Reconceptualising activism for a pedagogy of struggle: Occupying education, the power of the empty signifier for the future of education

Cassie Earl

Lancaster University

The global Occupy! actions gave some pause for thought. At first, some thought that this was a global movement that could change the way politics was conducted and maybe see the end of capitalism as we knew it. The hopes for Occupy! were high, but the highest hopes for the movement were short lived. This paper examines Occupy!'s legacy; what potential remains and where educators might go with it. An argument is presented that Occupy! became an empty signifier: a 'bucket' of discontent into which thousands of disjointed, dissenting voices and discontents were poured, ranging from the original Wall Street encampment to the Umbrella revolution in Occupy Central. The paper looks at the power of the 'empty signifier' as a galvanising mechanism and explores what this could mean for education. The notion of occupying the curriculum in HE will be explored as a unifying mechanism for multidisciplinary teaching and learning.

Keywords: *Popular Education; Occupy Movement; Dissent; collectivism*

In his chapter in a book on popular education, Bud Hall (2012) called the global *Occupy*! movement of 2011/12 a 'giant human hashtag'. It is from this notion that I would like to start, although this particular global movement was incredibly complex, what *Occupy*! actually was at that time and for a while afterwards, was a unifying symbol, a signifier of the possibility of change to come, a stream of consciousness to which anyone could, hypothetically, add their voice: a giant human hashtag. The questions that this paper seeks to theoretically address concern the notion that if this was so, what does that mean? What possibilities does that unleash? And where could it take us? What power does a 'giant human hashtag' have in shaping our current and future thinking about how we 'do' forms of education in a changing world? What could be the future for adult education and what sorts of (re)organisation would it take to make that desired future happen? These, and other socio-political questions are needed now, in a time when politics and truth are at a strange juncture (Havt-Rabin, & Media Matters, 2016; Wilson, & Swyngedouw, 2015) and critical thinking and high levels of political education are needed to combat a potentially dystopian future for many. Therefore, this paper asks what might be needed to change, not just in our classrooms in adult education and other spaces, but perhaps in our hearts and minds too, in order to fill the empty spaces left by the street eruptions, the movements of the Squares and the global occupations of politics and lives, that left such an impression on so many. What can we capture, still, now a number of years on, of that energy so that its legacy lives on in some guise of resistance? What can we take into our spaces of adult and popular education, our universities and our colleges, that will turn our education into an occupation of ourselves and our communities?

I have written more extensively elsewhere about the *Occupy*! movement, specifically in the UK (Earl, 2013; Earl, 2015; Earl, 2015), about its fulfilled and unfulfilled potential, its prefigurative practices and its promises of the creation of a world, as John Holloway (2010) might say, that exists not yet. The discussion in this paper on the actual *Occupy*! movement, constituted as a global political movement with the specific actions of the physical occupations, with tents and bodies, of squares and parks around the world, will be brief as it is only included as a specific moment, event, protest, process, as a reference point for the potential it did and, I argue, still could contain. But these discussions are still important, whatever your own opinion on *Occupy*!, it did something

to the collective imagination, it was written about extensively and it gave many people a reason to pause and reconsider, so a description is essential before moving on.

The global *Occupy*! actions of 2011–2012; the encampments, the protests, the solidarity displays, the spring uprisings, etc., created a massive amount of excitement, a huge amount of hope, and a glimpse of collective action on a global scale, unprecedented in its use of space and public pedagogy (Sandlin, Shultz, & Burdick, 2010), it was what Chomsky (2012) termed the greatest public response to class war in thirty years. At first, many activists and academics (Chomsky, 2012; Gitlin, 2013; Graeber, 2011) thought that this was a global movement that could change the way politics was conducted, bring the hidden countervailing discourses out into the public consciousness and maybe even see the end of capitalism as we knew it. A huge expectation for a leaderless movement and grand ambition indeed. However, as grand as it seems in the cold light of day, there was something about *Occupy*! that was undeniably different, undeniably exciting and undeniably grand. My research was conducted at Occupy London Stock exchange (Occupy LSX) and I have to admit, the idea, the camp, the rhetoric was seductive.

As I have said, the hopes for *Occupy*! were high, but the highest hopes for the movement were reasonably short lived, *Occupy*!, as a new social movement was plagued with problems, distrust, internal disagreements, even some abuse of its members (Anonymous, 2012; Campbell, 2011; Earl, 2018; Mann, 2013). Much research deemed that in *Occupy*! London, the repression of internal dissent against the consensus democracy model was an influential factor that contributed to the London movements' downfall. These issues, coupled with the sometimes violent repression seen in various sites around the world, meant that, certainly in the UK, what was solid about *Occupy*! has melted into air as a new social movement.

However, as interesting as the stories from *Occupy*! are, what this paper seeks to examine is *Occupy*!'s potential legacy for thinking into the future of a specific pedagogical form; what can we as popular, adult, and higher education teachers and researchers gain from the events that unfolded, what potential remains from those thoughts, happenings and produced spaces, and where might we go with it? The argument that I present here is that what has happened cannot merely disappear. What

occurred in those spaces produced, stirred up by the activists' tents and physical presence, which disrupted the flow of business as usual in the City of London and other spaces across the world, gave valuable new meaning in the most commercialised space in the UK, and disquieted the familiar discourses on the right to the city and the assertion of the right to public assembly, currently being eroded in most countries around the world. Those happenings cannot merely go away, despite violent evictions, disillusionment and the often spreading distrust. There is left an energy, which has the potential to be translated into imaginative hope for other spaces and other imaginaries. MacKenzie (2011) said in an article that what *Occupy*! was good at, and had sincerely and effectively begun, was 'hacking the public imagination' or what Haiven and Khasnabish (2014) might call awakening the Radical Imagination, and it is this that was begun during the uprisings constituted by the various occupations around the globe in 2011–2012, and I will argue, continued after the camps had gone – rethought and reconstituted. I wish then, to explore whether this energy and these ideas produced in those spaces could still be useful notions for thinking about radical social change through forms of education, and how we move forward as peoples and educators into the next stage of—if left unchecked—inevitable and vicious attacks on the poor and subjugated from a currently still (re)formulating kind of neoliberalism that is more oppressive and repressive than possibly ever before, and with the US marching toward fascism (if it isn't already there) (Hawley, 2019). I will look particularly at the UK context as this is what I know best and because the adult and higher education sector here are currently and have been for some time now under economic and ideological attack (Bailey, & Freedman, 2011; Couldry, 2011; Earl, in press), facing a fast and furious move toward the commodification of knowledge (Williams, 2013) and academic capitalism (Leslie, & Slaughter, 1997; Molesworth, Scullion, & Nixon, 2011; Neary, & Amsler, 2012; Williams, 2016). Student fees are being raised alongside the marketisation of not just universities themselves, but individual courses and academic disciplines (McGettigan, 2013; Williams, 2013). The adult education that used to be fully funded, such as Access Courses that help 'non-traditional' (mature and those with no formal qualifications) students access higher education, now has an expensive individual 'investment' of around £2400. The community education that I spent my first career working in is almost now non-existent, and that's where the radical work was being

done, through a Freirean popular pedagogy, with a focus on community organising (Alinsky, 1969).

What I want to argue here however, is that *Occupy*! became an empty signifier: a 'bucket', if you like, of discontent into which thousands of disjointed, dissenting voices were poured. This empty signifier contained discourse ranging from the original Wall Street encampment in New York's Zuccotti Square, USA, to the so called 'Umbrella Revolution' at Occupy Central, in Hong Kong. Most of the demonstrations that happened under the name of *Occupy*!, including some of the 'Movements of the Squares', looked at democratic practice in some way, some wanting more democracy, some wanting different democracy, but all stating[1] one thing in common—anyone was welcome, anyone, whatever their individual and specific political leaning, as long as their unhappiness was aimed at corruption, greed, was essentially anti-capitalist and cried out against the alienation of themselves from their human senses (Anonymous, 2012; Brown, 2012; Byrne, 2012; Chomsky, 2012; Earl, 2018; Federici, & Halven, 2011; Giroux, 2012). Whatever these issues meant for individuals personally, in a specific way, they were welcome in this emergent global community of dissent. The movement gave no blue print for the future, other than a prefigurative bent on how to move forward, there was no specific ideology that needed to be subscribed to, no dogma to divide, apparently. Whether it was entirely successful in upholding its post-ideological stance or not is hotly debated by many, and won't be looked into here as mentioned earlier, but what this ethos did was create an inclusivity that allowed and encouraged the radical imaginings of off shoots from the movement. One of the slogans posted on the wall of the 'Bank of Ideas', a learning space in London was that 'you can't evict an idea' and, I would argue, it seems they were onto something much larger than they had intended with this one notion.

It is this idea of *Occupy*!, not the camps, not the protests, or the corporeal occupations that I want to concentrate on, but the idea that hacked the public imagination, the empty signifier of occupation that resides in the minds and hearts of so many. It is this idea that cannot be evicted, an idea whose time has come, that I wish to take up and run with into the thought experiment that follows. It is this idea, this ethos and this collective memory that creates the powerful 'empty signifier' that this paper wishes to utilise for further thinking about the future.

So, what do I mean by *Occupy*! as an empty signifier? Moreover, what definition of empty signifier am I using to argue the case? The way I see it, there are two routes to take here. One of those routes takes us down a road with Laclau, the empty signifier of governance. He states that in this context 'emptiness … is entirely different from the relative poverty of contents resulting from an operation of abstraction' (Laclau, 2004, p. 280) so what he is referring to as the empty signifier is an emptiness which results from 'irrepresentability and not from abstraction. He goes on to say that this irrepresentability or what he calls 'holes in the symbolic order', a term borrowed from Lacan, acquire a certain form of 'discursive presence through the production of empty signifiers', which he says 'name an absent fullness—in socio-political analysis, the fullness of the community'. Here he gives an example:

> *'[I]n a situation where people experience a feeling of being wronged, 'justice' has no content of its own; it is just the positive reverse of a constitutive lack and, as such, it gives discursive presence [or] it names something which is at the same time absolutely empty and absolutely full.'*

(Laclau, 2004, p. 280).

I like this notion of the absent fullness, it fits with some descriptions of the politics of *Occupy*!, and it fits with the word 'education'. In addition, I argue that this can allow the production of what Haiven and Khasnabish (2014), Shukaitis and Graeber (2007) and others call insurgent knowledge production due to the 'occupation', in terms of the ideas expressed here, being at the same time completely empty as a signifier and absolutely full as a discursive presence, a political moment and a way of thinking about social change.

The other route is a semiotic one, where the linguistics of the signifier are privileged. Semiology concerns itself with the different meanings and 'truths' conveyed by signifiers, signifieds and referents (Rose, 2001). The referent here is the actual encampments, it could be argued, although I think that even that is a spurious argument as many of the global movements did not have encampments, but then the referent is the actions, the meetings and teach outs that happened under the name of *Occupy*!. A signified is the concept which is conjured up by the signifier *Occupy*!—for those who remember the movements around the world, images, sounds, smells and atmospheres from the encampments might be brought to

mind. But here I want to assert that it is not the referent when we talk of the *Occupy*! movement that is important but the signified, or what Laclau might call the discursive space—the signified is particularly important not as an iconic signified—the images seen throughout the world of encampments, the infamous pepper spraying and other recollected scenes, but the symbolic signified, the notion again that you cannot evict an idea.

I have written elsewhere about the notion of Occupation as escape, escape from the enclosure of neoliberalism and the fatalism that it promotes. Occupation as something we can do in all parts of our lives, the occupation of ourselves, of our work as educators, our communities as activists, and our lives as human subjects. I argue here, as I have elsewhere, that this is the power of the *Occupy*! empty signifier. So, I want to look now at the power of this 'empty signifier' of occupation as a galvanising mechanism and explore what this could mean for education.

Therefore, in terms of education, how might we connect the notion of the empty signifier that *Occupy*! remains as in our collective imaginations and in the notion of education? This job has already begun.

Brown (2012, p. 56) argues that 'the target of occupation is no longer just physical spaces or objects, but everything, everywhere—including ourselves to begin with'. Of course, of particular interest here is the burgeoning movement to 'occupy the curriculum' in more formal educational spaces and learning, however, the walls of those spaces under this conception are melted away as Bigelow (2011) reiterates, 'we don't need to take tents and sleeping bags to our town squares to participate ... we can also "occupy" our classrooms, "occupy" the curriculum, and then collect the stories about what we have done', thus expressing the power of that empty signifier, the meaning becomes symbolic from the original movement. Neary and Amsler (2012, p. 114) agree, 'we are particularly interested in the possibility ... of appropriating the social space and time of education in ways to enable us to articulate what, how and why people learn'. This is the basis of occupation in terms of the emptiness left by the spaces, the encampments, once occupied, the empty signifier that is left can be filled this way: with people continuing the occupation of the space and time of the original events. Otherwise, as Shantz (2013, p. 14) says, 'the thrill of immediacy of the street eruptions quickly subsides, leaving little of real gain in its wake'. *Occupy*! may feel like Shantz's description to

many, but therein lies the power of the empty signifier, from a popular, critical pedagogical point of view, the energy that was spent there could be recouped and learnt from. Holloway (2010, p. 30–31) explains the notion of capturing these 'happenings', these street explosions like this:

> *'Often such explosions are seen as failures because they do not lead to permanent change, but this is wrong: they have a validity of their own, independent of the long-term consequences. Like a flash of lightening, they illuminate a different world, … the impression that remains on our brain and in our senses is that of an image of the world we can (and did) create. The world that does not yet exist displays itself as a world that exists not-yet.*

This world that exists not-yet in the case of *Occupy*!'s emptied space of meaning making, is one of relations attended to otherwise, experimental democracy and, of particular interest here, open education (Neary, & Winn, 2012), politically charged education in a place where the agora is reclaimed; reclaimed through filling the empty place of power (Lefort, 1988), using the notion of the empty signifier, with discussion, creativity and liberated desires to commune. These practices, thus far limited, need to be extended if the social world is to escape from enclosure.

This world that exists not-yet, encompassed by the empty signifier *Occupy*! could possibly become the new space of occupation. If this is so then, Merrifield (2011, p. 133) has a point when he asserts that:

> *[W]e need another zone of indistinguishability, another space of slippage, a space in which there's a lot of spontaneous energy as well as a few signs indicating where to go and what time the action begins. We need a new space of slippage in which we can organise and strategize, act without self-consciously performing, encounter others without walls, and hatch en masse a daring Great Escape from capitalism.*

Sounds like a classroom to me[2] … and of course, conferences, reading and discussion groups, journal special issues, and revolutionary conversations between friends.

Under this powerful notion of the empty signifier, it is argued that occupation can be viewed as a less public or explicit transgressive act, as well as an overt, physical act. The sites imagined and invented would

have to transgress to varying degrees, the normative rules in education and instead attempt to occupy the creative imaginations of those who wander/wonder in. Popular education already has this built in to its genetic code. However, as Foust (2010, p. 3) states, 'transgressive actions incite reactions due to their relationship to norms: Transgressions violate unspoken or explicit rules that maintain a particular social order. Yet, as scholars and practitioners have figured it, transgression's threat to social order runs deeper than violating the rules and expectations that govern what is normal'. The occupation of our newly emancipated selves also transgresses those unspoken and explicit rules and indeed, the threat to the normative order of educational practice runs deeper than violating the rules and expectations that govern what is normal. The transgression of individuals reclaiming their occupied selves can have a 'catalytic validity', which can have a 'reality-altering impact of the inquiry process and a gaining of self-understanding and self-direction' (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011, p. 171).

It can be argued that when individuals occupy, their task is then to reclaim. Reclaiming the determination of subjectivity from those constraints takes an alternative way of thinking about social structures, and the organisation of different forms of education itself (Shantz, 2016).

Peters and Freeman-Moir (2006, p. 2) insist that the individual 'political will to imagine much beyond the present seems hardly to exist', and that in the halls of academe 'the idea of utopia or the value of utopian thinking is easily dismissed as idle and silly. ... Nothing like an alternative to global capitalism seems remotely possible'. However, in *Occupy*! individuals attempted to begin the collective task of finding the solidarity required to find the will to escape from their ordinary lives and to find others to work with; and it is argued here that all forms of education should attempt to create a greater awareness of how to dream, how to use utopian thought, to find an alternative; and to create organisational structures that can support the theorising and the building of such alternatives. As Kincheloe *et al.* (2011, p. 169) insist 'a basic dimension of an evolving criticality involves a comfort with the existence of alternative ways of analysing and producing knowledge'. Therefore, it is argued that as yet unseen potential is never any less important than empirical evidence and that this may be the sight of our new occupation, the as yet unseen potential or to borrow a term from Freire, 'untested feasibility' (Freire, 2007; Freire, Escobar, Fernandez, & Guevara-Niebla, 1994).

If the mass schooling, and therefore enclosure and dulling of our creative imaginations, is to be challenged, then the assertion of the right to freely associate, to assemble, to imagine and to produce our own knowledge, seen here as popular education, should be reclaimed and can be done so under the seeming galvanising mechanism of the empty signifier of *Occupy*!. Foust (2010, p. 3) states that 'transgressions that are permitted or escape the notice and discipline of boundary-policing authorities, push the boundaries further', therefore, what is acceptable tomorrow will be *different* to what is acceptable today. I would argue that if newly organised and constituted forms of the occupation of education were able to escape the 'notice of the boundary policing authorities' they could become accepted and normative practices, but only if they are celebrated for their occupation and reclamation of thought, imagination and a popular curriculum.

However, due to the attempted full enclosure of all spheres of social life (Shantz, 2013) and the notion that 'the political will to imagine much beyond the present seems hardly to exist', the first urgent occupation and reclamation can be argued to be that of ourselves. I argue that it is true, as von Kotze (2012, p. 109) says, that 'creative collective experiences can help break through from seeing others as barriers rather than essential allies and make conscious the potential of solidarity in action'. This entails reclaiming sociality: reclaiming what is common to us all, creating, in other words, commons. According to Dyer-Witheford (2010, p. 106), 'the notion of the commons presupposes collectivities—associations and assemblies—within which sharing is organised'. Shantz (2013, p. 19) adds to this 'in commonism we re-appropriate our own productive power, taking it back as our own'. Therefore, an educational philosophy that enhances the occupation and reclamation of sociality seems essential for initiating the process.

Neary and Amsler (2012, p. 132) say that: 'the essential aspect of critical practical reflexivity is that it questions the validity of its own concepts, which it does by recognising itself as inhering in the practical social world emerging out of, and inseparable from, the society it is attempting to understand'. This type of reflexivity should be emergent from the authenticity of the human experience, Freire (1998, p. 31–2) understood that 'when we live our lives with the authenticity demanded by the practice of teaching that is also learning, we are participating in a total experience that is simultaneously directive, political, ideological, gnostic, pedagogical,

aesthetic and ethical'. I argue here that it is this collective experience, through both communing and questioning the validity of our own concepts, which brings us into a state of conscientisation, this is the connection between a prefigurative politics, practiced in the new social movements, and popular education. The prefigurative, and therefore intensely pedagogical, nature of *Occupy*! made this questioning inevitable. According to von Kotze, 'Popular educators and activists in social movements would say radical interventions happen through the concerted, purposive building of critical consciousness, through analysing power relations, through fashioning a constantly vigilant attitude' (2012, p. 104), this is perhaps what we should all concentrate on doing, on occupying the moment where the space for this is opened up. Neary and Amsler (2012, p. 113) report that *Occupy*! 'asserted that because it was primarily an idea or collectivised sense of agency, it could never be "evicted" from social relations', as I have argued earlier, and this is how the notion, the empty signifier of *Occupy*! becomes part of newly emergent and flourishing social relations. This form of fluidic, spatially and temporally contextualised voice of *Occupy*! has the possible potential of creating and organising spaces that are both creative and politically progressive. This is because they do not silence dissent, but relish its ability to add to the constitution of new identities and new forms of relations and organisations that may eventually replace the corrupt and greed ridden institutions that the multitude of heterogeneous voices argue against (Hardt, & Negri, 2004; 2012).

This is where popular education and social movements collide in an explosion of radical imaginings and emergent revolutionary knowledge. A collision of protest and pedagogy, popular education has always been a prefigurative form of communal learning for political purposes and social movements, post-Seattle, have become places to reimagine the future and the social relations that accompany that. But to ensure that these ideas can be mainstreamed without co-option, that the 'empty space of power' in the way Lefort (1988) describes it, is filled with the discursive space, rather than the populist or the despot, we need the occupation of our hearts, our minds and our communities to begin, prefiguratively, gently (maybe), and en masse. Those 'spaces of indistinguishability' Merrifield introduced earlier need to be highly charged political and empty as Laclau (2004) had it.

To conclude, then, we can take up the call to occupy, still, even though the tents have gone, we can occupy our own work as radical and critical

educators, occupying the energy and the space and time left by those street eruptions—and not just *Occupy*!, but also the movement of the squares, the protests in Spain, Greece, Turkey, Hong Kong, and around the world. The new social movements that spread in their various ways such as Black Lives Matter, #MeToo, the School Strikes for the Climate, and others that deal with issues but start, always, to inevitably become more and more anti-capitalist. The notion of occupation now covers everything from occupying the curriculum, the food chain, the imagination, the heart, to the physical occupations of the university buildings, the foreclosed houses, the streets and the squares. It seems, as the ongoing project of occupation moves around the globe, questions will remain for pedagogical initiatives and educators regarding where do we interject, where are our efforts best realised? The conversation will continue in future research as the event is not over, it happened, and it is still ever necessary. The significantly 'empty bucket' of *Occupy*! moves across continents and peoples, linking them together in a plethora of struggles, and more initiatives may be needed to link the learning from one to the other to keep the cycle going. Therefore, from a pedagogical point of view more research is needed throughout the journey we now have to take and are committed to as to how to maintain the explicitly pedagogical aspects of this vessel for discontent in order to understand how people learn to act otherwise in these situations. It was the pedagogical and prefigurative nature of the *Occupy*! London movement and encampment that was so interesting and potentially important, if this nature is lost, one wonders what the 'occupy' vessel might become. I argue that we should indeed be present in our lives, our communities, our classrooms—we should, in fact, be in constant occupation of everything that matters.

Endnotes

[1]This was the stated intension, although often on the ground it didn't feel quite as welcoming as this, but here, the intension is what is important.

[2]Classroom here is used in its loosest sense to mean any space of learning, whether that be a formal classroom, or under a tree on a sunny day, a conversation with intent in a coffee shop, or an internet discussion group, the 'room' doesn't matter as long as the revolutionary intent is present.

References

Alinsky, S. D. (1969). *Reveille For Radicals* (Vintage ed.). New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House Inc.

Anonymous. (2012). Occupy—The End of the Affair. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest, 11*(3–4), 441–445.

Bailey, M., & Freedman, D. (Eds.). (2011). *The Assault on Public Universities: A Manifesto for Resistance*. London, New York: Pluto Press.

Bigelow, B. (2011). Occupy the Curriculum. In *Blog: Rethinking Schools.*

Brown, N. (2012). Occupations: Oakland. *Radical Philosophy,* 53–54.

Byrne, J. (Ed.) (2012). *The Occupy Handbook*. New York, Boston, London: Back Bay Books.

Campbell, E. R. A. (2011). A Critique of the Occupy Movement from a Black Occupier. *The Black Scholar, 41*(4), 42–51.

Chomsky, N. (2012). *Occupy*. London, New York and Worldwide: Penguin Books.

Couldry, N. (2011). Fighting for the University's Life. In M. Bailey & D. Freedman (Eds.), *The Assault on Universities: A Manifesto for Resistance* (pp. 37–46). London: Pluto Press.

Dyer- Witheford, N. (2010). Commonism. In Turbulance Collective (Ed.), *What Would it Mean to Win?* (pp. 105-112). Oakland: PM Press.

Earl, C. (2013). Being Realistic by Demanding the Impossible: Beginning the Bricolage. *Enquire, 8 Special Edition(1)*, 14–36.

Earl, C. (2015). *An Exploration of Popular Education from Occupy! London to the University: Making Hope Possible in the Face of Neoliberal Enclosure?* (PhD). Manchester Metropolitan University,

Earl, C. (2015). Making Hope Possible: An Exploration of Moving Popular Pedagogy Forward in Neoliberal Times from the Streets to the Academy. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 12*(3), 1–43.

Earl, C. (2018). *Spaces of Political Pedagogy: Occupy! and Other Experiments in Radical Adult Education*. London, New York: Routledge.

Earl, C. (in print). *Nurturing the Unruly Subject in Higher Education: Students Learning Dissent*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Federici, S., & Halven, M. (2011). Feminism, Finance and the Future of #Occupy: An Interview with Silvia Federici. Retrieved from http://www. zcommunications.org/feminism-finance-and-the-future-of-occupy-an-interview-with-silvia-federici-by-max-haiven.

Foust, C. (2010). *Transgression as a Mode of Resistance: Rethinking Social Movements in an Era of Corporate Globalisation*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth UK: Lexingon Books.

Freire, P. (2007). *Daring to Dream: Toward a Pedagogy of the Unfinished* (A. K. Oliveira, Trans.). Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Freire, P., Escobar, M., Fernandez, A., & Guevara-Niebla, G. (1994). *Paulo Freire on Higher Education*. Albany: Suny Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Giroux, H. (2012). The Occupy Movement and the Politics of Educated Hope. *Truthout(18 May 2012)*. Retrieved from http://truth-out.org/news/item/9237-the-occupy-movement-and-the-politics-of-educated-hope

Gitlin, T. (2013). Occupy's Predicament: the Moment and the Prospects for the Movement. *The British Journal of Sociology, 64*(1), 3–25.

Graeber, D. (2011, 30 November 2011). Occupy Wall Street's Anarchist Roots. *Aljazeera*. Retrieved from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/11

Haiven, M., & Khasnabish, A. (2014). *The Radical Imagination: Social Movement Research in the Age of Austerity*. London: Zed Books.

Hall, B. (2012). 'A Giant Human Hashtag': Learning and the #Occupy Movement. In B. L. Hall, D. E. Clover, J. Crowther, & E. Scandrett (Eds.), *Learning and Education for a Better World: The Role of Social Movements* (pp. 127–140).

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York and Worldwide: Penguin Books.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2012). *Declaration*. New York: Argo Navis Author Services.

Havt-Rabin, A., & Media Matters. (2016). *Lies, Incorporated: The World of Post-Truth Politics*. New York: Anchor Books.

Hawley, G. (2019). *Making Sense of the Alt-Right*. New York: Columbia University press.

Holloway, J. (2010). *Crack Capitalism*. London, New York: Pluto Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2011). Critical Pedagogy, and Qualitative Research: Moving to the Bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Limcoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Vol. 4, pp. 163–178). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage.

Laclau, E. (2004). Glimpsing the Future. In S. Critchley & O. Marchart (Eds.), *Laclau: A Critical Reader* (pp. 279–328). London, New York: Routledge.

Lefort, C. (1988). *Democracy and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Leslie, L. L., & Slaughter, S. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

MacKenzie, I. (2011, Dec 30 2011). *How the Occupy Movement is Hacking Your Consciousness.* Retrieved from http://matadornetwork.com/bnt/occupy-movement-hacking-consciousness

Mann, S. (2013). Occupy Protester Found Not Guilty of St. Paul's Cathedral Tent Rape. *London 24.* Retrieved from http://www.london24.com/news/crime/occupy_protester_found_not_guilty_of_st_paul_s_cathedral_tent_rape_1_2178167

McGettigan, A. (2013). *The Great University Gamble: Money, Markets and the Future of Higher Education.* London, New York: Pluto Press.

Merrifield, A. (2011). *Magical Marxism: Subversive Politics and the Imagination.* London, New York: Pluto Press.

Molesworth, M., Scullion, R., & Nixon, E. (Eds.). (2011). *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer.* London, New York: Routledge.

Neary, M., & Amsler, S. (2012). Occupy: A New Pedagogy of Space and Time. *Critical Journal of Education Studies, 10*(2), 106–138.

Neary, M., & Winn, J. (2012). Open Education: Commons, Commonism and the New Commonwealth. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization, 12*(4).

Peters, M., & Freeman-Moir, J. (2006). Introducing Edutopias: Concept, Genealogy, Futures. In M. Peters & J. Freeman-Moir (Eds.), *Edutopias: New Utopian Thinking in Education* (pp. 1-20). Rotterdam, Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Rose, G. (2001). *Visual Methodologies.* London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE.

Sandlin, J., Shultz, B., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of Public Pedagogy.* New York, London: Routledge.

Shantz, J. (2013). *Commonist Tenencies: Mutual Aid Beyond Communism.* Brooklyn: Punctum Books.

Shantz, J. (2016). *Constructive Anarchy: Building Infrastructures of Resistance.* London, New York: Routledge.

Shukaitis, S., & Graeber, D. (2007). Moments of Possibility // Genealogies of Resistance: Introduction. In S. Shukaitis, D. Graeber, & E. Biddle (Eds.), *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorization* (pp. 36–38). Oakland, Edinburgh, West Virginia: AK Press.

von Kotze, A. (2012). Composting the Imagination in Popular Education. In B. L. Hall, D. E. Clover, J. Crowther, & E. Scandrett (Eds.), *Learning and Education for a Better World: The Role of Social Movements* (pp. 101-112). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Williams, J. (2013). *Consuming Higher Education: Why Learning Can't Be Bought.* London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury.

Williams, J. (2016). *Academic Freedom in an Age of Conformity: Confronting the Fear of Knowledge*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, J., & Swyngedouw, E. (2015). Seeds of Dystopia: Post-Politics and the Return of the Political. In J. Wilson & E. Swyngedouw (Eds.), *The Post-Political and its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics* (pp. 1–24). Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

About the author

Cassie Earl is a lecturer in Education and Social Justice at Lancaster University, UK. Before coming in to higher education, she had a long career in community education, organising, and activism. She now researches and writes on activism and community education.

Contact details

c.earl@lancaster.ac.uk