Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Utopian Pedagogy: Creating Radical Alternatives in the Neoliberal Age[1]

Mark Coté, Richard Day, and Greig de Peuter

INTRODUCTION

How might we, as critical academics, work within, against, and beyond the neoliberal order? How might the progressive intellectual act and be understood today? How can and does the university do more than serve corporate powers and produce docile producer-consumer-citizens? How are people working to develop critical pedagogies appropriate to their local communities? To help us confront these sorts of questions we propose the conceptual tool and creative practice of ''utopian pedagogy.'' We do not use the concept of ''utopia'' in the sense of rationalistic dreams of a future perfect society. Rather, we mean it to refer to an ethos of experimentation that is oriented toward carving out spaces for resistance and reconstruction here and now. Utopian theory and practice acquire a new relevance as something *other* than and *outside* of the hyper-inclusive logic of neoliberalism. With the untimely concept of utopian pedagogy we hope to contribute to the debate on the current state of higher education, and to circulate struggles that show other educational worlds are not only possible but are already living in our present.[2]

This article seeks to put flesh on our key concept through a discussion of three interlinked themes: universities in the age of neoliberal globalization; non-hegemonic modes of intellectual and political activity; and concrete experiments in utopian pedagogy. From free schools and co-research to open-source media labs and popular theatre, experiments in utopian pedagogy are (re)emerging in various places around the world, in response to an urgent need to critically analyze relations of power around nodal points of race,

317

class, caste, and rational-bureaucratic (state) domination. Formed along lines of affinity, rather than as elements of a totalizing project, the intellectual subjectivities and educational projects that we describe and theorize in the pages that follow affirm a multitudinous capacity for working together against neoliberal hegemony, and for creating working, sustainable—and joyful—alternatives. In order to appreciate the particularity of these experiments, it is first necessary to understand the common context that enables and constrains them—the context of the ongoing, global neoliberal ''revolution.''

NEOLIBERALISM AND UNIVERSITIES

By neoliberalism we mean to refer to a multifaceted political and economic project that includes the globalization of capital[3] as well as the intensification of the societies of control.[4] The neoliberal project also relies upon and perpetuates shifts in the organization of the global system of states, through regional agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, the construction of ''super-states'' such as the European Union, and international military intervention.[5] Within and across these state formations, a politics of representation—a ''multicultural'' politics—allows excluded identities and communities to be ''integrated'' into the global economic and socio-symbolic order.[6] Central to the neoliberal regime is the discourse of the market—privatization, entrepreneurialism, competition, and so on—which is fetishistically worshipped as a populist remedy to the ''inefficiencies'' of an anachronistic welfare state. This is to say that we cannot understand state domination outside of capitalist exploitation, and we cannot understand either of these without reference to the societies of control.

It is important to add that state domination and capitalist exploitation are sustained in neoliberal societies through the division of populations according to multiple lines of inequality based on race, gender, sexuality, ability, age, and region—both inter- and intra-nationally. Thus, the divisions neoliberalism perpetuates and heightens mean that its effects are far from undifferentiated. For example, for the privileged classes of the G8 countries, neoliberalism has meant more service- and knowledge-related jobs, the exportation of highly polluting manufacturing plants, and easy access to a vast array of cheap, low-quality consumer goods.

Although privatization and program-slashing have had terrible effects on the lives of women, working people, and racialized communities in these countries, the carnage has been even greater outside their gates. Through World Bank and IMF restructuring plans, entire nations and continents have had their social, political, and economic structures overturned in preparation for their further integration into the neoliberal order. When we refer to the neoliberal project, then, we are referring to a complex web of practices and institutions that have the effect of perpetuating and multiplying various forms of interlocking oppression.[7] These allow "populations" to be divided and managed, and our daily lives to be more intensely immersed in capitalist exploitation and state-based, rational-bureaucratic control.

This has not gone uncontested, of course, from the stirring mobilizations of the Zapatistas, to protests in Seattle and Genoa, and ongoing community-based struggles in Argentina, Bolivia, Iraq, and Venezuela. Some would say that there is no "common enemy" against which the newest social movements are fighting, while others have argued that they do share a rejection of a multi-faceted, differentially articulated logic of neoliberal domination and exploitation.[8] We identify most strongly with the latter position, in seeing a disparate set of social struggles, each of which needs to be addressed in its particularity, while noting that all of these struggles occur in an increasingly common context of neoliberalism.

How do universities figure into this neoliberal social order? Universities render services that aid in the perpetuation of this order, from the developing of intellectual property to the training of "human capital." Universities are also being internally reorganized to conform to a neoliberal model, which is "driven principally by vocational and economic questions," and in which "every procedure has been managerialized."[9] The increasing tendency to direct research funding to those whose work has clear possibilities for commercial exploitation or will aid in state domination is also indicative of a turn away from critical thought and basic research, which were once considered to be primary tasks of "higher" education institutions. As what Lyotard has called "performativity" becomes the highest value, an environment is fostered that is hardly conducive to critical reflection. Henry Giroux, for example, has written eloquently and persistently about the need to "discard the careerism, professionalism, and isolation" in today's academy.[10] The consequences of the neoliberal model on academic subjectivity can

indeed be profound: Heather Menzies's recent study highlights the pervasiveness of stress and anxiety amongst over-extended, media-saturated academic workers;[11] and cases like that of David Healy in Canada have done much to shed light on the bioethical costs of the corporatization of medical research.[12] To all of this must be added the ''flexibile'' management of academic labour; in the university, as in so many other employment sectors, job security is being replaced by precarity with the increasing use of sessional contracts and limited-term appointments. On the student side, there is increasing concern about the ''manifest subordination of education to the job-market.''[13] Meanwhile, with escalating tuition fees, working-class students, single-parents, and countless others without adequate financial resources face greater and greater obstacles to entering the university system at all. In light of these various neoliberal transformations, state-based higher-education cannot be seen by those of us who are committed to social justice ideals as an oasis in the desert of neoliberalism.

Labels like Academia Inc. are accurate but one-sided. It is important to remember that the university has always contained a constitutive tension between the production of knowledge and skills valuable to power as domination, and the critique of these products. Today it remains a contested space, a site of conflicting possibilities not least because, as Nick Dyer-Witheford reminds us, ''[i]n academia as elsewhere, labor power is never completely controllable.''[14] Dissenting academics demonstrate this daily: by defending critically-oriented academic programs from the ''fiscal *Realpolitik*'';[15] by utilizing the classroom as a laboratory in collaborative critical thinking; by contributing to oppositional groups on and off campus; by developing solidarities with like-minded colleagues, etc. It is important to remind ourselves of the depth of struggle over higher education. Furthermore, rather than being a cause for despair, the current situation of the university should be taken as a reason for modifying our strategies and tactics. In combating the ''culture of compliance'' in the Corporate University, says Ian Angus, ''[t]he first task is . . . to raise the larger questions, to make the issues public and thus to fulfill the social task of the university by bringing critical thinking to the public outside the university.''[16] Can education be saved from neoliberalism? How are we to work positively, within and against the neoliberal revolution? What spaces of possibility are open to us? These are among the questions facing what we call utopian pedagogy. Addressing these

questions more fully requires a genealogical interlude to chart a passage from hegemony to affinity in contestational intellectual engagement and politics.

FROM HEGEMONY TO AFFINITY: INTELLECTUALS AND POLITICS

Gramsci's concept of the "organic intellectual" is a good point of entry to address what we see as a key tension between "hegemonic" and "post-hegemonic" styles of intellectual subjectivity—and the pedagogical strategies and educational projects with which those respective styles tend to be related.[17] Discussion of the Gramscian model's value for intellectual engagement today must heed the historical specificity of his situation: in the 1920s, Gramsci was an executive member of the Italian Communist Party, persuaded by the seeming success of the Soviet model, and was witnessing, first-hand, Italian cities teetering on the brink of proletarian insurrection. The organic intellectuals of the working class were, in Gramsci's schema, drawn from the ranks of workers and/or identified with such class interests; they performed a "mediating function" in class struggle,[18] a crucial element being their pedagogical practices, which sought to deepen class "homogeneity" by raising workers' awareness of their economic function in the capitalist system.[19] The Gramscian organic intellectual is conceptually housed in, and operates out of, the apparatus of a political Party: the Party *is* nothing other than "the organic intellectuals of the proletariat,"[20] an intellectual/educative/institutional composite that assumes the "directive and organising" role in the revolutionary socialist movement.[21] Playing a crucial role in the struggle for hegemony, organic intellectuals are loyal to the class from which they have emerged, and explicit in their efforts to organize, advance, and represent the interests of their class as a whole: "One of the most important characteristics of any group that is developing towards dominance is its struggle to assimilate and to conquer "ideologically" the traditional intellectuals, but this assimilation and conquest is made quicker and more efficacious the more the group in question succeeds in simultaneously elaborating its own organic intellectuals."[22] As for where organic intellectuals might originate, Gramsci proposed the factory council as an educational space that could allow workers to better understand their current socio-economic position and work towards social transformation.

There is much of value in Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual. Not least the stress on the intellectual's responsibility to maintain contact with the dynamics of everyday struggle, organizing in support of the interests of subaltern groups, and the injunction to "active participation in practical life."[23] Most importantly, Gramsci rooted the organic intellectual in an ethico-political commitment of which any utopian pedagogy must be cognizant: "all men (*sic*) are intellectuals."[24] Intellectual capacity is universally distributed, though its modalities differ in kind and intensity. Thus, communities are not seen as composed of passive receptacles into which "expert" knowledge might be poured, but of active living human subjects, possessed of ways of seeing, speaking, listening, thinking, acting, and imagining.

While some elements of Gramsci's conception of the organic intellectual must be preserved, others must just as certainly be abandoned. One of these is the privilege granted to the political Party as a site of mediation, which allows for the channeling of diverse oppositional tendencies into an overarching organizational body. One problem with this model is that it overlooks the potentialities of forms of political organization that move beyond mass-based, parliamentary forms of representation. Most important for our purposes, we note that although the organic intellectual is oriented *against* capitalist hegemony, this figure's ethical commitments, pedagogic methods, and political vision remain governed by a logic that is itself hegemonic; that is, it is a logic that endeavours "to assimilate and to conquer" a "social group," and that seeks "dominance" over an entire social formation.[25] Even in its anti-essentialist forms in various post-Marxist accounts, the concept of hegemony retains a Leninist will to totalizing "irradiation effects."[26] From our perspective, a central task of radical theory and practice today is to explore lines of flight out of this hegemonic compulsion. We must break with the idea that the only way to achieve social change is to totally remake an entire national-social order, as in classical Marxist and anarchist theories of revolution, or to partially remake an entire social order, as in classical and post-Marxist theories of liberal reform.

Elements of a shift away from a hegemonic model of intellectual engagement can be found in Foucault's concept of the "specific intellectual."[27] This new intellectual has "become used to working not in the modality of the "universal," the "just-and-true-for-all," but within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own

conditions of life or work situate them (housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family and sexual relations).''[28] For us, the specific intellectual, as it was theorized, practiced, and problematized by Foucault, operates according to a logic not of hegemony but of *affinity*—a logic made visible in the forms of organization, in the conception of micro-politics, and in the ethico-political commitments with which this figure is aligned. The specific intellectual intervenes in struggles in local and particular situations of power. But although Foucault used the categories of ''specific'' and ''general'' to conceptualize the field in which the intellectual operates, he did not so much privilege one modality over the other as propose that the intellectual must set to work in the middle of them. Rather than a simple inversion of the value of the ''micro'' over the ''macro,'' micro-political engagement ''concerns the relationship of large social groups to what surrounds them, to their own economic set-up, but it also concerns attitudes which run through the individual's life, through family life, through the life of the unconscious, of artistic creation, etc.''[29] Intellectual micro-politics challenge us to maintain constant attention to the ways in which local concerns and subjectivities are articulated with, but also expose possible lines of flight from, hegemonic power-knowledge formations.

Elements of an affinity-based organization of academic engagement are displayed in the Prison Information Group (GIP) that Foucault co-founded in 1971. Involving prisoners, former prisoners, academics, student radicals, and prison psychiatrists, among others, GIP was a ''transversal'' network organized to investigate and publicly expose the conditions of life in French prisons.[30] Most importantly, the illusory stance of ''scholarly objectivity'' was abandoned; instead, struggle was recognized and sides were taken. In many ways paralleling the Italian practices of *conricerca*,[31] GIP used research tools like questionnaires, collected first-hand accounts by prisoners of abusive guards, beatings, revolts, and daily life in general that were then disseminated via pamphlets and press conferences. One of the group's members, Gilles Deleuze, called GIP an ''experiment in thinking''—an apt description of an attempt to invent a bottom-up, collaborative communicative apparatus.[32] GIP's aim was not to win a concession but to make visible the operation of power as domination, in the interest of provoking a public rethinking of the discourse of punishment.

The GIP is relevant to our discussion in its questioning of the role of the intellectual as a representative. Foucault's conception of the intellectual is propelled by a utopian impulse ''to be done with spokespersons.''[33] In a conversation recorded in ''Intellectuals and Power,'' Deleuze lauds Foucault for teaching us about ''the indignity of speaking for others.''[34] Neither relegating the academic-intellectual to insularity nor sanctioning her silence when power operates as domination, acknowledging ''the indignity of speaking for others'' is a result of an ethico-political commitment to strive to facilitate the conditions so that others might speak for themselves. But ''what does it mean to speak for oneself rather than for others?'' As Deleuze suggests in a later interview: ''It's not of course a matter of everyone finding their moment of truth in memoirs or psychoanalysis; it's not just a matter of speaking in the first person.''[35] Instead, the injunction of the indignity of speaking for others gives expression to a *problem*, the resolution of which requires formulating questions. For example: Through what mechanisms do others claim the right to speak on your behalf? Even when one speaks for oneself, how do prevailing concepts function to condition or constrain that which one speaks and sees? Perhaps it was in the light of such questions that Foucault believed ''[y]ears, decades, of work and political imagination will be necessary, work at the grass roots, with the people directly affected, restoring their right to speak.''[36]

Elsewhere, we have proposed the term *academicus affinitatus*, as part of our attempt to unsettle the hermetic scholastic habitus of what Pierre Bourdieu termed *homo academicus*.[37] We conjure this conceptual persona to describe how what we term a political logic of affinity might affect the production of an engaged academic-intellectual subjectivity and also guide the design of education initiatives such that they might be stitched into movements against neoliberal globalization. Whatever strategies we adopt, as dissenting academics it is imperative to continue to defend the university as a site of critical inquiry. But in the light of the real limits on what is politically possible within that institutional space, we believe we must extend ourselves to other communities to explore possible contributions, however modest, to the struggle against the ''dogmatic images of thought'' that prop up power as domination.[38] The affinity-based academic leverages the oppositional potential of her academic capital by forming relays with other like-minded individuals who continue to work, at least partially, inside the

academy. Extending those links to progressive organizations that are rooted and working in specific communities is one possible avenue towards a revitalized radical pedagogy. Operating under the injunction to avoid the indignity of speaking for others, while challenging his or her own structural privilege, the affinity-based academic-intellectual seeks dialogic participation in contexts exceeding the limits of the university classroom. In such practices, academics might enter into the role of ''exchangers,'' within networks of ''mutual exchange and support.''[39] This could entail, for example, the creation of new lines of affinity that bring together critical social scientists and social movements as called for by Bourdieu: ''Our objective is not only to invent responses, but to invent a way of inventing responses, to invent a new form of organization of the work of contestation . . . of the task of activism.''[40] Ultimately, we agree with Gayatri Spivak when she insists that it is ''not a question of speaking for, but of building an infrastructure so that resistance/agency might be recognized . . . not to teach people how to resist . . . .''[41]

The task, then, is one of *inventing*, of *building*. This creative impulse distinguishes *academicus affinitatus* from other modes of academic-intellectual engagement, like, say, the public intellectual, though that figure need not be entirely displaced. For *academicus affinitatus*, the infrastructures described by Bourdieu and Spivak are most valuable when they exceed the name resistance and take on the quality of a prototypical, but necessarily partial, alternative— what might be called non-branded strategies and tactics, such as Food Not Bombs, Reclaim the Streets, and Tent City. In this sense, *academicus affinitatus* perceives academic dissent as a laboratory of experiment in non-capitalist, non-statist futures, and seeks to produce encounters in the name of exploring a potential politics of solidarity across all of the divisions—by race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, age—that are crucial to the continued functioning of the systems of states and corporations. The persona of *academicus affinitatus* is, therefore, a style of working that responds to a *transformative impulse*, that prefers open experimentation to rule-based procedures, chooses the politics of the act over a politics of demand, pursues inventions rather than reforms, respects heteronomous systems of difference rather than universalizing hegemonic formations, and is committed to the task of minimizing the operation of power as domination in every situation. Moreover, *academicus affinitatus* proceeds with the belief that ''the work of deep

transformation can be done in the open and always turbulent atmosphere of a continuous criticism.''[42]

Although the preceding discussion has focused on academic-intellectuals, they are but one protagonist in what we call utopian pedagogy. Once again, we return to Gramsci's dictum that ''We are all intellectuals,'' but now would like to demonstrate how this formulation fruitfully connects to the concept of the ''general intellect,'' as developed by autonomist Marxism.[43] Proposing high-technology capitalism as the ''era of general intellect,'' autonomists see the general intellect manifesting in, and from, the subjectivities of ''immaterial labour'': capacities of language, speech, affect, learning, etc. As Dyer-Witheford states, the general intellect ''appears…throughout a whole network of educational and cultural relations. It is present in industrial and service workers, laboring at the interface with digital technologies, in students keeping pace with technological innovations through ''lifelong learning,'' and in the various technocultural literacies on which new markets for electronic and entertainment goods depend.''[44] In short, immaterial labour is becoming the ether of everyday life, the target of capitalist expropriation, and hence a central site of struggle. One of the challenges facing utopian pedagogy is therefore to reconstruct ''institutions of knowledge, of creation, of care, of invention and of education that are autonomous from capital''—that is, to reconstruct the general intellect from within and against its current confines.[45]

EXPERIMENTS IN UTOPIAN PEDAGOGY

Utopian pedagogy has numerous antecedents, from the liberationist tradition of popular education, which has roots in early twentieth century Latin America,[46] to the history of cultural studies, which is rife with examples of scholars and activists developing relays between critically oriented education, bottom-up pedagogy, and oppositional social movements.[47] Deployed in myriad teaching and learning contexts—from university classrooms to media literacy programs to community-based education to co-research—such radical pedagogy strives to draw out and examine connections between the practices of everyday life and wider structures of domination. Before going on to address some concrete contemporary experiments in what we call utopian pedagogy, we want

to note just two intellectual-political traditions that have been instructive sites of creative resistance in education: anarchism and autonomism.

Since its earliest days, anarchism has seen education as a crucial element of its projects for radical social change. Free schools, reading circles, public lectures, and publishing houses are common examples of anarchist activities that are definitely pedagogical in the liberal-humanist sense, but which also contain a moment that looks beyond education as indoctrination. ''We revolutionary anarchists are proponents of universal popular education,'' declared Mikhail Bakunin, but we are ''enemies of the state'' and all who worship ''the goddess Science.''[48] Like most anarchists after him, Bakunin was convinced that abstract reflection must emerge out of everyday lived experience, and not vice versa. Thus, the sciences should not develop into autonomous spheres, but rather serve the communities in which they are located. Anarchist popular education, then, is education for change, *for* autonomy of individuals and communities, *by* autonomous individuals and communities. This tradition has continued unbroken from Bakunin's time through the Spanish revolution,[49] and a diverse array of projects undertaken all over the world, peaking in the 1960s and again in the 1990s, and now proliferating via the Internet. Any discussion of anarchist education must also include the de- and un-schooling movements, which, while not the sole purview of self-declared anarchists, include many figures who have been prominent in anarchist circles. Ivan Illich is perhaps the best known of these, by way of his book, *Deschooling Society*.[50] Illich argued that traditional schools operated according to a ''hidden curriculum'' which ''unconsciously accepted by the liberal pedagogue, frustrates his conscious liberal aims.''[51] This is because schools in fact alienate us from our learning; they force us down pathways functional to the perpetuation of the existing order rather than allowing the pursuit of avenues which call out to us as particular subjects.

Like anarchism, the tradition of Italian autonomist Marxism is characterized by a rejection of the state form and by a commitment to furthering self-valorizing practices of autonomous labour and community.[52] It rejects the Leninist model of the Party as a site of centralized leadership, instead developing ''from below'' through the self-organizing capacity of labour in de-centralized, non-hierarchical structures. From the earliest days of *operaismo*, the labour-focused political movement that preceded *autonomia*, the

methods of inquiry followed the spirit of what Marx called ''workers inquiry.''[53] In practice, they were inspired by workers who resisted the union bosses and union hierarchy as much as they did the factory owners. Thus there was close collaboration with workers, as activist-intellectuals bypassed institutional union structures and entered the mammoth factories of Northern Italy to gather workers' narratives, in order to better understand the changing composition of production and its concomitant political dynamics. This methodological innovation, known as *conricerca*, or co-research, is in application around the globe: for example, Colectivo Situaciones, an autonomist collective in Argentina, use a variation of the *conricera* method in the current crisis through their collaborative work with the Movement of Unemployed Workers.[54]

These two streams of theory and practice provide some guidance as to what we mean by utopian pedagogy. But it is crucial to clearly distinguish our use of the concept of utopia from the tradition of perfectly planned and highly rationalized communities inaugurated by Plato,[55] carried on in the work of More and Fourier,[56] and finding its way into the twentieth century via writers such as Huxley[57] and Skinner.[58] We are working within this tradition, to be sure, but in a creative, deconstructive fashion. Our concern is to ask how the concept of utopia can be revalued, in response to its many critics on the Left, to the inevitablism of the Right, and to the poststructuralist critique of the fantasy of the ''transparent society'' that has transcended all relations of power. To do this, we look to utopia not as a place we might reach but as an ongoing process of becoming. The concept of utopia that runs through our work involves both a critical attitude toward the present *and* a political commitment to experiment with the coordinates of the future. As is becoming increasingly clear, ''the enemies within'' a social order of infinite war and imminent threat—critical thinkers, educators, activists, builders—all share the common trait of proposing something *other* than a new Anglo-American world order, a beyond that exceeds not only this particular configuration, but also all possible particular configurations. The utopian impulse in which we are interested does not lead to a promised land; it knows that domination and exploitation can only be minimized, never eliminated—that struggle will persist—and that something like a state, like a corporation, like asymmetrical power relations in any form, will forever be trying to emerge from within and without our communities and will therefore need to be warded off. It orients

to the radical outside to such an extent that no blueprint could ever survive the passage from conception to implementation without becoming something entirely other than what it was. Thus, it might be said that utopian experiments today share a point of *departure* much more than a point of arrival. As Hardt and Negri have so eloquently argued, utopia is not transcendent, but immanent, based on

the celebration of the possible, or rather of specific, existing possibilities, a celebration that depends equally on the intellect and the will. Our hope dictates that we recognize and act on a tendency actually existing in present reality that can lead toward a potential future. This hope is not utopian, if by utopian we understand the dream of a future that is separated from the present. Hope is better conceived as a temporal vector that points from the present into the future from a specific location, with a determinate direction and force.[59]

The concrete experiments in utopian pedagogy that we briefly discuss in what follows all involve the ignition of a utopian imagination in precisely this sense. All of these projects were formed in response to an urgent need to critically analyze and potentially change—relations of power around nodal points of race, class, caste, and state domination. They are, therefore, necessarily partial in their scope, and necessarily, to some extent, *inside* the field of constituted power; indeed, they are often components of larger struggles transversally linked on a global scale. Despite the variations documented here, we would argue that these projects are indicative of a common desire to produce circumstances, spaces, and subjectivities that, within and against the present, strive toward anti-authoritarian, autonomous, and radically democratic modes of organizing intellectuality and learning.

As discussed above, we are convinced that one of the tasks of the affinity-based academic is to participate in the creation of autonomous spaces of radical teaching and learning that stand apart from, but relay with, pockets of dissent in the university. One example of this kind of activity is the creation, in 2003, of an undergraduate degree program called Media and the Public Interest by the Faculty of Information and Media Studies at the University of Western Ontario: ''This is aimed specifically at students who want to do media-related work with social movements, NGOs, and the public sector generally. It includes special courses on alternative media and on communication practices in social movements. It also includes an 'internship' program whereby students receive credit

for paid or unpaid work on media issues with social movements.''[60] This program is interesting not only in the links it explicitly sets out to make, but in the way in which it managed to find its way into the curriculum of an otherwise very conservative university. Nick Dyer-Witheford, who teaches in the program, has suggested that the initiative was, rather ironically, shielded by some of the more ''corporate'' connections the Faculty of Information and Media Studies had previously made. He comments,

Since we already offered academic credit for media-related corporate work, why not for volunteer activities in, say, a network of Independent Media Centres? University-business linkages have been rationalized under the name of breaking down the 'ivory tower' and connecting academia to the 'community.' Once such an ideological motif has been launched, however, it is very hard to reject arguments for connections that go beyond the business community.[61]

Neoliberal ''rhetoric can thus be played back against itself,'' to create sites of resistance and alternative community connections with the academy.

Although digitally mediated utopian pedagogies can be criticized for their dependence upon technologies that are relatively inaccessible outside of the fortress of the global North, there are many such projects emerging in the South. Cybermohalla, for example, is an experiment in ''self-regulated media labs in working class settlements'' being carried out in Delhi, India.[62] A project of Sarai, Cybermohalla operates labs that provide young people with access to computer technology based on free and open-source software. But its pedagogy is not limited to digital media; it spans multiple modes of communication, including conversation, diary, video production, and wall magazines. Aware of the dual edge of the high-tech sword, organizers and participants raise questions about how the local neighbourhood is tied up with a global ''knowledge economy,'' and seek to discover how, through practical experience in multimedia production, it is possible to develop a ''transformative relationship with technology.'' Shveta Sarda describes the Cybermohalla project as ''a desire for a wide and horizontal network (both real and virtual) of voices, sounds and images in dialogue and debate.'' For her, Cybermohalla pivots on what one participant calls ''speech without fear''—a necessary component of any experiment in utopian pedagogy. ''Critical to the engagement is an acute consciousness of and constant reflection on the

relations between friendship and knowledge, knowledge and conditionalities of speech, knowledge and silences, knowledge and sharing. It is from these that an ethics of the interaction in each . . . encounter evolve.''[63]

Our next example of utopian pedagogy is different in almost every way from the previous two, which are relatively institutionalized, except in that a logic of non-hegemonic creation of alternatives through education can still be clearly discerned. The *Movimento de Trabajadores Desocupados*, or *Piqueteros*, as they are commonly known, are un- and under-employed Argentinians who have taken to direct-action as their jobs have disappeared as a result of aggressive neoliberal ''restructuring'' and the flight of foreign capital. They are most famous for their highway blockades, but they are also involved in many different projects to meet local needs, including bakeries, organic gardens, clinics, and water purification. Their watchword is ''horizontalism,'' which means working without hierarchy and with a constant requirement for self-analysis and self-criticism.[64] They use consensus forms of decision-making, and avoid at all costs any kind of ''help'' from states, corporations, or NGOs. Although the *piqueteros* do have some connections with academic-intellectuals, such as Colectivo Situaciones, who we mentioned earlier, they are adamant in seeing their theory as not only emerging out of, but *embedded in*, their daily practice. They insist that the education is as much in the organizing, in the collective kitchen or the occupied factory, as it is in the book or the workshop. With this example we see that utopian pedagogy is not only something to read or write about, it is necessarily something to *live*, to struggle for, whatever one's position might be within the global system of states.

Our final example is Critical U, a project in which we, as part of a wider affinity group, have participated.[65] Operating out of Vancouver, British Columbia since 2000, Critical U is a community-based ''free'' school, in that it operates autonomously from the state education system and does not charge tuition fees. This intermittent project is a modest experiment in building a dialogic learning space, explicitly in struggle against neoliberal hegemony. Critical U offers multi-week courses on topics from globalization to community gardening to media literacy. The project strives to make connections between dissenting academics and students based at the local Simon Fraser University, critical theoretical concepts and research, and social issues and struggles that members of the

neighbourhood define as most relevant to their lives. In recent years, initiatives like this have been proliferating, a few recent examples being the University of Openess in London, Copenhagen Free University, and Anarchist Free University in Toronto. Community education, while no panacea, is one space of possibility where oppositional academics might work—within and against both the neoliberal model of education and the socio-symbolic order of Empire—''to create an autonomous space where a certain kind of discourse can be broached.''[66] As one such space, Critical U demonstrates the possibility of a small-scale, non-state, non-profit, community education sector, and shows that the logic of affinity can guide the concrete design of utopian pedagogies.

CONCLUSION

We have offered this contribution in the name of identifying and circulating a radical utopian impulse that proceeds from the assumption—shared by many anarchist, antiracist, autonomist, feminist, indigenous, and queer activists—that the crucial task of our times is not only to analyze and oppose existing forms of oppression and inequality, but to discover within our various communities the powers that will allow us to create viable alternatives to them. If the purpose of ''lifelong learning'' is to produce socialized subjects for the perpetuation of the neoliberal order, the goal of an oppositional, utopian pedagogy must be to foster experiments in thinking and acting that lead us *away* from that order. Thus, utopian pedagogies emerge out of—and point towards—what Giorgio Agamben has called ''the coming communities.''[67] These can be defined positively as crucibles of human sociability, potentiality, and creativity out of which the radically new emerges: possibilities such as singularity against integration; affinity without identity; justice without homogenization; sociability without the state; production without the corporation . . . . It is precisely what we do not know about how our communities live, learn, collaborate, love, and imagine that *demands* open-ended, risky experiments in new ways of life.

It is these practices which seek to propagate an awareness of the existence and possibilities of the radical outside that we see as oriented to a utopian pedagogy, a pedagogy that is itself, of course, contested and without guarantees. Creating alternative spaces of

education and co-operation inevitably involves dealing with the same structured behaviours that are in evidence everywhere else. It is a terrible error, and a failure of solidarity, to assume that racism, sexism, and homophobia will somehow magically disappear from alternative spaces simply because they are ''alternative.''[68] Indeed, the struggle against domination in *all* of its myriad forms must be relentless and central to any utopian pedagogy worthy of the name.

NOTES

1. Portions of this article appear in a forthcoming collection of essays and interviews that we co-edited, *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
2. For critiques of the neoliberal transformation of higher education, see Henry A. Giroux, ''Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere,'' *Harvard Educational Review*, 72:4 (Winter 2002): 425–462; Jeff Lustig, ''The University Revisioned: The Alternative to Corporate Mis-Education,'' *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 27 (2005): 17–52; David Noble, *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002); Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); James L. Turk, ed., *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities* (Toronto: Lorimer and Company, 2000). And for discussions of new social movements, see Ian Angus, *Emergent Publics: An Essay on Social Movements and Democracy* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2001); Susan George, *Another World is Possible If . . .* (London: Verso, 2004); *We are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anticapitalism*, Notes from Nowhere, ed., (London: Verso, 2003); Benjamin Shepard and Ronald Hayduk, eds., *From ACT UP to WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization* (London: Verso, 2002).
3. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 2000); Saskia Sassen, *Globalization and its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money* (New York: The New Press, 1998); Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2004).
4. Gilles Deleuze, ''Postscript on the Societies of Control,'' *October* 59 (1992): 3–7.
5. See Vincent Mosco and Dan Schiller, eds., *Continental Order? Integrating North America for Cybercapitalism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001); Chris Shore, ''Inventing the 'People's Europe': Critical Approaches to European Community 'Cultural Policy,'' *Man* 28:4 (1998): 779–800.
6. Slavoj Zizek, ''Multiculturalism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism,'' *New Left Review* 225 (1997): 28–51.
7. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990); Maxine Baca Zinn and Bonnie Thornton Dill, ''Theorizing Difference from Multicultural Feminism,'' in *Through*

the Prism of Difference: Readings on Sex and Gender, Zinn et. al. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997).

8. See Richard J. F. Day, ''From Hegemony to Affinity: The Political Logic of the Newest Social Movements,'' Cultural Studies 18:5 (2004): 716–748.

9. Stuart Hall, ''The University, Intellectuals, and Multitudes,'' interview by Greig de Peuter, Utopian Pedagogy.

10. Henry A. Giroux, ''Utopian Thinking in Dangerous Times: Critical Pedagogy and the Project of Educated Hope,'' in Utopian Pedagogy.

11. Heather Menzies, No Time: Stress and the Crisis of Modern Life (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2005).

12. In 2000, Healy was recruited to a post in the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health at the University of Toronto. Following an invited talk at the University's Department of Psychiatry anniversary meeting, at which Healy voiced his criticisms of the pharmaceutical industry, the offer of a post was rescinded.

13. Nick Dyer-Witheford, ''Teaching and Tear Gas: The University in the Era of General Intellect,'' in Utopian Pedagogy.

14. Nick Dyer-Witheford, Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 236.

15. Ian Angus, ''Academic Freedom in the Corporate University,'' in Utopian Pedagogy.

16. Ibid.

17. Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 5–23.

18. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, introduction to Antonio Gramsci, ''The Intellectuals,'' in Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 3.

19. Gramsci, 5.

20. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, general introduction, to Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), xci.

21. Gramsci, 16.

22. Ibid., 10.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., 9.

25. Ibid., 10.

26. For the most influential post-Marxist re-reading of Gramsci's theory of hegemony, see Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy (London: Verso, 1985). For a critique of the theory of hegemony from the viewpoint of the logic of affinity, see Richard J. F. Day, ''Ethics, Affinity, and the Coming Communities,'' Philosophy and Social Criticism 27:1 (2001): 21–38.

27. Michel Foucault, Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984 (New York: The New Press, 2002), 126–133.

28. Ibid., 126.

29. Félix Guattari, Soft Subversions (New York: Semiotext(e), 1996), 87.

30. Gilles Deleuze, Negotiations, 1972–1990 (New York: Columbia, 1995), 87–88.

31. See Guido Borio, Francesca Pozzi, and Gigi Roggero, ''Conricerca as Political Action,'' trans. Enda Brophy, in Utopian Pedagogy.

32. Cited in James Miller, The Passion of Michel Foucault (London: Flamingo, 1994), 193.

33. Foucault, 2002, 289.

34. Cited in Deleuze and Foucault, 76.
35. Deleuze, 1995, 88.
36. Foucault, 2002, 288.
37. Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988). See Mark Coté, Richard Day, and Greig de Peuter, ''*Academicus Affinitatus*: Academic Dissent, Community Education, and Critical U,'' in *Utopian Pedagogy*.
38. Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (London: Athlone Press, 1994).
39. Foucault, 2002, 127.
40. Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market* (New York: New Press, 2001), 58.
41. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, in discussion at ''Subalternity and Marxism'' panel at *Marxism and the World Stage* conference, 7 November 2003, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA, 6–8 November.
42. Foucault, 2002, 457.
43. See Dyer-Witheford, 1999; Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life* (New York: Semiotext(e), 2004).
44. Dyer-Witheford, 1999, 222.
45. Franco (Bifo) Berardi, ''Book Review of Geert Lovink's *Dark Fibre*,'' trans. Arianna Bove (2002). Retrieved from http://www.generation-online.org/t/bifosreview.htm, accessed 25 August 2003.
46. See Liam Kane, *Popular Education and Social Change in Latin America* (London: Latin America Bureau, 2001).
47. For historical accounts of cultural studies and its links to non-traditional education, see Dennis Dworkin, *Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left, and the Origins of Cultural Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Stuart Hall, ''Life and Times of the First New Left,'' in *Out of Apathy: Voices of the New Left 30 Years On*, ed. Oxford Socialist Discussion Group (London: Verso, 1989); Tom Steele, *The Emergence of Cultural Studies: Adult Education, Cultural Politics, and the 'English' Question* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1997); Raymond Williams, ''The Future of Cultural Studies,'' in *The Politics of Modernism* (London: Verso, 1989); Stephen Woodhams, *History in the Making: Raymond Williams, Edward Thompson and Radical Intellectuals, 1936–1956* (London: Merlin Press, 2001); Handel Wright and Karl Maton, ''Cultural Studies and Education: From Birmingham Origin to Glocal Presence,'' *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 26:2–3 (2004): 73–89.
48. Mikhail Bakunin, *Statism and Anarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 135.
49. Murray Bookchin, *The Spanish Anarchists* (San Francisco: AK Press, 1998), 48–50.
50. Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971).
51. Ivan Illich, ''After Deschooling, What?'' in *After Deschooling, What?* eds. Alan Gartner et. al. (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 9.
52. For intellectual and historical surveys of autonomist marxism, see Harry Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically* (Leeds: Anti/Theses, 2000), 23–80; Dyer-Witheford, 1999, 62–90; Sylvere Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, ed., *Italy: Post-Political Politics* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1980); Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt, *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Steve Wright, *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* (London: Pluto, 2002).
53. Wright, 32–62.

54. See Colectivo Situaciones, ''On the Researcher-Militant,'' trans. Sebastian Touza, in *Utopian Pedagogy*.

55. Plato, *The Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).

56. Charles Fourier, *Design for Utopia: Selected Writings of Charles Fourier* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971).

57. Aldous Huxley, *Island, a Novel* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962).

58. B. F. Skinner, *Walden Two* (New York: Macmillan, 1948).

59. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in Hardt and Negri and Nicholas Brown and Imre Szeman, ''Subterranean Passages of Thought: *Empire*'s Inserts,'' *Cultural Studies* 16:2 (2002): 201.

60. Nick Dyer-Witheford, ''Teaching and Tear Gas: The University in the Era of General Intellect,'' in *Utopian Pedagogy*.

61. Ibid.

62. Shveta Sarda, '''Before Coming Here, Had You Thought of a Place Like This?' Notes on Ambivalent Pedagogy from the Cybermohalla Experience,'' in *Utopian Pedagogy*.

63. Ibid.

64. See Marina Sitrin, ''Horizontalidad in Argentina.'' Retrieved from http://info. interactivist.net/print.pl?sid=05/07/26/1417232. Accessed 26 July 2005.

65. Coté et al.

66. Maurizio Viano and Vincenzo Binetti, ''What is to be Done? Marxism and Academia,'' in *Marxism Beyond Marxism*, eds. Saree Makdisi, Cesare Casarino, and Rebecca E. Karl (New York: Routledge, 1996), 250.

67. Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community*, trans. Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

68. See Sarita Srivastava, '''Let's Talk': The Pedagogy and Politics of Anti-Racist Change,'' in *Utopian Pedagogy*.