Citation:
Pusey, A (2018) "Refuse, Resist, Revolt: Cognitive capitalism and the struggle for the general intellect." In: Roberts, J and Ibrahim, J, (eds.) Contemporary Left-Wing Activism Vol 1: Democracy, Participation and Dissent in a Global Context. Routledge. ISBN 9780815363507

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:
https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/4378/

Document Version:
Book Section (Accepted Version)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Contemporary Left-Wing Activism Vol 1: Democracy, Participation and Dissent in a Global Context on 11 Dec 2018, available online: http://www.routledge.com/9780815363507

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please contact us and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Refuse, Resist, Revolt: Cognitive capitalism and the struggle for the general intellect

This chapter focuses on social movements and struggles coalescing around the neoliberal restructuring of higher education. Higher education has increasingly become a battleground (ROU, 2010). Protest has ranged from a series of high-profile university occupations in the U.S during 2008 and 2009 (After the fall, 2010; Levenson, 2011), the student protests and occupations against the removal of Education Maintenance Allowance and tripling of university tuition fees in the UK during the winter of 2010 (Brown, 2010; Hancox, 2011; Ibrahim, 2011; Solomon & Palmieri, 2011; Younis, 2011), the Quebecian student strike of 2012 (Spiegel, 2015a; Spiegel 2015b; Spiegel, 2016), and more recently protests against the ongoing colonial legacies of the university (Newsinger, 2016). This chapter maintains that through the transition from Fordist to post-Fordist modes of production and the concurrent rise of 'immaterial' (Lazzarato, 1996) forms of labour, the university is directly a site of capitalist production (Edu-Factory, 2009). It is argued, therefore, that the struggles around higher education and universities across many parts of the world are about more than simply a resurgence of cycles of student protest that have waxed and waned over the course of the mid to late twentieth century. Instead, they are symptomatic of a transformation of the role of knowledge and intellectual production within society and the economy, and subsequently the role of intellectuals and knowledge production within social struggles. Using Marx's (1993) 'fragment on machines' from the *Grundrisse* this chapter concludes that the struggles around education are struggles against the enclosure of the general intellect through cognitive capitalism and for mass intellectuality, the general intellect unchained from capitals capture.

Restructuring the University

There has been extensive discussion of the numerous ways in which universities and higher education are being restructured according to neoliberal logic (Radice, 2013). These debates have been wide ranging. For example, many have focussed their arguments against the increased precarity of academic labour (Bousquet, 2004; Krause, Nolan, Palm & Ross, 2008; Lopes & Dewan, 2014), others the increased anxiety associated with academic working conditions (Hall & Bowles, 2016; Berg, Huijbens & Larsen, 2016) and the introduction of metrics systems and an audit culture that commodifies the outputs of academic work (Ball, 2004; De Angelis & Harvie, 2009; Hall & Stahl, 2015; Harvie, 2000). Another focus has been a critique by educators of the transformation of the student into a consumer (Molesworth,

Scullion & Nixon, 2011), and the spiralling of student debt (Caffentzis, 2010; Federici, 2014). Critics have attacked these reforms as representing a 'great university gamble' (McGettigan, 2013) and suggested the university is in 'ruins' (Readings, 1996). Some have mourned the erosion of the public university in the face of corporate encroachment and marketization, and attempted to defend it from attack (Holmwood, 2011; Newfield, 2008). Other have focussed their critique on the 'gendered, sexualised, raced and classed politics of motherhood' within marketised universities (Amsler & Motta, 2016).

Enda Brophy (2011) has observed that the university increasingly seeks to commodify its intellectual production and market itself, developing its 'unique selling points' in order to find its niche within an increasingly global market for HE products and providers. Gigi Roggero (2011) argues this transformation of the university has been occurring concurrently with the convergence of the figures of the student and the worker, and that increasingly the divide between these two figures is porous where it exists at all. In turn these transformations of labour and the university are occurring within a period which has experienced an increased focus and integration of communication, culture, knowledge and affect within the valorisation of capital. Or as Brophy (2011: vii) puts it, these categories have been 'put to work with unprecedented intensity'.

Although the elements of these reforms may be context specific, across vast parts of Europe and North America the response has been a wave of struggles that have shared certain commonalities: against increases in tuition fees, against precaratization of working conditions, against marketization of education. This 'assault on the university' (Bailey & Freedman, 2011), or what Giroux (2014) has described as neoliberalism's 'war on education' has unsurprisingly been met with an acceleration of education struggles. Ostensibly these may be viewed as defensive fights, calls to protect the public university from corporate encroachment and privatisation, or to reform the existing 'neoliberal university' (Giroux, 2015). However, I argue below they are far more radical than this and that they call into question the nature of the society we live in.

As Capitalism becomes increasingly reliant on the production of knowledge, codes and affects it is also simultaneously reliant on increased levels of cooperation, collaboration and sociability (Hardt & Negri, 2009). The struggles that have emerged around education and knowledge production have not only been resistive, but contained strong elements which have experimented with prefigurative alternatives, and merged with autonomous education projects

outside universities (Noterman & Pusey, 2012; Roggero, 2011). These have produced forms of 'minor knowledge' (Pusey, forthcoming) and are projects that contain examples of a future general intellect freed from capitals apparatus of capture, seeds of another social world. Before moving on to discuss this in greater detail, the next section briefly outlines some of these struggles.

Refuse, Resist, Revolt: the three R's and pedagogic resistance

During 2008 protestors in Italy organised the first mobilisation against austerity measures related to the 2007-8 financial crisis (Zamponi, 2012). This movement became known as the 'anomalous wave' and developed into the largest in Italy in thirty years (Benardi & Ghelfi, 2010). Protestors galvanized around the slogan "We won't pay for your crisis". The slogan's double meaning refers to both the global 2007/8 economic crisis and the crisis of the university and the Bologna process. These protests were to become emblematic of the emerging cycle of education struggles that are not only protesting relatively contained issues around educational reform but instead are engaged in struggles around the 'double crisis' of the university and the economy. Furthermore, a self-consciousness about both the increased centrality of the neoiliberalised and corporatized university within the economy, but also of the increased importance of the knowledge economy more broadly within 'cognitive capitalism' (Vercellone, 2007).

The anomalous wave in Italy was quickly followed by struggles elsewhere. In the US during December 2008 students occupying the New School for Social Research in New York City suggested that activists needed to 'occupy everything'. This was a call for the immediate occupation of not only the New School NYC, or even of universities more generally, but of 'everything' the occupation and appropriation of the entire socio-spatial realm. This expansive call to action summons up the long history of occupation as a revolutionary tactic. But retrospectively we can also see this slogan as heralding the new wave of occupations in the struggles during the post 2007/2008 financial crisis: Tahir square Egypt in 2011, and the Occupy encampments around the world to name just a few (Halvorsen. 2012; Lunghi & Wheeler, 2012; Mason, 2013; Pickerill & Krinsky, 2011; Van Gelder, 2011).

Between September to December 2009, occupations of university campus buildings spread across California, including at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Cruz (After the Fall, 2010). At these protests, the slogan 'Occupy Everything', coined by the New School occupiers, was

extended to ‘Occupy Everything. Demand Nothing!’ This simple slogan embodied a refusal of mediation and representation. In place of the ‘rational demands' and media based activism often accompanying protest and student occupations, these activists proposed simply a refusal, negation. Encompassed within this simple slogan was a nod to the politics of communization (Mansoor, Marcus & Spalding, 2012). Indeed, a vocal element of these protests was openly invoking the rhetoric of communization. Communization can be described as a ‘problematic’ rather than a fully formed theory (Noys, 2011). It developed out of French ultra-left currents during the 1970s and has since morphed into several tendencies, analytic and prefigurative communization (Clare & Habermehl, 2016). Arguably the Californian students were utilizing a prefigurative form of communization, with antecedents in the French journal *Tiqqun* and the Invisible Committee (See Merrifield, 2010). It views communism not as something to be put into practice in the distant future, after some transitionary stage, but now through immediate communizing measures. Therefore, the occupations of the Californian students are not simply seen as ways to attract media attention, ‘speak truth to power’, or even apply pressure to university administrations. Instead, they are viewed as processes of reappropriation and decommodification.

During the Autumn/Winter of 2010 England experienced a series of increasingly militant protests against the removal of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), and the proposed tripling of University Tuition fees by the coalition government (Browne, 2010; Ibrahim, 2011). These protests were notable for refusing to be controlled by either the lecturer’s union, the University College Union (UCU) or the National Union of Students (NUS). Indeed, at the first major demonstration of this movement protestors refused to be marshaled by protest stewards, occupied and damaged the Conservative Party headquarters at Millbank and were roundly condemned by the presiding head of the NUS, Aaron Porter (BBC, 2010). This effectively marked the withdrawal of the NUS from any relevance to this movement and future national and local demonstrations largely operated outside of any official NUS involvement or funding (Penny, 2010; Robertson, 2011l; Sealey-Huggins & Pusey, 2013). At the second national demonstration, protestors evaded police ‘kettles’ and ran through the streets making up the route as they moved through the city. At the demonstration to mark the final decision about these reforms protestors fought with police outside parliament, attacked prominent government buildings and corporate targets and even a car carrying members of the Royal Family. Although protests began to recede after the bill was passed, at a demonstration in Manchester in the New Year of 2011 protestors pelted the head of the NUS, Aaron Porter, with

eggs, again demonstrating the disdain for him and perhaps the NUS bureaucratic apparatus more generally (Fox, 2011). After the rally protestors set off on their own unofficial march away from the out of the way park where the NUS had organised the rally and into Manchester City Centre.

These protests utilised a diverse repertoire of contention (Tilly, 2008). One prominent feature of these protests was the ‘book block’, a tactic that utilised shields made to represent books. An iconic image of these protests is that of demonstrators attempting to defend themselves from police batons with copies of seminal texts, such as George Orwell’s *1984* and Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*. This provided a poignant symbolism to the protests, as knowledge struggled against its further commodification and was forcibly suppressed by the state. Over twenty university campuses were occupied as part of this struggle, some for several weeks (NCAFC, 2010). These occupations form important spaces through which hthe movement organise and mobilise further (Salter & Kay, 2011). Many of these occupations included prefigurative and pedagogical elements (Burton, 2013; Hall, 2011) which began to build critical spaces of free association and experimental self-education, contributing towards processes of (re)politicisation and the transformation of student subjectivities (Pusey, 2016).

Although these protests dissipated with their apparent ‘defeat’, new protests emerged in 2013 around cleaners’ wages and cops off campus (UCLU, 2013). In Sussex, protests erupted during 2013 about the university outsourcing support staff jobs. Students occupied the university conference centre for over six weeks. Sussex developed an innovative ‘pop-up union' (Nişancıoğlu & Pal, 2016). The Sussex protests utilized a yellow square, which was adapted from the Quebec student protests a year earlier.

In Quebec during 2012, approximately 75% of students went on strike as part of a mass struggle over a 75% increase in student tuition fees. Perhaps most prominent among the array of tactics used by the movement was the utilization of the red square as a symbol of being ‘squarely in the red’ or ‘squarely in debt’ (Spiegel, 2016 Spiegel, 2015c). This movement not only shut down most colleges and universities in the province for six months but also mobilised thousands of supporters. At its height, nearly three-quarters of Quebec's postsecondary student population were on strike (230,000) and Spiegel (2015) suggests that the largest demonstration was attended by up to 500,000 people.

This is far from an exhaustive list of education struggles and merely gives an indication of the kinds of contestation being organised around Higher Education struggles since 2008. It

misses out the highly militant student struggle in Chile during 2011 (Guzman-Concha, 2012; Simbuerger & Neary, 2015; Somma, 2012), the organisation of adjunct labour in X (REFS) and the Rhodes Must Fall campaign, which started in Cape Town and spread to Oxford (Chaudhuri, 2016). But it gives an account of some of the high points of struggle and the transnational nature of the contestation around HE. This chapter now moves on to argue that these struggles are symptomatic of the centrality of higher education to the economy and encompass resistance to the enclosure and commodification of the general intellect.

Universities, cognitive capitalism and the struggle over the general intellect

The struggles discussed above are symptomatic of a transformation of the role of knowledge and intellectual production within society and the economy, and subsequently the role of intellectuals and knowledge production within social struggles. Using Marx's 'fragment on machines' from the *Grundrisse* (Marx, 1993), I argue that the protests around education are struggles against the enclosure of the general intellect by cognitive capitalism and for mass intellectuality, the general intellect unchained from capitals capture.

The concept of the 'general intellect' is introduced by Marx in a passage in the *Grundrisse* commonly referred to as the 'fragment on machines' (Marx, 1993). In the 'fragment on machines,' Marx uses the term 'general intellect' to refer to the general 'social knowledge' of a society, what could be described as its collective intelligence, or perhaps the limits of what we know about ourselves at any given period. In the *Grundrisse* Marx focuses on forms of 'fixed capital' such as machinery as embodying the general intellect, as well as human beings, contending that:

> Nature builds no machines, no locomotives, railways, electric telegraphs, self-acting mules etc. These are products of human industry; natural material transformed into organs of the human will over nature, or of human participation in nature. They are organs of the human brain, created by the human hand; the power of knowledge, objectified. The development of fixed capital indicates to what degree general social knowledge has become a *direct force of production*, and to what degree, hence, the conditions of the process of social life itself have come under the control of the general intellect and been transformed in accordance with it. To what degree the powers of social production have been produced, not only in the form of knowledge but also as immediate organs of social practice, of the real life process. (Marx, 1993, p706)

From this starting point, Paulo Virno (2004) understands the general intellect to include all the 'formal and informal knowledge, imagination, ethical tendencies, mentalities and "language games" that are not the property of an individual or corporation but are rather immanent to the productive capacity of society itself'. The general intellect is, therefore, the driving force of production in society, from the immaterial, such as languages and codes, to the concrete, such as bridges and cars – the cumulative creative potential of society. The general intellect incorporates not only an immaterial capacity but knowledge that has become materially embodied in physical objects, such as machines and the built environment. This is not, however, to say that physical objects have their own isolated productive capacity, but rather that a manifestation of the general intellect can be found in those phenomena that augment the productive capacity of the general intellect.

Dyer-Witheford (1999: 233) states that 'in [the] contest [for the general intellect] the contemporary proletariat fights to actualise the 'general intellect,' not according to the privatizing, appropriative logic of capital, but in ways that are deeply democratic and collective, and hence truly 'general.'. This indicates a struggle against the enclosure of knowledge (Federici & Caffentzis, 2007) and for a generalization or 'commonization' (Clare & Habermehl, 2016) of the general intellect. A key space and place of this 'value struggle' (De Angelis, 2007) over the general intellect is the university, 'for no site could be more vital to capital's harnessing of collective intelligence than academia' (Dyer-Witheford-1999: 233). One of the ways capital harnesses academic 'doing' (Holloway, 2010) is through metrics systems and the struggle over the implementation of measure (De Angelis & Harvie, 2009; Harvie, 2000).These are key mechanisms for implanting market-like conditions upon academia and transforming the production of knowledge and teaching into commodities.

According to Dyer-Witheford, analyzing an article by Negri & Lazzarato, in the `ivory-tower' era of the university, when universities were:

> only partially integrated into capitalism, or marginal to its central functions, academics appeared (however much this actually mystified real interconnections) to be removed from industrial activity and its attendant class-conflicts. It was from this position of apparent exteriority that the intellectual could commit or engage himself with political movements (Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p234).

We can describe this era as that of formal subsumption, where capital takes command of labour processes previously organised outside or prior to the capital relation. Today, however, with

the corporatisation and marketisation of universities, 'university teachers find themselves unequivocally involved in capital's appropriation of 'general intellect' (Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p234). This is real subsumption, where the labour process of academic production is reorganised by capital for its own benefit. Negri and Lazzarato suggest these changed conditions, 'create the grounds for a new relation between dissenting academics and oppositional social movements. Rather than descending from the heights of the university to commit themselves to a cause largely external to their daily experience, possibilities emerge for academics to make more 'transverse connections' (cited in Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p234). This leads Dyer-Witheford to suggest that this may mean academics to 'lose some pretensions as the bearer of great truths and grand analysis, but become the carriers of particular skills, knowledges and accesses useful to movements in which they participate on the basis of increasing commonalities with other members of post-Fordist 'mass intellect' (1999, pp234-235).

Dyer-Witheford suggests, in order to effectively harness the mass intellect to accumulation, capital must maintain a certain degree of openness within the universities. Part of what capital seeks in its subsumption of academia is the creativity and experimentation of social labor power, qualities vital to a high-technology economy based on perpetual innovation. But if industry is to benefit from such invention-power, it cannot entirely regiment the institutions of education (Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p235). It is this seemingly unavoidable condition, 'of an economic order based on general intellect', that in Dyer-Witheford's view, gives a 'limited but real porosity to universities' (1999, p235). Capital, therefore, needs the creativity and cooperation of the academic commons (Harvie, 2004). Dyer-Witheford optimistically suggests that:

> this porosity can be exploited by dissident academics--to research and teach on topics of value to social movements in opposition to capital; to invite activists and analysts from these movements onto campuses and into lectures and seminars; and to use the university's resources, including its easy access to the great communication networks of our age, to circulate news and analysis that are otherwise marginalised (Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p235).

This is certainly the case in some instances, for example, some academics have developed programmes in Activism and Social Change (see Hodkinson, 2009), and of course, there a

numerous other examples that are perhaps less overt in their stance. We can also think of the various struggles to include/make space for marginalised and 'minor knowledges'.[i]

Dyer-Witheford concludes that:

> In academia, as elsewhere, labor power is never completely controllable. To the degree that capital uses the university to harness general intellect, insisting its workforce engage in life-long learning as the price of employability, it runs the risk that people will teach and learn something other than what it intends (Dyer-Witheford, 1999, p236).

I argue below that this is what we are experiencing though the rise of the movements outlined above.[1] Fundamentally this is about struggles over measure (De Angelis and Harvie 2009) and the law of value being introduced into the university (Harvie, 2001).

Within elements of the Italian workerist tradition, and especially the writings of Antonio Negri, the figure of the 'mass worker' was the embodiment of the worker in the Fordist era of capitalist production (Negri, 1988; Wright, 2002). The 'socialised worker' came to replace it with the development of 'post-Fordist' and 'cognitive' forms of labor, at least within the eyes of some post-autonomist theorists. Dyer-Witheford argues that:

> corporations went 'cognitive' in the 1960s and 70s not just because computers and biotech innovations were available, but also because high technology restructuring offered a weapon against the massive unrest that beset industrial, Fordist capitalism - whether by automating unruly factories, networking outsourced global production costs or green revolutionizing the sites of peasant struggle. But making the shift from industrial to cognitive capital - or from Fordism to post-Fordism - required pacifying and restructuring academia. After the immediate discipline of police action, shootings and academic purges, the neoliberal response was radical reorganization (Dyer-Witheford, 2005, p75).

---

[1] There is, however, a substantial difference between exceeding capital's total capture of the university in the form of teaching as a transgressive act (hooks, 1994) and a rebellious labor force actively resisting the commodification of its labor power. While it is certainly possible to use the university to teach 'freedom and defiance' (Chatterton, 2008) or even the uncovering/or creation of marginalised 'minor knowledges' (Pusey, forthcoming), it remains to be seen whether these can be put to use in a struggle inside & against the university, so as to go beyond it (REFS).

The ‘radical restructuring’ that Dyer-Witheford suggests was Neoliberalism’s response to the earlier Fordist ‘mass worker’, and student cycles of struggle incorporates some of the demands of these earlier struggles such as the demands for formerly marginalised knowledges within the university, we can regard this as a ‘weapon of inclusion’ (Roggero, 2011). This restructuring also introduces a regime of liberalization that makes universities productive for ‘cognitive capitalism' (Vercellone, 2009).

Post-Fordism utilizes the ‘general intellect' through its deployment of cooperative and collaborative forms of labor, something that has led some, notably Paulo Virno, to describe it as the ‘communism of capital’ (2004, p11). We can extend this analysis to ‘cognitive capitalism’. Matteo Pasquinelli suggests that 'in technical terms, the expression ‘communism of capital’ refers to a process of colonization of any aspect of human life that can be transformed into a credit line' (Pasquinelli, 2010, p5), that is the process of marketisation and financialisation of the world, part of the ongoing process of primitive accumulation and enclosure (Bonefeld, 1988; Midnight Notes, 1990). Pasquinelli analyses the ‘communism of capital’ as causing [or relying upon?] a ‘cannibalism of the common’ (*ibid*). Returning to the university then, capital relies on the openness and criticality of the university in order to cannibalise it, but this comes with the risk of refusal and labour acting in excess of this capture. Thus the student-workers of the struggles discussed in this chapter are part of a broader struggle over the cannibalisation of the university-common.

According to Virno ‘mass intellectuality is the prominent form in which the general intellect is manifest today’ (Virno, 2007, p6). Virno describes mass intellectuality as the ‘entirety of post-Fordist living labor' (*ibid*). Mass intellectuality then is the ‘collective intelligence and accumulated intellectual powers that extend horizontally across society’ (Virno & Hardt, 1996, p262). This appears to point towards the general intellect in its liberated form, breaking free from or slipping past capital’s 'apparatus of capture' (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004). The University relies upon the cooperation of the common. The problematic of contemporary education struggles is to find ways to exceed this capture and cannibalisation, in order to throw off this apparatus of capture and enclosure entirely, liberating the general intellect.

Taking this further and relating it back to struggles around higher education discussed above, the University of Utopia (2010, np) state that they do not want ‘mass education or education for the masses but mass intellectuality', continuing that ‘mass education is based on

the assumption that people are stupid and must be made not-stupid (i.e. Educated). Mass intellectuality recognizes that education maintains the population in a condition of stupidity (i.e. Intelligence Quotient) regulated through examinations and other forms of humiliations (i.e. Grades and Assessments)'. The University of Utopia (2010, np) suggest that 'mass intellectuality is based on our common ability to do, based on our needs and capacities and what needs to be done'. What needs to be done 'raises doing from the level of the individual to the level of society. In the society of doing, based on what needs to be done, my own needs are subsumed with the needs of others and I become invisible (i.e. Free)' (UOU, 2010, np). This invocation of mass intellectuality can be seen to be the result of a process of social struggles to free the 'general intellect' of its containment by capital and in this case education.

For Franco 'Bifo' Berardi, 'the birth of the student movement in the 1960s was the sign of the mutation of the social scenario out of which emerges this new figure of mass intellectuality' (Berardi, 2009b, p63). Beradi continues:

> no longer are intellectuals a class independent of production, or free individualities that take upon themselves the task of a purely ethical and freely cognitive choice; instead the intellectual becomes a mass social subject that tends to become an integral part of the general productive process'(*ibid*).

This argument concurs with Dyer-Witherford and back to the discussion outlined above regarding the centrality of the academy in the struggle over the general intellect, because 'intellectuals no longer find the realm of political action to be outside of their daily practices; is now lies in the transversal connections between knowledge and social practices' (Berardi, 2009b, p66).

The current struggles around higher education and universities across many parts of the world are therefore about more than simply a resurgence of cycles of student protest that have waxed and waned over the course of at least the mid to late twentieth century. Instead, they are symptomatic of a transformation and increased centrality of the role of knowledge and intellectual production within society and the economy, and subsequently the role of intellectuals and knowledge production within social struggles. At the point at which the university is being incorporated further into capital's circuits, integrating students and academics into the general productive process, it is simultaneously relying on the communicative capacity, collaboration and cooperation of their labour power. However, it needs to control this whilst maintaining the porosity and freedom that facilitates this continued production for capital. The University relies upon the cooperation of the common. The

problematic of contemporary education struggles is to find ways to exceed this capture and cannibalisation, in order to throw off this apparatus of capture and enclosure entirely, liberating the general intellect, perhaps utilising what Neary & Hagyard (2010) term the 'pedagogy of excess', an ‘overflowing’ (Holloway, 2002). As Jason Read states: ‘Wealth is no longer produced by bodies put to work in the closed spaces of the factory but by knowledge, communication, and interactions throughout society’ (Read, 2003, p104). As part of this process, capital also becomes more dependent on social forms of knowledge, cooperation and communication. Read elaborates:

> At the heart of the capitalist mode of production there are relations of cooperation, which are not only productive for capital but productive of the material possibility of relations that exceed those reinforced by the competitive market of labor and the hierarchy of the technological division of labor (Read, 2003 p101).

There are several ways the recent cycles of struggle around HE do this. Firstly, through a refusal of the conditions being imposed on the existing neoliberal university. The struggles outlined at the beginning of this chapter represent a ‘scream’ of refusal of these processes (Holloway, 2002). Although notionally they are organised and mobilised around the specifics of their particular context, from localised cuts and restructuring of institutions, through to national campaigns against fees and cuts, they are also part of a broader rejection of the HE status quo, and by implication given the analysis above, they become struggles over the alienation of their labour within cognitive capitalism, the capturing of their doing and the commodification of the creative and cooperative capacities. As Roggero states:

> We have to recognise that in cognitive capitalism we run into a situation in which the resistance to the expropriation of knowledge is immediately the struggle against the relations of exploitation because this resistance poses the question of the collective control of the (cognitive) production of the common against capitalist capture. (Roggero, 2010, p.363).

The second way these struggles do this is through the creation of alternatives. Many of these movements have either directly experimented with forms of alternative education (Pusey, 2017; Pusey & Sealey-Huggins, 2013) or contained pedagogical elements (Neary & Amsler, 2012). These struggles, therefore, create ‘pedagogies of resistance’ (Thompsett, 2017) and exist within a longer history of free university experiments (Amsler, 2017; Kanngieser, 2008). Struggles are involved in the production of common spaces (Pusey & Chatterton, 2016) where

it is possible to reimagine education and the university (Pusey, 2017), 'and by extension the rest of our lives' (ROU, 2010).

For Hall (2017), 'the idea of an alternative questions the legitimacy of formalised spaces'.

> From inside-and-against the hegemonic institution, alternatives articulate the limits of formal education, including its problematic nature as a public or private good (Marginson 2012). Here, the idea of the school or university as a form of enclosure of knowledge and practice is refused through public intellectualism or educational activity that is conducted in public.

Through critiquing and resisting the neoliberalisation of academia and acting within the 'double crisis' (Edu-Factory, 2009) and creating examples of how academic labour, knowledge production and learning could take place in common, these movements point to an excess that could refuse the enclosure of these practices as subsumed within capital and recreate them as mass intellectuality, the general intellect unchained from the capital relation. This is counter the subsumption and valorisation of academic labour that characterises the contemporary university. Instead this is a process of self-valorisation (Cleaver, 1992 Negri, 1991), the self-determining, self-organised autonomous activity of scholars and 'student-scholars' (Neary, 2013).

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that the mobilisations, struggles and movements coalescing around universities and higher education go beyond mere iterations of previous cycles of student struggle. Instead, this chapter suggests that these are struggles against the enclosure of the general intellect through cognitive capitalism and for mass intellectuality, the general intellect unchained from capitals capture. It has argued that the subsumption of the university and the valorisation of academic labour has not only been met with resistance through this wave of struggles, but that they have also created experiments with alternatives. These experiments have involved the production of common spaces from which to reimagine education and the university in a non-commodified form. These self-valorizing practices point towards an excess, and overflowing, which critically interrogates and undermines formalised educational space and begins to develop new practices where it might be possible to engage in knowledge production learning and teaching in common.

[i] This is not, however, an unproblematic or straightforward process, as this 'porosity' cannot only be exploited by 'dissident academics' in order to 'subvert' the academy from within but can also be used to boost the cultural capital and profile of an academic in order to enhance their own careers. Even if this is not explicitly the case, the university can attempt to co-opt these subversive spaces within the institution for its own ends, recapturing them as part of a 'rebellious' liberal image.

References

After the Fall Communiqués (2010) Communiqués from Occupied California.

Amsler, S. (2017). 'Insane with courage': Free university experiments and the struggle for higher education in historical perspective. *Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 5-23.

Amsler, S., & Motta, S. C. (2017). The marketised university and the politics of motherhood. *Gender and Education*, 1-18.

Ball, S. J. (2004). Education for sale! The commodification of everything. *Department of Education and Professional Studies Annual Lecture, Institute of Education, London (June 2004)*.

BBC (2010) 'NUS president condemns the violence during tuition protest'. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-11728264/nus-president-condemns-the-violence-during-tuition-protest (accessed 31/5/17)

Berardi, F. 'Bifo' (2009*). Soul at Work*. Los Angeles: MIT Press.

Bonefeld, W. (1988). Class struggle and the permanence of primitive accumulation'. In *Common Sense* (Vol. 6, pp. 54-65).

Bousquet, M. (2008). *How the university works: Higher education and the low-wage nation*. NYU Press.

Brophy, E. (2011) Translators foreword. In Roggero, G. (2011). *The production of living knowledge*. Temple University Press.

Browne, J. (2010). Securing a sustainable future for higher education: an independent review of higher education funding and student finance.

Chaudhuri, A. (2016). The Real Meaning of Rhodes Must Fall. The Guardian, 16. A. (2016). The Real Meaning of Rhodes Must Fall. *The Guardian*, 16.

Clare, N., & Habermehl, V. (2016). Towards a Theory of ‘Commonization’. *Theories of Resistance: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt*, 101.

Cleaver, H. (1992). The inversion of class perspective in Marxian theory: From valorisation to self-valorisation. *Open Marxism*, 2, 1992-106.

De Angelis, M. (2007). *The beginning of history: Value struggles and global capital*. Pluto Press.

De Angelis, M., & Harvie, D. (2009). 'Cognitive capitalism' and the rat-race: how capital measures immaterial labour in British universities. *Historical Materialism*, 17(3), 3-30.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2004). *A Thousand Plateaus.* London: Continuum

Dyer-Witheford, N. (1999). *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and circuits of struggle in high-technology capitalism.* University of Illinois Press.

Edu-Factory Collective. (2009). Toward a global autonomous university: Cognitive labor, the production of knowledge, and exodus from the education factory. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Federici, S. (2009). Education and the Enclosure of Knowledge in the Global University. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 8(3), 454-461.

Federici, S., & Caffentzis, G. (2007). Notes on the Edu-factory and Cognitive Capitalism. *The Commoner*, 12, 63-70.

Fox, T. (2011) ‘Hundreds of students chase Aaron Porter through Manchester’. Available at: http://manchestermule.com/article/hundreds-of-students-chase-aaron-porter-through-manchester. (accessed 31 May 2017).

Fritsch, K. (2010). Occupy Everything: A Roundtable on US Student Occupations. *Upping The Anti*.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). The Quebec student protest movement in the age of neoliberal terror. *Social Identities*, *19*(5), 515-535.

Hall, R. (2017) ‘Alternative Education’. Available at: http://www.richard-hall.org/2017/06/02/notes-for-alternative-education/ Last accessed 9th June 2017

Hall, R. (2011) “Occupation: A Place to Deliberate the Socio-History of Re-Production.” *Roundhouse Journal: Reimagining the University* 2: 54–63.

Hall, R., & Stahl, B. (2015). Against commodification: The university, cognitive capitalism and emergent technologies. In *Marx and the Political Economy of the Media* (pp. 65-97). Brill.

Halvorsen, S. (2012). Beyond the network? Occupy London and the global movement. *Social Movement Studies*, *11*(3-4), 427-433.

Hancox, D. (2011). Summer of Unrest: Kettled Youth: The Battle Against the Neoliberal Endgame. Random House.

Harvie, D. (2000). Alienation, class and enclosure in UK universities. *Capital & Class,* 24(2), 103-132.

Holloway, J. (2002) *Change the World Without Taking Power*. Pluto Press

Holloway, J. (2010). *Crack capitalism*. Pluto Press.

Ibrahim, J. (2011). The new toll on higher education and the UK student revolts of 2010–2011. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(4), 415-421.

Ibrahim, J. (2014) The moral economy of the UK student protest movement 2010-2011. *Contemporary Social Science*, 9 (1) January, pp. 79-91

Kanngieser, A. (2008). It's Our Academy: Transforming Education through Self-organized Universities. *Arena Journal,* (29/30), 25.

Lazzarato, M. (1996). Immaterial labor. Radical thought in Italy: A potential politics, 1996, 133-47.

Levenson, Z (2011) Occupying Education: The Student Fight Against Austerity in California, NACLA Report on the Americas, 44:6, 25-28, DOI: 10.1080/10714839.2011.11725563

Lunghi, A., & Wheeler, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Occupy Everything!: Reflections on why It's Kicking Off Everywhere*. Minor Compositions.

Mansoor, J., Marcus, D., & Spaulding, D. (2012). Occupy Response. *October* 142: 48–51.

Marx, K. (1993). *Grundrisse*. Penguin.

Mason, P. (2013). *Why it's still kicking off everywhere: The New Global Revolutions*. Verso Books.

Merrifield, A. (2010). The coming of The Coming Insurrection: Notes on a politics of neocommunism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(2), 202-216.

Midnight Notes (1990). The new enclosures. *Midnight Notes*, 10, 1-9.

NCAFC (2010) 'List of university occupations'. Available at: http://anticuts.com/2010/11/27/list-of-university-occupations/ last cessed 9th June 2017

Neary, M. (2013) Occupying the City with the Social Science Centre – an Interview with Mike Neary. Available at: http://undercommoning.org/occupying-the-city/ Last accessed 9th June 2017.

Neary, M., & Amsler, S. (2012). Occupy: a new pedagogy of space and time. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(2), 106-138.

Neary, M., & Hagyard, A. (2010). Pedagogy of excess: An alternative political economy of student life. *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer*, 209-223.

Negri, A., & Fleming, J. (1991). *Marx Beyond Marx Lessons on the Grundrisse*. Autonomedia

Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class*. Harvard University Press.

Newsinger, J. (2016). Why Rhodes must fall. *Race & Class*, *58*(2), 70-78.

Nişancıoğlu, K., & Pal, M. (2016). Counter-conduct in the university factory: Locating the Occupy Sussex campaign. *Global Society*, 30(2), 279-300.

Noterman, E., & Pusey, A. (2012). Inside, outside, and on the edge of the academy: Experiments in radical pedagogies. In Haworth, R. *Anarchist pedagogies: Collective actions, theories, and critical reflections on education*. PM Press

Noys, B. (2011). *Communization and its discontents: Contestation, critique, and contemporary struggles*. Minor Compositions.

Pasquinelli, M. (2010). Communism of Capital and Cannibalism of the Common: Notes on the Art of Over-Identification. 1-7 October, Abandon Normal Devices festival, Manchester. Available at: kruzok.files.wordpress.com/.../pasquinelli_communism_of_capital1.pdf].

Penny, L (2010) 'Out with the old politics'. Available at: politicshttps://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/dec/24/student-protests-young-politics-voices (accessed 31 May 2017)

Pickerill, J., & Krinsky, J. (2012). Why does Occupy matter?. Social Movement Studies, 11(3-4), 279-287.

Pusey, A. (2016). Strike, occupy, transform! Students, subjectivity and struggle. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 26(2), 214-232.

Pusey, A. and Chatterton, P. (2016) Commons. In: Jayne, M and Ward, K, (eds.) *Urban Theory: New Critical Perspectives*. Routledge

Pusey, A., & Sealey-Huggins, L. (2013). Transforming the university: Beyond students and cuts. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 12(3), 443-458.

Radice, H. (2013). How we got here: UK higher education under neoliberalism. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *12*(2), 407-418.

Read, J. (2003). *The Micro-politics of Capital: Marx and the Prehistory of the Present*. SUNY Press.

Robertson, M. (2010) 'Aaron Porter is no longer fit to lead the student movement'. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/jan/11/nus-porter-failed-student-protestors (accessed 31 May 2017)

Roggero, G. (2010). Five theses on the common. *Rethinking Marxism*, 22(3), 357-373.

Roggero, G. (2011). *The production of living knowledge*. Temple University Press.

Salter, L., & Kay, J. B. (2011). The UWE student occupation. *Social movement studies*, 10(4), 423-429.

Sealey-Huggins, L., & Pusey, A. (2013). Neoliberalism and Depoliticisation in the Academy: Understanding the 'New Student Rebellions'. *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, 10(3), 80-99.

Solomon, C., & Palmieri, T. (2011). Springtime: The new student rebellions. London: Verso

Spiegel, J. B. (2015a). Rêve général illimité? The role of creative protest in transforming the dynamics of space and time during the 2012 Quebec student strike. Antipode, 47(3), 770-791.

Spiegel, J. B. (2015b). Masked protest in the age of austerity: State violence, anonymous bodies, and resistance "in the red". Critical Inquiry, 41(4), 786-810.

Spiegel, J. B. (2016). Performing "in the red": transformations and tensions in repertoires of contention during the 2012 Quebec student strike. Social Movement Studies, 15(5), 531-538.

Thompsett, F. (2017). Pedagogies of resistance: Free universities and the radical re-imagination of study. *Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 24-41.

Tilly, C. (2008). *Contentious performances.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UCLU (2013) Cops off our campus. Available at: http://uclu.org/policy/up1302/cops-off-our-campus. Last accessed 9th June 2017

University of Utopia (2010). 'sharing'. Available at: http://www.universityofutopia.org/sharing

Van Gelder, S. (2011). This changes everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% movement. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Vercellone, C. (2007). From formal subsumption to general intellect: Elements for a Marxist reading of the thesis of cognitive capitalism. *Historical materialism*, 15(1), 13-36.

Virno, P. (2004). *A Grammar of the Multitude*. Semiotext(e).

Virno, P. (2007). General intellect. *Historical Materialism*, 15(3), 3-8.

Virno, P., & Hardt, M. (1996). *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Younis, M. (2011). British Tuition Fee Protest, November 9, 2010, London. *Interface: a journal for and about social movements*, 3(1), 172-181.

Zamponi, L. (2012). 'Why don't Italians Occupy?'Hypotheses on a Failed Mobilisation. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(3-4), 416-426.