearing down the walls of the university are necessary – all the more so at a time when dangerous political rhetoric endeavors to create a more uncritical, unreflected, uneducated populace. This is why we especially need cross-border, cross-sectional solidarity and exchange of experiences and knowledges of struggle. This includes the continuation of struggles for what the university can mean for us today and in the future. It also includes the creation of critical spaces, new worlds, and alternative new frontiers for exchanging, producing, and safeguarding knowledges of life.

References

- 100,000 Strong in the Americas Website. (n.d.). Retrieved January 12, 2012, from <http://www.100kstrongamericas.org/>
- Abahlali. (2006, November 7). "University of Abahlali baseMjondolo." *Abahlali baseMjondolo: Home of the Abahlali baseMjondolo Shackdwellers' Movement South Africa* [online]. Retrieved December 23, 2011, from <http://abahlali.org/university-of-abahlali-basemjondolo/>
- Abahlali baseMjondolo and 30 Others vs Thekwini Municipality and Others ('Cato Crest')*. (2013). *Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa (SERI)*. Retrieved March 23, 2014, from <http://www.seri-sa.org/index.php/19-litigation/case-entries/189-abahlali-basemjondolo-and-30-others-vs-thekwini-municipality-and-others-cato-crest>
- Adamson, M. (2009). "The Financialization of Student Life: Five Propositions on Student Debt." *Polygraph*, 21, 97–110.
- Adepoju, A. (Ed.). (1993). *The Impact of Structural Adjustment on the Population of Africa: The Implications for Education, Health, & Employment*. London and Portsmouth, New Hampshire: James Currey Ltd.
- After the Fall: Communiqués from Occupied California*. (2010, February). Retrieved January 2, 2011, from <http://libcom.org/library/after-fall-communiques-occupied-california>
- Alexiadou, N. & Lange, B. (2007). "New Forms of European Union Governance in the Education Sector? A Preliminary Analysis of the Open Method of Coordination." *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(4), 321–335.
- Alidou, Ousseina. (2000a). "Booker T. Washington in Africa." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 25–36). Africa World Press.
- Alidou, Ousseina. (2000b). "Francophonie, World Bank and the Collapse of the Francophone Africa Education System." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 37–42). Africa World Press.
- Alidou, O., Caffentzis, G., & Federici, S. (Eds.). (2000). *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities*. Africa World Press.

- Alley, S., & Smith, M. (2004, January 27). "Timeline: Tuition Fees." *The Guardian* [online]. Retrieved February 6, 2012, from <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2004/jan/27/tuitionfees.students>
- Amir, F., Egermann, E., Osten, M. von, & Spillmann, P. (2010, June–August). "What Shall We Do...?" *e-flux*. 17. Retrieved June 13, 2012, from <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/what-shall-we-do%E2%80%A6/>
- Anknüpfungspunkte für transnationale Organisation*. (n.d.). *Mediterranean Precarious Connections*. Retrieved March 8, 2012, from <http://bordermonitoring.eu/files/2011/08/mediterranean.precarious.connections-de.pdf>
- Anomalous Wave. (2008, November 20). "The Anomalous Wave so far: The Education Rebellion in Italy (October–November 2008)." London 56a Infoshop. Retrieved November 28, 2013, from https://jaromil.dyne.org/journal/documents/anomalous_wave-eng-nov09.pdf
- APA/Der Standard. (2013, December 16). "Wissenschaftsministerium abgeschafft: schwarze Flaggen an Österreichs Universitäten." *Der Standard* [online]. Retrieved January 12, 2013, from <http://derstandard.at/1385171177676/Kein-Wissenschaftsministerium-Schwarze-Flaggen-an-Oesterreichs-Universitaeten>
- APA/nachrichten.at. (2009, May 29). "ÖH-Wahl: Harsche Kritik regnet es für Minister Hahn." *Nachrichten.at*. Retrieved June 24, 2014, from <http://www.nachrichten.at/nachrichten/ticker/OeH-Wahl-Harsche-Kritik-regnet-es-fuer-Minister-Hahn;art449,188973>
- Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2007, August). *Knowledge Exports by Canadian Universities*. Retrieved July 23, 2012, from <http://www.aucc.ca/media-room/publications/knowledge-exports-by-canadian-universities/>
- Atbaşı, F. D., Bürkeç, Y., & Öz, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Gerçek, Yıkıcı ve Yaratici*. Ankara: Nota Bene.
- Australian Government. (2008, March). "Export Income to Australia from Education Services." *Australian Education International*. 34.

- Balán, J. (2013). "Introduction – Latin American Higher Education Systems in a Historical and Comparative Perspective." In J. Balán (Ed.), *Latin America's New Knowledge Economy: Higher Education, Government, and International Collaboration* (pp. vii–xx). Global Education Research Reports. Report Seven. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Balibar, É. (2004, November 10). "Europe as Borderland." The Alexander von Humboldt Lecture in Human Geography, University of Nijmegen. Retrieved November 23, 2012, from <http://gpm.ruhosting.nl/avh/Europe%20as%20Borderland.pdf>
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003). "Who Sustains Whose Development? Sustainable Development and the Reinvention of Nature." *Organization Studies*, 24(1), 143–180.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2011). "Voices of the Governed: Towards a Theory of the Translocal." *Organization*, 18(3), 323–344.
- Bayly, C. A. (2002). "'Archaic' and 'Modern' Globalization in the Eurasian and African Arena, c. 1750–1850." In A. Hopkins (Ed.), *Globalization in World History* (pp. 47–73). London: Pimlico.
- Benino, A. (2009, August). "Notes on the Anomalous Wave, the G8 of Universities, the Repression and What (Presumably) Awaits Us." *transversal. knowledge production and its discontents*. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0809/benino/en?highlight=Notes%20on%20the%20Anomalous%20Wave>
- Bologna Burns! (2010, January 14). "Make Bologna History!" *MR Zine*. Retrieved October 23, 2014, from <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2010/bologna140110.html>
- Bologna Process – European Higher Education Area Website*. (2014). Retrieved June 23, 2014, from <http://www.ehea.info/members.aspx>
- Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, É. (2005). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. G. Elliott (Trans.). London, New York: Verso.
- Buck, T. (2014, February 20). "Migration: The Drain from Spain." *Financial Times* [online]. Retrieved November 13, 2014, from <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f7bdd5ce-995e-11e3-91cd-00144feab7de.html#axzz3KRhJzA80>
- Buden, B. (2009). "Foreword: A Miracle in Moscow." In *The Occupation Cookbook* (Eds.), *The Occupation Cookbook: Or the Model of the Occupation of the Faculty of Humanities*

- and Social Sciences in Zagreb* (pp. 12–14). Center for Anarchist Studies. Retrieved July 4, 2011, from <http://www.minorcompositions.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/occupationcookbook-web.pdf>
- Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung. (2008). “Visionen. Perspektiven. Strategien > Zur Zukunft der Universitäten.” [online .pdf pamphlet]. Retrieved January 6, 2013, from http://www.tuwien.ac.at/fileadmin/t/tuwien/docs/news/Unitour_1.pdf
- CACIM – India Institute for Critical Action: Centre in Movement Website. (n.d.). Retrieved December 23, 2013, from: <http://www.cacim.net/twiki/tiki-index.php?page=CACIM-Home>
- Caffentzis, G. (1975). “Throwing away the Ladder: The Universities in Crisis.” *ZEROWORK I*. 128–142.
- Caffentzis, G. (2000a). “The World Bank and Education in Africa.” In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 3–18). Africa World Press.
- Caffentzis, G. (2000b). “The World Bank’s African Capacity Building Initiative.” In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 69–81). Africa World Press.
- Caffentzis, G. (2011, May). “The Student Loan Debt Abolition Movement in the U.S.” In 1,000 Little Hammers (Eds.), *Dispatches from the Ruins: Documents & Analyses from University Struggles, Experiments in Self-Education* (pp. 32–35). Retrieved September 23, 2013, from <https://libcom.org/library/dispatches-ruins-documents-analyses-university-struggles-experiments-self-education>
- Caffentzis, G., & Federici, S. (2009). “Notes on the Edu-factory and Cognitive Capitalism.” In The Edu-factory Collective (Eds.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (pp. 125–131). New York: Autonomedia.
- Cantoni, D., & Yuchtman, N. (2012). “Medieval Universities, Legal Institutions, and the Commercial Revolution.” National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 17979. Retrieved July 2, 2012, from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17979.pdf>

- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2011, April 6). "Academic Freedom and the Corporatization of Universities." Lecture, University of Toronto Scarborough. Retrieved March 2, 2013, from <http://www.chomsky.info/talks/20110406.htm>
- Clark, L. (2012, August 30). "2,600 Face Threat of Deportation after Damning Government Probe: University Told to Stop Letting in Students from Overseas." *Daily Mail Online*. Retrieved December 2, 2012, from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2195566/London-Metropolitan-Universities-visa-licence-revoked-students-fear-deportation.html>
- Colectivo Rise Up* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved December 16, 2013, from <http://colectivoriseup.blogspot.com/>
- Colectivo Situaciones. (2006, April). "On the Researcher-Militant." S. Touza (Trans.). *transversal. militant research*. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0406/colectivosituaciones/en?highlight=On%20the%20Researcher-Militant>
- Commission of the European Communities. (2001, November 21). *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. COM(2001) 678. Brussels. Retrieved March 23, 2013, from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0678:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Commission of the European Communities. (2005, April 6). *Communication from the Commission: Building the ERA for Knowledge and Growth*. Brussels. Retrieved April 23, 2013, from [Cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/72299121EN6.pdf](http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/72299121EN6.pdf)
- Commoniversity 2010. (2010, November). "Public Programme." Commoniversity: Doing Politics with Knowledge in the Transformations of the Global University. Organized by Universidad Nómada, Traficantes de Sueños, MNCARS. November 25–27, 2010, Barcelona. Retrieved April 23, 2012, from <https://commoniversity.wordpress.com/>
- Costa, R. (2014, February 25). "International Students or Cash Cows?" *Arthur* [online]. Retrieved May 23, 2014, from <http://trentarthur.ca/international-students-or-cash-cows/>
- Council of Europe* Website. (2014). Retrieved January 13, 2014, from <http://hub.coe.int/>

- Craig, N. (2010, May 23). "Students from Abroad Treated like Cash Cows." *The AGE* [online]. Retrieved July 23, 2014, from <http://www.theage.com.au/national/students-from-abroad-treated-like-cash-cows-20100522-w31k.html>
- Crawford, S. (1983, October) "The Origin and Development of a Concept: The Information Society." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 71(4), 380–385.
- Creating Worlds*. (n.d.). *eipcp*. Retrieved January 12, 2012, from <http://eipcp.net/projects/creatingworlds/files/about/>
- Dalla Costa, M. & James, S. (1972). *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- De Angelis, M. (2008). "Next Lap in the Rat Race? From Sub-Prime Crisis to the 'Impasse' of Global Capital." *UE News: United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America*, Pittsburgh, USA. Retrieved June 8, 2012, from <http://www.commoner.org.uk/?p=52>
- De la Porte, C., Pochet, P., & Room, G. (2001). "Social Benchmarking, Policy-Making and New Governance in the EU." CeuS-Working Paper no. 2001/7. Bremen: Jean Monnet Centre for European Studies. Retrieved April 8, 2014, from edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2012/3781/pdf/2001_7_Porte_Pochet_Room.pdf
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. B. Massumi (Trans). Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Vise, D. (2012, March 6). "Student Loans Surpass Auto, Credit Card Debt." *The Washington Post* [online]. Retrieved November 8, 2012, from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/college-inc/post/student-loans-surpass-auto-credit-card-debt/2012/03/06/gIQARFQnuR_blog.html
- Dhawan, N. (2009, February). "Zwischen Empire und Empower: Dekolonisierung und Demokratisierung." E. Fink (Trans.). *Femina Politica*, 2, 52–63.
- Die Redaktion. (2011). "Mediterranean Precarious Connections." Retrieved May 5, 2014, from <http://www.bordermonitoring.eu/files/2011/08/mediterranean.precarious.connections-de.pdf>
- Djefflat, A. (2009). *Building Knowledge Economies for Job Creation, Increased Competitiveness, and Balanced Development*. World Bank draft paper. Retrieved September 6, 2013, from http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/252537/2009-12-18-142047_ADjefflat_Background_Report.pdf

- Dobbins, M., & Knill, C. (2014). *Higher Education Governance and Policy Change in Western Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dokuzović, L. (2011a, August). "Culture and Knowledge or Spillover Knowledge Economies." *policies, eipcp*. Retrieved January 3, 2012, from <http://eipcp.net/policies/dokuzovic/en>
- Dokuzović, L. (2011b). "Lessons Learned: Struggles against the Commodification of Knowledge, their Appropriation, Oppression and Knowledges of Dissent." In Atbaşı, F. D., Bürkeviç, Y., & Öz, D. (Eds.), *Gerçek, Yıkıcı ve Yaratıcı* (pp. 375–384). Ankara: Nota Bene.
- Dokuzović, L., & Freudmann, E. (2009). "Squatting the Crisis: Perspectives on Radical Change." *Reartikulacija*, 8, 5–6.
- Dokuzović, L., & Freudmann, E. (2010, July). "Fortified Knowledge: From Supranational Governance to Translocal Resistance." *The Worlds & Knowledges Otherwise (WKO)*, 3(2), Marina Gržinić (Ed.), *On Europe, Education, Global Capitalism and Ideology*. Duke University. Retrieved October 12, 2012, from <https://globalstudies.trinity.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/DokuzovicFreudmannGrz-inicWKO3.2.pdf>
- Dyer-Witheford, N. (2005). "Cognitive Capitalism and the Contested Campus." *European Journal of Higher Arts Education*, 15(2), 71–93.
- Bandeh-Ahmadi, A., Bracken, J., Cruz, R. de la, Flattau, P. E., Sullivan, K., & Van Atta, R. (2007). *The National Defense Education Act of 1958: Selected Outcomes*. Washington D.C.: Science and Technology Policy Institute.
- Edgerton, D. E. H. (2007). "The Contradictions of Techno-Nationalism and Techno-Globalism: A Historical Perspective." *New Global Studies*, 1(1/1). Berkeley Electronic Press. Retrieved January 11, 2013, from https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/historyofscience/Public/files/edgerton_contradictions_of_technoglobalism.pdf
- Edu-factory Mailing List. (2010, January 12). "To Build up a Transnational Network of Struggles and Resistance: Within and Against the Global University." *Edufactory Digest*, 21(9). Retrieved March 28, 2013, from <https://www.mail-archive.com/cyberinternational@ml.free.fr/msg01164.html#time>
- Eisenhower, D. D. (1958, September 2). "Statement by the President Upon Signing the National Defense Education

- Act.” The American Presidency Project. Retrieved March 23, 2013, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=11211>
- Ekine, S. (2009, September 30). “Shack Dwellers’ Struggle.” *New Internationalist* [online]. Retrieved July 14, 2014, from <http://newint.org/blog/majority/2009/09/30/shackdwellers-strugg/>
- Ekine, S. (Ed.) (2010). *SMS Uprising: Mobile Activism in Africa*. Cape Town, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press.
- Energy Capital of India: About Singrauli*. (2010). *District Singrauli*. Retrieved January 2, 2013, from <http://singrauli.nic.in/abtsing.htm>
- Engelen, E., Fernandez, R. & Hendrikse, R. (2014). “How Finance Penetrates Its Other: A Cautionary Tale on the Financialization of a Dutch University.” *Antipode* 46, 4: 1072–1091.
- Erasmus+ EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport* Website. (2016). Retrieved January 12, 2016, from <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/>
- Erler, L. & Sayer, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Schools for the Future Europe: Values and Change Beyond Lisbon*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). (2009). *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (3rd ed.). Helsinki: European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Retrieved March 8, 2013, from http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/ESG_3edition-2.pdf
- European Commission. (2001, November). *Communication from the Commission: Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. Luxembourg: Publications Office. Brussels. Retrieved March 8, 2013, from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0678:FIN:EN:PDF>
- European Commission. (2003). *Lifelong Learning, Governance and Active Citizenship in Europe*. EU Research on Social Sciences and Humanities. ETGACE Project. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from <http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/82607991EN6.pdf>

- European Commission. (2009a). *Preparing Europe for a New Renaissance: A Strategic View of the European Research Area*. First Report of the European Research Area Board. EU-R23905EN. Brussels: European Communities. Retrieved March 8, 2013, from http://ec.europa.eu/research/erab/pdf/erab-first-annual-report-06102009_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2009b). *The European Research Area Partnership: 2008 Initiatives*. Brussels: European Communities. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era-partnership-2008-initiatives_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2010, March). *Europe 2020: A European Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth*. COM(2010) 2020. Brussels: European Communities. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/pdf/COMPLET%20EN%20BARROSO%20%20%20007%20-%20Europe%202020%20-%20EN%20version.pdf>
- Faure, E., Herrera, F. Kaddoura, A. R., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A. V., Rahnema, M., & Ward, F. C. (1972). *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Federal Government's Official Information Website on Migration to Austria* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved March 14, 2014, from <http://www.migration.gv.at/en/>
- Federici, S. (2000a). "On the Future of the African University." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 83–86). Africa World Press.
- Federici, S. (2000b). "The Economic Roots of the Repression of Academic Freedom in Africa." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 61–68). Africa World Press.
- Federici, S. (2000c). "The New African Student Movement." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 87–112). Africa World Press.
- Federici, S. (2000d). "The Recolonization of African Education." In O. Alidou, G. Caffentzis, & S. Federici (Eds.), *A Thousand Flowers: Social Struggles Against Structural Adjustment in African Universities* (pp. 19–23). Africa World Press.

- Federici, S. (2006). "Precarious Labor: A Feminist Viewpoint." *In the Middle of a Whirlwind*. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from <http://inthemiddleofthewhirlwind.wordpress.com/precious-labor-a-feminist-viewpoint/>
- Federici, S. (2012, January). "African Roots of University Struggles: From the Occupy Movement to the Anti-Student Debt Campaign." *transversal. unsettling knowledges*. Retrieved March 5, 2013, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0112/federici/en?highlight=African%20Roots%20of%20University%20Struggles>
- Figlan, L., Mavuso, Ngema, B., Nsiband, Z., Sibisi, S., & Zikode, S. (2009). *Living Learning*. Pietermaritzburg, Kwa-Zulu-Natal: Rural Network.
- Folbre, N. (2010, February 15). "College Students, the New Cash Cows." *The New York Times* [online]. Retrieved March 8, 2014, from http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/15/college-students-the-new-cash-cows/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0
- Foster, J. B. (2011, July-August). "Education and the Structural Crisis of Capital: The U.S. Case." *Monthly Review, Education and Capitalism [series]*, 63(3). Retrieved November 15, 2013, from <http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/education-and-the-structural-crisis-of-capital/>
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lecture at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. New York: Picador.
- Frank, S., & Sergeyev, K. (2011, October 4). "Video: A Brief Lesson on Using the Occupy Wall Street Human Microphone." *New York Magazine* [online]. Retrieved November 12, 2013, from http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2011/10/video_a_brief_lesson_on_using.html
- Freies Medium Ottensheim. (2010). "Anti-Repressionsdemo in Wien, 12. Juli 2010 – Solidarität mit den drei U-Häftlingen." *Freies Medium Ottensheim*. Retrieved November 12, 2013, from <http://fm5ottensheim.blogspot.com/2010/07/anti-repressionsdemo-in-wien-12-juli.html>
- Fumagalli, A. (2010). "The Global Economic Crisis and Socioeconomic Governance." In A. Fumagalli, & S. Mezzadra, *Crisis in the Global Economy: Financial Markets, Social Struggles, and New Political Scenarios* (pp. 61–83). J. F. McGimsey (Trans.). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e). Active Agents Series.

- Fumagalli, A., & Lucarelli, S. (2007). "A Model of Cognitive Capitalism: A Preliminary Analysis." Munich Personal RePEc Archive. MPRA Paper No. 28012. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/28012/>
- Fumagalli, A., & Lucarelli, S. (2008). "Cognitive Capitalism as a Financial Economy of Production." Munich Personal RePEc Archive. MPRA Paper No. 27989. Retrieved January 4, 2012, from <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27989/>
- Giannotis, A. (2009, October 16). "International Students: Cash Cows for Australian Capitalism." *Direct Action*. Retrieved May 8, 2013, from http://directaction.org.au/issue16/international_students_cash_cows_for_australian_capitalism
- Gibson, N. (2009). "Fanonian Practices and the Politics of Space in Postapartheid South Africa: The Challenge of the Shack Dwellers Movement (Abahlali baseMjondolo)." Presentation at the Frantz Fanon Colloque: Algiers. Retrieved May 24, 2012, from <http://abahlali.org/files/Fanon%20practices%20in%20South%20Africa%20algiers.pdf>
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew it): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K., & Roelvink, G. (2009, May). "A Post-capitalist Politics of Dwelling: Ecological Humanities and Community Economies in Conversation." *Australian Humanities Review*, 46. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-May-2009/roelvink&gibsongraham.html>
- Giri, S. (2009, August). "The Maoist 'Problem' and the Democratic Left in India." *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39(3), 463–474.
- Giroux, H. A. (2002, October). "The Corporate War Against Higher Education." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, 9, 103–117. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://ices.library.ubc.ca/index.php/workplace/article/view/184051/183878>
- Giroux, H. A. (2013, January 22). "The New Extremism and Politics of Distraction in the Age of Austerity." *Truthout* [online]. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/13998-the-new-extremism-and-politics-of-distraction-in-the-age-of-austerity>
- Global Day of Action 15th October*. (n.d.). *People's Assemblies Network*. Retrieved November 23, 2013, from <http://www.peoplesassemblies.org/2011/06/united-for-global-change-o15/>

- Global Mass Protests 15th October 2011 #global revolution #worldrevolution (make viral)*. (2011). *Youtube*. Retrieved May 5, 2013, from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jyzi-G5bUuBE>
- Goldtooth, T. B. K. (2012, January 31). "Occupy Talks: Indigenous Perspectives on the Occupy Movement." Retrieved January 4, 2013, from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-dUgGRKWEctA>
- Greenpeace India Society. (2011). *Singrauli: The Coal Curse. A Fact Finding Report on the Impact of Coal Mining on the People and Environment of Singrauli*. Retrieved January 4, 2012, from <http://www.greenpeace.org/india/Global/india/report/Fact-finding-report-Singrauli-Report.pdf>
- Haidar, H. (2013, November 13). "What Is an Associate's Degree?" *Top Universities*. Retrieved January 12, 2014, from <http://www.topuniversities.com/blog/what-associates-degree>
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Harney, S. & Moten, F. (2009). "The University and the Undercommons." In Edu-factory Collective (Eds.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (145–150). New York: Autonomedia.
- Hartwich, V. (2010, February). "Fortress Academy: The Points-Based Visa System and the Policing of International Students and Academics." London: Manifesto Club. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from http://www.liveartuk.org/uploads/documents/Manifesto_Fortress_Academy.pdf
- Harvey, D. (1992). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Hess, S., & Tsianos, V. (2007). "Europeanizing Transnationalism! Provincializing Europe! – Konturen eines neuen Grenzregimes." In Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe (Eds.), *Turbulente Ränder. Neue Perspektiven auf Migration an den Grenzen Europas* (pp. 23–39). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- History*. (n.d.). *Vidya Ashram*. Retrieved May 9, 2012, from <http://www.vidyaashram.org/history.html>
- Hopkins, A. G. (2002). "Introduction: Globalization – An Agenda for Historians." In A. Hopkins (Ed.), *Globalization in World History* (pp. 1–10). London: Pimlico.

- Hosseini, S. A. H. (2009). "Global Complexities and the Rise of Global Justice Movement: A New Notion of Justice?" *The Global Studies Journal*, 2(3), pp. 15–36.
- Initiative for the Re-democratization of Educational Institutions (IRDEI). (2009, February). "[Praxis (von) unten [einfüllen]]." *Kulturrisse, Ausgabe 02/2009: Politisierte Universitäten: Revolutions(t)räume?* Retrieved July 26, 2013, from <http://kulturrisse.at/ausgaben/022009/oppositionen/praxis-von-unten-einfuellen>
- Kafka – La rivista del Knowledge Liberation Front*. (n.d.). *Bartleby*. Retrieved June 13, 2014, from <http://www.edu-factory.org/wp/kafka-n-2-150/>
- Kahn, R., & Kellner, D. (2007). "Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich: Technology, Politics and the Reconstruction of Education." *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(4), 431–438.
- Karakayalı, S., & Tsianos, V. (2007). "Movements that Matter. Eine Einleitung." In Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe (Eds.), *Turbulente Ränder. Neue Perspektiven auf Migration an den Grenzen Europas* (pp. 7–17). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Kendall, M., Samways, B., & Wibe, J. (2002, October). *Position Paper: Lifelong Learning (LLL)*. Laxenburg: International Federation for Information Processing. Retrieved January 9, 2013, from <http://www.ifip-tc3.net/IMG/pdf/lllv1.pdf>
- Kent, J. (2008, January 25). "Entire Staff of Failing Cincinnati School to Be Fired." *Cleveland Leader* [online]. Retrieved January 9, 2013, from <http://www.clevelandleader.com/node/4411>
- Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine*. London: Penguin Books.
- Knowledge Liberation Front. (2011a, February 16). "Common Statement." For a New Europe: University Struggles Against Austerity. Transnational meeting, Paris. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/edu160211.html>
- Knowledge Liberation Front. (2011b, October). "Réseau de Luttes' Meeting in Tunisia." [Statement sent on the KLF mailing list (April 22, 2011)]. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://eipcp.net/n/1320920049>
- Knowledge Liberation Front. (2011c, May 18). "Notes from the Liberation without Borders Tour in Tunisia." [Statement sent on the Knowledge Liberation Front mailing list (May

- 15, 2011)]. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/klf180511.html>
- Knowledge Liberation Front. (2011d, May 16). "Liberation without Borders Tour – Day 4." [Statement sent on the Knowledge Liberation Front mailing list (May 16, 2011)]. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2011/klf180511.html>
- Koester, U., Schafer, H., & Valdés, A. (1990, July). *Demand-Side Constraints and Structural Adjustment in Sub-Saharan African Countries*. International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Kuster, B., & Tsianos, V. (2013, February). "Erase Them! Eurodac and Digital Deportability." *transversal. flee erase territorialize*. Retrieved June 14, 2014, <http://transversal.at/transversal/0313/kuster-tsianos/en?highlight=Erase%20Them!%20Eurodac%20and%20Digital>
- Kroszner, R. S. (2008). "Corporate Governance." *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*. Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved June 18, 2014, from <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/CorporateGovernance.html>
- Latin America, the Caribbean, the European Union's Member States and the European Commission (EU-LAC). (2010, February). "Document on the Joint Initiative for Research and Innovation." Buenos Aires: EU-LAC SOM of Science and Technology. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/policy/lac/joint_initiative_for_research_and_innovation_en.pdf#view=fit&pagedmode=none
- Lazerson, M. (1998, September). "The Disappointments of Success: Higher Education after World War II." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 559, *The Changing Educational Quality of the Workforce*, 64–76.
- Lazzarato, M. (1996). "Immaterial Labor." In M. Hardt & P. Virno (Eds.), *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics* (pp. 133–147). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lazzarato, M. (2003, May). "Struggle, Event, Media." *transversal. differences and representations*. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/1003/lazzarato/en?highlight=Struggle%2C%20Event%2C%20Media>
- Lazzarato, M. (2012). *The Making of the Indebted Man: An Essay on the Neoliberal Condition*. J. D. Jordan (Trans). Los Angeles, Cambridge/Mass., London: Semiotext(e) / intervention series. No. 13. MIT Press.

- Egger-Subotitsch, A., Kasper, R., Leuprecht, E., Muralter, D., & Poschalko, A. (2010, June). *Berufsfindung, Joberrfahrung und Beschäftigungschanzen von Bachelor-Absolventinnen ausgewählter Studienrichtungen in der Privatwirtschaft*. Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from http://www.abif.at/deutsch/download/Files/107_Endbericht_Bachelor.pdf
- Lilley, S. (2012a). "The Apocalyptic Politics of Collapse and Rebirth." In J. Davis, S. Lilley, D. McNally, & E. Yuen (Eds.), *Catastrophism: The Apocalyptic Politics of Collapse and Rebirth* (pp. 1–14). Oakland, California: PM Press.
- Lilley, S. (2012b, November 12). "Zombies, Labor, and Catastrophism." *Against the Grain*. [Radio program]. Retrieved January 14, 2012, from <http://www.againstthegrain.org/program/626/mon-111212-zombies-labor-and-catastrophism>
- Lisbon European Council. (2000, March). *Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000 Presidency Conclusions*. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm
- Ljubljana Process: Rehabilitating our Common Heritage* Website. (2014). Retrieved December 2, 2015, from: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/cooperation/see/irppsah/ljubljanaprocess_EN.asp
- Lokavidya Ashram, Singrauli* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved March 12, 2014, from: <http://lokavidyaashramsingrauli.blogspot.com/>
- Lokavidya Jan Andolan. (2011, November 18). "A Report on The First International Conference of *Lokavidya Jan Andolan* (LJA) Held at Vida Ashram, Sarnath, Varanasi between 12 and 14 Nov, 2011." Retrieved June 14, 2013, from <http://lokavidyajandanolan.blogspot.com/2011/11/report-lokavidya-jan-andolan-conference.html>
- Lokavidya Jan Andolan. (2011, November 26). "Sessions, Stalls and Meals – LJA Conf." Retrieved June 13, 2013, from <http://lokavidyajandanolan.blogspot.com/search?q=lina+>
- Lopez, R. S. (1995). *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages: 950–1350*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louis, M. (2013, June 6). "\$1 Trillion Debt Crushes Business Dreams of U.S. Students." *Bloomberg* [online]. Retrieved February 4, 2014, from <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-06/-1-trillion-debt-crushes-business-dreams-of-u-s-students.html>

- Luxemburg, R. (1951). *The Accumulation of Capital*. A. Schwarzschild (Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. Retrieved June 1, 2011, from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1913/accumulation-capital/accumulation.pdf> (Original work published 1913).
- Luxemburg, R. (1999). *Reform or Revolution*. Part I. Chapter II: The Adaptation of Capital. Retrieved June 14, 2013, from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1900/reform-revolution/ch02.htm> (Original work published 1900).
- Madrid Autonomous University Collectives. (2011, February 11). "Letter from Madrid's Autonomous University Collectives for the Paris Meeting: (11–2–2011)." Retrieved June 12, 2013, from <http://reallyopenuniversity.wordpress.com/2011/02/24/letter-from-madrid%E2%80%99s-autonomous-university-collectives-for-the-paris-meeting/>
- Majavu, A., & Sapa. (2010, June 2). "Sowetan: Council Takes Back Toilets." Retrieved May 8, 2013, from <http://abahlali.org/node/6778/>
- Malo de Molina, M. (2004a, April). "Common Notions, Part 1: Workers-Inquiry, Co-research, Consciousness-Raising." *transversal. militant research*. Retrieved May 8, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0406/malo/en?highlight=Common%20Notions%2C%20Part%201%3A%20Workers>
- Malo de Molina, M. (2004b, August). "Common Notions, Part 2: Institutional Analysis, Participatory Action-Research, Militant Research." *transversal. instituent practices*. Retrieved May 8, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0707/malo/en?highlight=Common%20Notions%2C%20Part%201%3A%20Workers>
- Malthus, T. (1998). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1798).
- Martin, S. (2008, Spring). "The Pedagogy of Human Capital." *Mute: Culture and Politics after the Net*, 2(8), 32–45. Retrieved June 8, 2011, from <http://www.metamute.org/en/Pedagogy-of-Human-Capital>
- Marx, K. (1993). *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. Retrieved May 18, 2012, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Grundrisse.pdf (Original work published 1939).

- Massumi, B. (1987). "Translator's Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy." In G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (pp. ix–xv). B. Massumi (Trans.). Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Matheson, D., & Matheson, C. (1996). "Lifelong Learning and Lifelong Education: A Critique." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 1(2), 219–236.
- McGimsey, J. F. (2011, May). "Tunisian Migrants and Activists Occupy Paris." Retrieved June 6, 2012, <http://eipcp.net/n/1304411844>
- McLaren, P. & Tristán, J. M. B. (n.d.). "Critical Pedagogy Against Capitalist Schooling: Towards a Socialist Alternative. An Interview with Peter McLaren." *Global Education Magazine* [online]. Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://www.globaleducationmagazine.com/critical-pedagogy-againstcapitalist-schooling-socialist-alternative-interview-peter-mclaren/>
- Mdlalose, M. (2012, April 12). "This Is how We Do it." Speech delivered at the Foundry Theater, New York City. Retrieved September 6, 2013, from <http://abahlali.org/node/8731/>
- Messerschmidt, A. (2008). "Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse in einer postnazionalsozialistischen Gesellschaft – Vom Umgang mit Rassismus und Antisemitismus" *Peripherie*, 109/110, 42–60.
- Mészáros, I. (2010). *The Structural Crisis of Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Mezzadra, S. (2010, September). "The Gaze of Autonomy. Capitalism, Migration and Social Struggles." *UniNomade*. Retrieved March 9, 2013, from <http://www.uninomade.org/the-gaze-of-autonomy-capitalism-migration-and-social-struggles/>
- Mezzadra, S. (2012, January). "How Many Histories of Labor? Towards a Theory of Postcolonial Capitalism." *transversal. unsettling knowledges*. Retrieved May 6, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0112/mezzadra/en?highlight=How%20Many%20Histories%20of%20Labor%3F%20Towards>
- Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2008). "Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor." *transversal. borders, nations, translations*. Retrieved May 18, 2012, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0608/mezzadraneilson/en?highlight=Border%20>

as%20Method%2C%20or%2C%20the%20Multipli-
cation%20of%20Labor

- Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method: Or the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.
- Mezzadra, S., & Rahola, F. (2006). "The Postcolonial Condition: A Few Notes on the Quality of Historical Time in the Global Present." *Postcolonial Text*, 2(1). Retrieved May 18, 2012, from <http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/view/393/819>
- Mies, M. (1986). *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. New York: Zed Books.
- Migrant_innen aller Welt, desintegrieren wir uns!* (n.d.). Petja Dimitrova Website. Retrieved May 24, 2014, from <http://www.petjadimitrova.net/kooperationen/Soho.html>
- Mills, N. (2012, Fall). "The Corporatization of Higher Education." *Dissent*. Retrieved August 23, 2013, from <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/the-corporatization-of-higher-education>
- Mito, S., & Ohno, T. (1988). *Just-in-Time for Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Mojab, S. (2009). "Turning Work and Lifelong Learning Inside out: A Marxist-Feminist Attempt." In L. Cooper & S. Walters (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Lifelong Learning and Work* (pp. 4–15). Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Mokre, M. (2013, February). "Where Europe Is Falling Apart and where it Could Emerge Anew." *transversal. flee erase territorialize*. Retrieved March 28, 2013, <http://transversal.at/transversal/0313/mokre1/en?highlight=Where%20Europe%20Is%20Falling%20Apart%20and%20where%20it%20Could>
- Monat der freien Bildung – Mai 2014* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2014, from <http://www.freie-bildung.at/>
- Montano, J. P. (2011, September 24). "An Open Letter to the Occupy Wall Street Activists." Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.zashnain.com/2011/09/open-letter-to-occupy-wall-street.html>
- Moulier-Boutang, Y. (2011). *Cognitive Capitalism*. E. Emery (Trans.). Cambridge / Malden, MA: Polity Press.

- Narushima, Y. (2008, December 17). "Overseas Students Exploited as Cash Cows." *The Sydney Morning Herald* [online]. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/overseas-students-exploited-as-cash-cows/2008/12/16/1229189622969.html>
- Negri, A. (2003). "Logic and Theory of Inquiry: Militant Praxis as Subject and as Episteme." *transversal. militant research*. Retrieved May 8, 2012, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0406/negri/en?highlight=Logic%20and%20Theory%20of%20Inquiry%3A%20Militant>
- Neilson, B. (2009, December). "Struggles on the Borders of Higher Education: The Subjectivation of Indian Students in Australia." Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney. *Refugee Watch*, 34, 42–54.
- Network of Struggles – International Meeting in Tunisia. (2011, August 28). "Why an International Meeting in Tunisia?" [Statement sent on the Knowledge Liberation Front mailing list (August 28, 2011)]. Retrieved December 12, 2012, from <http://www.infoaut.org/index.php/english/item/2757-why-an-international-meeting-in-tunisia>
- New Issue of Critique Magazine: Fascism Now and Here*. (2011). *New Socialist Initiative (NSI)*. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from <http://nsi-delhi.blogspot.com/search/label/Critique%20Magazine>
- New Socialist Initiative (NSI) – Delhi Chapter Website*. (2011a). Retrieved March 6, 2012, from <http://nsi-delhi.blogspot.com/>
- New Socialist Initiative (NSI). (2011b, November 26). Personal Interview.
- Occupied Universities*. (n.d.). *zurPolitik.com / Google maps*. Retrieved November 29, 2010, from <http://www.tinyurl.com/squatted-universities>
- Olds, K. (2010, March 10). "Celebrating, Protesting and Reflecting about the 10th Anniversary of the Launch of the Bologna Process." *GlobalHigherEd*. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <https://globalhighered.wordpress.com/tag/bologna-burns/>
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (1996). *The Knowledge-Based Economy*. Paris: OECD.

- Osten, M. von (2009). "STOP MAKING SENSE. Some Reflections on Educational Reforms." In L. Dokuzović, E. Freudmann, P. Haselmayer, & L. Kovačič (Eds.), *Intersections: At the Crossroads of the Production of Knowledge, Precarity, Subjugation and the Reconstruction of History, Display, and De-Linking* (pp. 39–54). Vienna: Löcker Verlag.
- OTS. (2010, April 13). "TU Wien-Rektor: 'Bin für Studiengebühren von 10.000 Euro pro Jahr.'" *APA-OTS*. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from http://www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_20100413_OTS0010/tu-wien-rektor-bin-fuer-studiengebuehren-von-10000-euro-pro-jahr
- PA. (2013, August 8). "Overseas Students Used as 'Cash Cows' by UK Universities." *The Independent* [online]. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.independent.co.uk/student/news/overseas-students-used-as-cash-cows-by-uk-universities-8752635.html>
- Paoletti, E. (2009, December 23). "More Oil, Less Migrants." *Pambazuka News* 463. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.pambazuka.org/en/category/features/61239>
- Papadopoulos, D., & Tsianos, V. (2007). "The Autonomy of Migration: The Animals of Undocumented Mobility." In A. Hickey-Moody & P. Malins (Eds.), *Deleuzian Encounters* (pp. 223–235). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paton, G. (2012, September 20). "Universities 'Using Foreign Students as Cash Cows.'" *Telegraph* [online]. Retrieved May 1, 2014, from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/universityeducation/9556080/Universities-using-foreign-students-as-cash-cows.html>
- Pearce, D. (1978). "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work, and Welfare." *Urban and Social Change Review*, 11, 28–36.
- Pithouse, R. (2006a). "'Our Struggle Is Thought, on the Ground, Running': The University of Abahlali baseMjondolo." *Centre for Civil Society Research Report*, 1(40), 5–47. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from http://abahlali.org/files/RREPORT_VOL106_PITHOUSE.pdf
- Pithouse, R. (2006b). "The Promised Land and the University of Abahlali baseMjondolo." *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 102–142.
- Public Law 85–864. (1958, September 2). "National Defense Education Act (NDEA)." *United States Statutes at Large*, 72, 1580–1605. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=11211>

- Quilodran, F., & Vergara, E. (2012, April 25). "Chile Student Protest: Students March Despite President Pineda's Education Reform Promise." *Huffington Post*. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/25/chile-student-protest-pre_n_1453944.html
- Radaelli, C. M. (2003, March). *The Open Method of Coordination: A New Governance Architecture for the European Union?* Stockholm: Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies.
- Rancière, J. (1991). *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*. K. Ross (Trans.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Raunig, G. (2000, August). "Der Aufstand der Massen, reverse mode. Massenhafter Nonkonformismus als Aufhebung des Gegensatzes von Masse und Individuum." *transversal. protest*. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/1001/1151429475/1151429707?highlight=Der%20Aufstand%20der%20Massen%2C%20reverse%20mode>
- Raunig, G. (2009, August). "In Modulation Mode: Factories of Knowledge." *transversal. knowledge production and its discontents*. Retrieved July 18, 2012, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0809/raunig/en?highlight=In%20Modulation%20Mode%3A%20Factories%20of%20Knowledge>
- Raunig, G. (2013). *Factories Of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity*. Los Angeles, Cambridge, London: Semiotext(e) / MIT Press.
- Ray, P. S., & Sanhati Collective. (2010, August). "Operation Green Hunt and School Occupations by Security Forces." *Sanhati* [online]. Retrieved May 18, 2013, from <http://sanhati.com/excerpted/2684/>
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Robins, N. (2002, April). "Loot: In Search of the East India Company, the World's First Transnational Corporation." *Environment & Urbanization*, 14(1), 79–88. Retrieved May 4, 2013, from <http://www.rrojasdatabank.info/urban/euv14n1p79.pdf>
- Roggero, G. (2007, May). "The Autonomy of the Living Knowledge in the Metropolis-University." *transversal. instituent practices*. Retrieved May 4, 2014, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0707/roggero/en?->

- highlight=The%20Autonomy%20of%20the%20Living%20Knowledge%20in%20the%20Metropolis-University
- Roggero, G. (2009, June). "The Power of Living Knowledge: Crises of the Global University, Class Struggle and Institutions of the Common." *transversal. knowledge production and its discontents*. Retrieved May 4, 2012, from <http://transversal.at/transversal/0809/roggero/en?highlight=The%20Power%20of%20Living%20Knowledge%3A%20Crises%20of%20the%20Global>
- Rosenzweig, B. (2010). "International Student Struggles: Transnational Economies, Guest Consumers and Processes of Restructuring." *Mutiny*, 48. Retrieved May 4, 2012, from <http://jura.org.au/files/jura/Mutiny%2048%20WebV3.pdf>
- Rudolph, J. L. (2003, January). "Portraying Epistemology: School Science in Historical Context." *Science Education*, 87(1), 64–79.
- Rüegg, W. (Ed.). (1992). *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 1, Universities in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rullani, E. (2011). *Ökonomie des Wissens. Kreativität und Wertbildung im Netzwerkkapitalismus*. K. Neundlinger (Trans.). Wien, Berlin: Turia + Kant.
- Sachs, W. (Ed.). (2010). *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power* (2nd ed.). London, New York: Zed Books.
- Sahasrabudhey, S. (2009). "Management of Knowledge vs. Production of Knowledge." In The Edu-factory Collective (Eds.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (pp. 42–44). New York: Autonomedia.
- Sánchez Cedillo, R. (2007, May). "Towards New Political Creations. Movements, Institutions, New Militancy." M. Casas-Cortés & S. Cobarrubias (Trans). *transversal. instituent practices*. Retrieved January 13, 2014, <http://transversal.at/transversal/0707/sanchez/en?highlight=Towards%20New%20Political%20Creations.%20Movements%2C%20Institutions%2C%20New%20Militancy>
- Sengupta, S. (2007, March 26). "India Attracts Universities from the U.S." *The New York Times* [online]. Retrieved January 13, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/26/world/asia/26india.html?_r=0

- Sheehan, M. (2007). *The International Politics of Space*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Shukaitis, S. (2009). "Infrapolitics and the Nomadic Educational Machine." In R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. A. Fernandez, A. J. Nocella II, & D. Shannon, *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy* (pp. 166–174). London/New York: Routledge.
- Srijan Lokbit Samiti Website. (n.d.). Retrieved July 7, 2014, from <https://lokhitsamiti.wordpress.com/>
- Strategic Framework – Education & Training 2020. (n.d.). European Commission. Retrieved January 14, 2013, from http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm
- Szyszczyk, E. (2006, July 4). "Experimental Governance: The Open Method of Coordination." *European Law Journal*, 12(4), 486–502.
- Tan, L. (2010, March 9). "Benefits of Foreign Students Often Overlooked." *The New Zealand Herald* [online]. Retrieved July 7, 2014, from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10630745
- Teachers and Students of the University of Vienna and Academy of Fine Arts Vienna. (2009, October 27). "Statement. Gesamtgesellschaftliche Einbettung und Forderungen." Retrieved January 7, 2014, from http://www.societyofcontrol.com/pmwiki/Akademie/uploads/Main/akbild_statement.pdf
- The Idea*. (n.d.). Vidya Ashram. Retrieved December 12, 2013, from <http://www.vidyaashram.org/index.html>
- The Ministers attending the Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting. (2006, April 4). *The Brisbane Communiqué*. Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting. International Education Forum 2006. Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved July 7, 2013, from https://www.aei.gov.au/About-AEI/Policy/Documents/Brisbane%20Communique/Brisbane_Communique_pdf.pdf
- The Occupation Cookbook: Or the Model of the Occupation of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb*. (2009). Center for Anarchist Studies. Retrieved July 17, 2012, from <http://www.minorcompositions.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/occupationcookbook-web.pdf>
- Tuck, E., & Yang, W. K. (2012). "Decolonization Is not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40. Retrieved March 23, 2014, from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/18630>

- Unicommon: La rivolta del sapere vivo* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved December 10, 2014, from <http://www.unicommon.org/index.php>
- Uniriot*. (n.d.). *Global Project*. Retrieved August 12, 2014, from <http://www.globalproject.info/it/tags/uniriot/community>
- United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). (1987). *Our Common Future*. UN Documents: Gathering a Body of Global Agreements. Retrieved March 23, 2013, from <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>
- University of Lubumbashi. (2007). "The African Universities' Adaptation to the Bologna Process." *European University Association*. Retrieved March 2, 2013, from http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/newsletter/Call.Proposals.pdf
- Vercellone, C. (2005, November). "The Hypothesis of Cognitive Capitalism." Working Paper Presented at Birkbeck College and SOAS, United Kingdom. Towards a Cosmopolitan Marxism, Historical Materialism Annual Conference, 4-6 November, Birkbeck College and SOAS, London, 4 et 5 November 2005. Retrieved March 23, 2013, from http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/27/36/41/PDF/The_hypothesis_of_Cognitive_Capitalismhall.pdf
- Vercellone, C. (2007). "From Formal Subsumption to General Intellect: Elements for a Marxist Reading of the Thesis of Cognitive Capitalism." *Historical Materialism*, 15, 13–36.
- Verma, S. (2013, July 11). "Pathways to Illegality, or 'What happened to the International Students?'" *Mutiny zine* [online]. Retrieved March 23, 2014, from <http://mutinyzine.blog.com/2013/07/11/pathways-to-illegality/>
- Vidya Ashram. (2009a). "The Global Autonomous University." In The Edu-factory Collective (Eds.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (pp. 165–170). New York: Autonomedia.
- Vidya Ashram. (2009b, February 23). "Walls of the University Must Come Down." *Really Open University*. Retrieved December 9, 2012, from <http://reallyopenuniversity.wordpress.com/2011/02/23/walls-of-the-university-must-come-down/>
- Vidya Ashram* Website. (n.d.). Retrieved December 9, 2012, from <http://www.vidyaashram.org/>
- Walker, J. (2012). "Towards Alternative Lifelong Learning(s): What Freire Can still Teach Us." *Rizoma Freireano*: 3, Instituto Paulo Freire de España. Retrieved March 8, 2013, from <http://www.rizoma-freireano.org/index.php/towards-alternative>

- Williams, J. (2009). "The Pedagogy of Debt." In The Edu-factory Collective (Eds.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University* (pp. 89–96). New York: Autonomedia.
- Williamson, J. (2004). "A Short History of the Washington Consensus." Conference paper, "From the Washington Consensus Towards a New Global Governance." Barcelona, September 24–25, 2004. Fundación CIDOB. Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics. Retrieved March 8, 2014, from <http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/williamson0904-2.pdf>
- World Education News & Reviews. (2007, April 1). "The Impact of the Bologna Process beyond Europe, Part I." *World Education News & Reviews*. Retrieved June 2, 2011, from <http://www.wes.org/ewenr/07apr/feature.htm>
- World Trade Organization. (n.d.). "General Agreement on Trade and Services." Retrieved March 8, 2013, from http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/26-gats_01_e.htm
- Yee, J. (2011, September 30). "Occupy Wall Street: The Game of Colonialism and Further Nationalism to Be Decolonized from the 'Left.'" *Racialicious – The Intersection of Race and Pop Culture*. Retrieved March 8, 2013, from <http://www.racialicious.com/2011/09/30/occupy-wall-street-the-game-of-colonialism-and-further-nationalism-to-be-decolonized-from-the-left/>

I would like to thank the following people for their support and assistance in the making of this book: Nina Höchtl, Andrea Hummer, Bernhard Hummer, Therese Kaufmann, Raimund Minichbauer, Kelly Mulvaney, Gerald Raunig, Ruth Sonderegger, and Martin Wassermair.

Furthermore, this would not have been possible without the care work of the following people, who supported me in various ways throughout this process: Ljerka Blazević, Eva Egermann, Michael Gangemi, Miltiadis Gerothanasis, Therese Kaufmann, Grace Leibolt, Greg Leibolt, Radostina Patulova, Clemens Stachel, Julia Wieger, and Bernhard Wychera.

I am also deeply indebted to the members of the various knowledge-based movements that have profoundly influenced my way of thinking and approaching issues of knowledge production on a translocal level and in a complex global context.

- Precarias a la deriva **Was ist dein Streik?**
- Birgit Mennel,
Stefan Nowotny (Hg.) **Die Sprachen
der Banlieues**
- Gerald Raunig **DIVIDUUM**
- Gin Müller **Possen des Performativen**
- Félix Guattari, Antonio Negri **Neue Räume der Freiheit**
- Antonio Negri,
Rául Sánchez Cedillo **Für einen konstituierenden
Prozess in Europa**
- Birgit Mennel,
Monika Mokre (Hg.) **Das große Gefängnis**
- Monika Mokre **Solidarität als Übersetzung**
- Rubia Salgado / maiz **Aus der Praxis im Dissens**
- Stefano Harney, Fred Moten **Die Undercommons**
- Gerald Raunig,
Ulf Wuggenig (Hg.) **Kritik der Kreativität**
- Isabell Lorey, Gundula Ludwig,
Ruth Sonderegger **Foucaults Gegenwart**
- Lina Dokuzović **Struggles for
Living Learning**
- Stefan Nowotny,
Gerald Raunig **Instituierende Praxen**
- Brigitta Kuster **Choix d'un passé**