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How To Use this Book

This book was compiled during the doctoral research period. It is the fourth and last book in the series. It should be read alongside Act 1: The Measure, Act 2: A Common World of Knowledge Production and Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room that inform the doctoral research project The Politics of Knowledge that Leads Elsewhere.

Using different entry points, each book examines the knowledge economy as understood under the hypothesis of cognitive capitalism and its impact on contemporary art practice, taking account of its conditions of production and struggle within the
local site of official art education at an elite university.

The Index is not an academic dictionary. It is not written under the dominant regime of the university. It is a lexicon that sets out to thwart the regime by the insertion of personal philosophy and at times cheering negativity, sometimes leaving thoughts and quotations stranded on the page. I call on the reader to think about the validity of their own thinking, to move along with me or against me. As a companion book, compiled from a mass of notes, variants of texts, lost thoughts and duplicates, as a practical guide to understanding and appreciation of the main ideas and concepts that subtend this practice-led artistic research as
dramatised in Acts 1, 2 & 3 of *The Politics of Knowledge that Leads Elsewhere*.

Thinking through the speculative poetics of collaborative writing and authorship, glossary entries are written from various entry points, situating myself biographically within the ideas and concepts, as well as through the writings of others whose work I have at times decided to not overwrite, but to leave as is, untouched.

A thought to hold – in the words of Ambrose Bierce, author of the satirical *The Devil’s Dictionary* (1911), a book that inspired the creation of this work:

“Dictionary, n. A malevolent literary device for cramping the growth of a language and making it
hard and inelastic. This dictionary, however, is a most useful work”.

-The A-Z Glossary describes how I read the terms I have used in Acts 1-3. All textual corrections made to this book after the doctoral viva are made visible to the reader. These appear in black boxes and written in white font.

-Following the A-Z Glossary are the notes that correlate with Act 2 and Act 3. As a live transcription of the event, Act 1 was not overwritten and therefore it does not appear with notes.
The Index is alphabetically arranged, listing page numbers in which the item can be found.

The Guide to Further Reading is divided into topic categories.
AFFECT:

In *Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room*, I turn to the notion of ‘affect’. This informs the performative dimension of the ten Instructions to the Trespasser. Emma Dowling writes: “To ‘affect’ or to be ‘affected’ is about the increase or diminution of bodily propensity; it is about the increase or diminution of power as it takes place in action in relation to the world around us.” (Emma Dowling in *Cognitive Capitalism*, 205) This attention to affect occurs in the performative before we cognitise it, here in words, the space between action and language. The affective register eludes cognition. Only in the performative engagement with affect, its pure capacity can there be affective resonance, this is cognition, to affect and be affected. We are
affected through the other, through our social relations.

In *Affect Revisited* (2009), Peter Redman describes affect as a “subjectively registered embodied experience” and emotion as a “cultural or discursive articulation of bodily response.” (Peter Redman, *Affect Revisited*, 53) They are both social. But there is subtle difference in that affect is not ownable. The moment I express my emotions they are personalised, whereas affect is pre-cognitive, it exists before its interpretation. It is in movement, embodied between desires and drives which affect produces. In *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (2002), Brian Massumi writes that affect “circulates in the collective actual and virtual relationalities in which we exist. To be attracted,
repelled, to be excited or depressed, to be swept up in something, to be compelled to take a particular action or not, to sense moods and levels of energy, are affective processes.” (Massumi: 2002, 16)

Affect precludes its own analysis “given that analysis require a conscious process of sense-making, of evaluation, and is communicated through language.” (Emma Dowling, *Cognitive Capitalism*, 205) The affective register eludes cognition. Only in the performative engagement with affect, its pure capacity can there be affective resonance (cognition), to affect and be affected.

We are affected through the other. The discursive interpretive is suboptimal. The moments of affective co-production we inhabit, that we labour in, can be ‘discerned’ through cognition, affective cognition. Emma Dowling refers to this as the
“will to knowledge” that is in “itself an affective drive.” Affect and cognition are in a dialectical movement of consciousness. This process of movement between test subjects is an “embodied form of knowing” where experience, subjectivity and (critical) analysis are constituted. (Ibid, 206)

AGENCY:

My agency correlates directly with the performative mode of taking action, of actions done to us and in relation to ourselves that spur on our agency. Hannah Arendt describes the human condition in terms of relationality that is useful here. This concept helps develop the conceptual argument around the condition of possibility for the performative interventions of the research project.
Arendt writes: “Because the actor always moves among and in relation to other acting beings, he is never merely a ‘doer’ but always and at the same time a sufferer. To do and to suffer are like opposite sides of the same coin, and the story that an act starts is composed of its consequent deeds and sufferings. These consequences are boundless, because action though it may proceed from nowhere, so to speak, acts in a medium where every reaction becomes a chain reaction and where every process is the cause of new processes. Since action acts upon beings who are capable of their own actions, reaction, apart from being a response, is always a new action that strikes out on its own
and affects others. Thus action and reaction among men never move in a closed circle and can never be reliably confined to two partners. This narrower sense of the word, as though the boundlessness of human interrelatedness were only the result of the boundless multitude of people involved, which could be escaped by resigning oneself to action within a limited, graspable framework of circumstances; the smallest act in the most limited circumstances bears the seed of the same boundlessness, because one deed, and sometimes one word, suffices to change every constellation… Action, moreover, no matter what its specific content, always establishes relationships and therefore has an inherent tendency to force open all limitations and cut across all boundaries.”
(Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, (The University of Chicago Press, 1958), 190)

AGONISM:

Chantal Mouffe developed a radical and plural political philosophy of agonistics where she posits antagonism as an ever-present possibility in the articulation of the common. In her introduction to *Agonistic: Thinking the World Politically* (Verso Books, 2013), she writes: “In the field of politics, this means that the search for a consensus without exclusion and the hope for a perfectly reconciled and harmonious society have to be abandoned.” Mouffe’s theory of agonistic pluralism regards opponents not as enemies, but as adversaries and within this democratic model she writes there exists between people ‘conflictual consensus’
informed by ‘the political’ (where ‘the political’ is necessary; for Mouffe it is the ontological dimension of antagonism, and politics she regards as the ensemble of discourses, practices and institutions who organise and order human societies in conditions that are always possibly conflictual, see Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of the Political*, Verso, London New York, 1993).

I’ve appropriated Mouffe’s agonistic conception to theorise my interventions, using ideas from this model where I adopt a ‘war of positions’ (to use Gramsci’s argument) as a mode of counter hegemonic struggle. (See a reformulation of this concept in the Manifesto “I Too Have Decided To Keep Silent” in *Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room*.)
Though there are some pitfalls to the agonistic debate when it is presented on a level playing field for the sake of itself and abstracted from any political, social or class master signifiers, I side with Mouffe in her critical stance with regards to ‘exodus’ as proposed by the Italian Operaista (workerist) theorists Michel Hardt, Antoni Negri, Mario Tronti and Paolo Virno. She asserts ‘engagement with’ rather than ‘desertion’ alone. (Mouffe 2013: xvi).

She refutes the pessimistic diagnosis that in the total commodification of culture where every subversive gesture is swiftly recuperated and neutralised by capitalism, and where artists are no longer able to provide subversive countenance or play a critical role in radically transforming the
present order (for arguments supporting the notion that there is no longer an outside to capitalist hegemony, see Chiapello and Boltanski, *New Spirit of Capitalism*, Verso Books, 2007). Rather, Mouffe proposes the fostering of agonistic debate in public spaces and within our institutions through artistic interventions. Mouffe argues that the denial of “the political in its antagonistic dimension” is “what prevents liberal theory from envisaging politics in an adequate way. The political in its antagonistic dimension cannot be made to disappear by simply denying it or wishing it away!” (Mouffe: 2013, 4).

Mouffe’s argument could not be more poignant as we find ourselves unable to grasp the full extent of the new antagonisms and the utter defeat of the Left after selling itself out to centre politics. Liberal thought’s universalism adheres to individuals
reducing them to homogeneity and refutes or is unable to understand the difference of collective identities, their singularity and partiality as a multitude.

Mouffe analyses ‘the political’ in consideration of collective forms and the formation of ‘us’ that requires as the very condition of its constitution, an exteriority, opposed to ‘them’. This demarcation is not always antagonistic, it happens only when the others, who are considered different put into question or threaten the existence of the other. As we know from Carl Schmitt, when this us/them is constituted through ethnic, religious or economic relations, it can become the primary locus of antagonism (Mouffe: 2013:6) - as we see today through the profound effects of globalisation and
migration. Passions are trivialised under liberalism
(Mouffe’s argument appeals on a deeply personal
level, having bore witness to the full spectrum of
the antagonism she addresses, growing up in a
partisan and sectarianism society, imparted at every
level of life as a Catholic in Northern Ireland
during the bloody troubles, passions however
muted they may seem today, could overspill at any
moment as the fine threads of the Belfast
Agreement hold the peace process together.)

Mouffe’s agonistic model allows for the
irrationality of passion. She defines it as the
struggle not between enemies, but the common
allegiance of adversaries in their difference. An
aversion towards conflict and the continued
emphasis on consensus leads to political apathy
and disaffection of political participation. Unlike Hannah Arendt who seeks a mode of agonism through consensus, Mouffe argues instead for an agonistic politics that allows the confrontation to take place, but insists that it is structured by democratic procedures accepted by the adversaries. Part of my own process when researching and thinking through how to conceptualise the idea of what is ‘common’ to us (students and tutors alike) as we partake in academia was the consideration of Mouffe’s line of thought: “Every form of collective identity entails drawing a frontier, between those who belong to the ‘we’ and those who are outside it” (2013: 45). Using two types of proposal, I was able to make productive my own disaffection and contradictoriness of an ambivalent pedagogy as I encountered it at an elite brand of educational
institution; firstly through a ‘withdrawal from’ and then an ‘engagement with’ the School, intervening through performative negation and then re-articulation in these four books that comprise the research project *The Politics of Knowledge That Leads Elsewhere*. Mouffe calls this “a double moment of disarticulation and then re-articulation” (2013: 74).

Mouffe’s argument asserts the moment of re-articulation that desertion theorists have missed. The disaffection and antagonism must be relayed back to the institution in order for it (i.e. artistic practices in counter-hegemonic struggle) to change anything. Desertion alone will not change the rules of the game or transform a given situation into a new configuration. While I had from the outset sought to dismantle the textual documentation of this practice (to somehow negate the evidencing
and cognitive measure), it became necessary over the time of this research project to ensure the project is fully articulated and not foreclosed by its invisibility. The arguments presented here assure and expand the concerns around education in order to find a path towards a fully emancipatory art education inside the official educational institution.

Mouffe asserts too that agonistic approach is fraught with difficulties, that there are “consequences for artistic and cultural practices because those who foster the creation of agonistic public space will conceive critical art in a way very different from those whose aim is the creation of consensus” (2013:92). This is a poignant statement as it has been my experience throughout this
doctoral research project having jumped
Kafkesque administrative hurdles that were put in my way by the School, not as it should do by way of fostering the artistic activism of the project, but rather to disarm it and thereby attempt to stop it from challenging the existing consensus.
Fortunately there are some cracks in the system. These cracks need to be fostered.

To close, I draw on Mouffe’s final argument against desertion theory and the notion that institutions can’t be transformed, therefore a total break with the institution is required. This argument she writes sustains the view that art can no longer play a critical role or escape recuperation, instead she argues that the role of the artist is to become part of a ‘common will’,
constructing new practices that engage in ‘a war of position’ that can subvert the existing configuration of power: “To believe existing institutions cannot become the terrain of contestation is to ignore the tension that always exists within a given configuration of forces and the possibility of acting in a way that subverts their form of articulation.” (2013:100)

Holding onto this thought, why revisit the educational turn in art if, as I’ve claimed at the outset of this project, it has already ended, and what can be retained from the intuition of this turning in order to move beyond it (so not only turning around it, but able to see past it), and can we embed within official art educational institutions a real transformative educational praxis
where different forms of producing and sharing are actualised?

By way of conclusion, I can sketch four crucial reasons, (1) the role of the primary market and the second economy that underwrites art practice must be illuminated through pedagogic processes and the art school’s responsibility to engage with capital and critique of the value form (the artWORK), (2) an assertion of arts autonomy and a defense of avant-garde praxis through its education programmes, (3) Aestheticised withdrawal and antagonistic tendency to take risks and to struggle within and against ambivalent pedagogies (4) a model of antagonism that moves towards an agonistic engagement allowing for a form of life in common. The extra-institutional context of self-
organising the educational praxis on the outside will not change anything, while it justifies the precarity and marginality of the second economy artist, serving the art industry and its primary market commercial ends. What is required is ‘educational turning’, the act of actualisation inside the official art educational institution, where educators and students together struggle within and against, to create a strategy of engagement with the official institutions of knowledge rather than abandoning them entirely. This is how the art school can become unconditionally political: withdrawing, not so much from but into…

ALTERITY:
Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak’s theory of alterity was introduced in a symposium on ‘Remaking History’. It is the imperative for one to uncover the histories and inherent historical behaviours in order to exercise an individual right to authentic experience, identity and reality. Within the concept of the socially constructed histories one “must take into account the dangerous fragility and tenacity of these concept-metaphors” (Spivak, G “Who Claims Alterity” Wikipedia.org/wiki/Alterity, accessed 30 March 2014).

ANTAGONISM:

Throughout this project I have identified with the dimension of disagreement, an antagonistic point of view that allows the existence of pluralism, for the equal recognition of different points of view.
within the established order. Chantal Mouffe writes that a disassociate view associates with “the dimension of conflict, the dimension of antagonism and hostility that exists in human societies.” (Markus Miessen, *The Space of Agonsim: Markus Miessen in Conversation with Chantal Mouffe*, 2012, 28).

If we accept the existence of pluralism where there are multiple viewpoints rather than everyone acting in concert as in the associative view (see also consensus), we therefore have to accept antagonism, which Mouffe describes as “a specific form of conflict, as it cannot be resolved rationally, the two positions are irreconcilable.” (Miessen 2012: 19)
ART:

The term Art is to be read alongside the terms Art thinking & artWORK. The first entry in my thesis - that I haven’t included in the research submission - is a citation by John Roberts from Revolutionary Time and the Avant-Garde (2015: 35):

“…for in its heteronomous encounter with capital, art must offer a place, a memory, a set of relations, modes of cognition and learning and mapping, that provides a different space of encounter between praxis, critique and truth – a place that sustains an open and reflective encounter between art and the totalizing critique of capitalism”.

This citation formed a precise vector point that I returned to again and again, an interpretation that I
tried to follow. By conclusion, the four books of this research project are the ‘art’: a place, a memory, a set of relations, modes of cognition and learning and mapping…

However, at one moment during the research, I was temporarily thrown off this vector point and onto another. Pitted contradictorily alongside this formulation is the discipline of art that Alana Jelinek outlined in *This is Not Art: Activism and Other ‘Non-Art*, (2013: 135). Jelinek argues that art is a discipline with clear borders (whereas John Robert’s asserts art’s *ad*isciplinary form and intimacy with the revolutionary tradition of the avant-garde), which sets out to create and police its field of knowledge.
Like other disciplines that were born of modernity such as science and history, the field of art has core knowledge and core practitioners that everyone within the discipline must be aware of. Undergraduates and graduates must know the lexicon in order to be taken seriously, listened to and be understood as a professional.

Consequently, and purposefully contradictorily, I draw on both arguments throughout this doctoral project. Jelinek rather convincingly argues that activism is non-art. This argument validated my temporary desire to leave the frame of art fully. To exit as I was afraid that my agency was better placed elsewhere. As an integral part of the research towards a complete dissolution of my artistic identity and practice (guerrilla politics of
withdrawal), I attempted, albeit unsuccessfully, to get employment with various NGO’s (Greenpeace, Oxfam). The conceptual turning process that research procures is fundamental to a dialectical understanding of the what is at stake in a real transformative situatedness.

ART THINKING:

Rather than considering art as a means of production, artist and educator Luis Camnitzer (a sceptic of art school education as it is enacted inside the corporate university) takes a compelling counter position regarding art production and instead views art as a means of thinking, which he calls ‘art thinking’: “Art thinking is much more than art: it is a meta-discipline that is there to help expand the limits of other forms of thinking.
Though it’s something as autonomous as logic might be, and though it can be studied as an enclosed entity, its importance lies in what it does to the rest of the acquisition of knowledge.” (See Luis Camnitzer’s essay “Thinking about art Thinking” in E-Flux Journal 56th Venice Biennale, http://supercommunity.e-flux.com/texts/thinking-about-art-thinking/)

ARTISTIC CRITIQUE:
As inheritors of the anarcho-libertarian 60’s and 70’s and the Situationist International (1957-1969) legacy, social critique has been neutralised through economic concessions, while so-called artistic critique has been selectively mined and subsumed allowing capital to enter its late phase and argument formulated by Luc Boltanski and Eve
Chiapello in *New Spirit Capitalism*. Their argument is that there is no longer an outside to capital’s ideological programme. Therefore, if this is so, we must assume we are all on the inside of this smooth apparatus. Resistance then must come from the inside. With the advent of the knowledge economy, any form of de-materialised art, including social and pedagogical art practices of the 90’s and 2000’s could be captured and monetised, then set to work within the market.

**ArtWORK:**

I use the term artWORK throughout to define the particular labour process and exchange between art (the conceptually grounded commodity) and work (a critique of productive labour itself). I accentuate further the term ‘artWORK’, cogently analysed in
Angela Dimitrakaki’s 2013 publication *Gender, artWork and the Global Imperative* on the question whether gender is implicated in how art does its work or is defined as work (See Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room).

Luis Camnitzer likewise approaches what artists do, considering the terms of art as a form of work and a means of production: “‘Work’ refers to labor as much as to an object, while ‘art’ means the discipline in which this is performed, although it is also used as a laudatory adjective. In any case this divides people in two groups: those who make the objects, and those who appreciate them. Those who make them are subject to the criteria of meritocracy and the educational system aims to distill the few that may rise to the top. The art they
produce is supposed to attract as great a quantity of appreciative viewers as possible in order to sustain the market by consumption of museum tickets or direct purchase of the art works.” (See Luis Camnitzer’s essay “Thinking about art Thinking” in EFlux Journal 56th Venice Biennale, http://supercommunity.e-flux.com/texts/thinking-about-art-thinking/)

AUTONOMY:
In its emergence from wage labour, art’s autonomy is broken and is controlled entirely at the point of its production, at the point of its cognitive, libidinal and affective values. These are fully operated by contemporary capital. I read autonomy through Marina Vishmidt’s precise clarification of the term: “Adorno argues that art has to use autonomy to
question autonomy. This is emblematic of the conceptual and political model of negative dialectics: using constitutive subjectivity to dismantle the fiction of constitutive subjectivity. More precisely, however, Adorno argued that the autonomy of art – its social uselessness – relies on the concealment of labour, and, also on the exaggeration of the split between mental and manual, or intellectual and manual labour in capitalist society. Which is to say, briefly, that while capital is always both incorporating and expelling labour, as classically depicted in the fetish-character of the commodity, in art this is presented in an emancipatory, creative and, as it were, 'pure' way, which is why Adorno and contemporary writers such as Stewart Martin call it the 'absolute commodity': the commodity under laboratory
conditions, shorn of the ideology of social necessity that other 'products' and labours carry with them. But, paradoxically, it is the critical distance with which art is endowed, the distance from the way this tendency of capital establishes and perverts social or wage labour that allows it, from a place of perhaps spurious autonomy, to question this arrangement and model different ways of organizing production, on however small and fictional a scale.” (Marina Vishmidt, Anti-Work, Anti-Art: The Paradoxes of Radical Proximity, http://www.openspace-zkp.org/2013/en/journal.php?j=4&t=25)

In *Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room*, a (re)connection with the place of autonomy (free labour) allowed me to pursue the dissolution of my artistic identity,
stopping it from being in circulation in public.

Throughout this practice-led project I pertinently refused the category of artist as an identity, a category whose privileged critical distance, its autonomy and purposeless experimentation, is historically removed from alienated labour of daily life - heteronomy. I argue at key stages throughout this project that the historical position of arts autonomy is no longer the case and artists’ production processes and their products, be they material or immaterial, are fully integrated into economic relations to be bought and sold on the market (the commodity fetish). While art participates in advanced relations of production, by way of conclusion this project argues through intervention (in the realm of thought experiments), for the continued assertion of arts autonomy and
defense of avant-garde praxis particularly through its research programmes.

AVANT-GARDE:

In *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1984), Peter Burger rendered the avant-garde’s cultural, political and cognitive specificity and meaning to its conditions of production, thereby lowering the threshold of the avant-garde to a dead end.

Throughout this research project, two questions arose regarding the avant-garde are (1) How do we mediate the category of the avant-garde within the dialectic of the intellectual and social division of labour? (2) Can the research programme of the avant-garde have continued validity, as we see through the expansion of new forms of
participatory, pedagogic (collaborative and self-critical learning) and dialogic practice through the encounter with art today.

In a defense of the avant-garde as an open ended research programme to be re-produced, John Roberts’ writes: “The avant-garde is an essentially suspensive category under capitalism, and therefore any identification of it with a premature escape into politics and instrumental reason, irrespective of art’s alignment with political praxis or with the ‘end of art’, or with art’s embrace of non-artistic practices and disciplines – dissolves its non-identititary functions and ambitions.” (John Roberts, Revolutionary Time and the Avant Garde, Verso 2015, 15)
BREACHING EXPERIMENT:

As part of an overall experiment in ethnomethodology, Harold Garfinkel developed the breaching experiment in the 1950’s to violate and disrupt common practices of everyday life as a way to analyse social norms and to develop and understanding of how everyday social behaviour is constructed, and adherence to unwritten rules. He famously asked his students to return home and act as if they were lodgers in their homes, requesting permission to use the toilet and acting out the role of a guest. Parents were disturbed and tried to rationalise the behaviour of their children, some were angry. (Corresponding to this see the peculiar working methods that threaten the order of the workplace in Pilvi Takala’s 2008 piece The Trainee (available https://vimeo.com/119535540).
BOYCOTT:

Recent art world exit strategies of boycott, withdrawal and protest have been reasserted in the form of direct action, dissent and speaking truth to power (Dave Beech, “To Boycott or not to Boycott”, Features Art Monthly, October 2014).

This current mode of genuine political critique fuses art with activism to balance the power within art, whereby individual artists and artist groups, negotiate uneasy situations linked to institutional deficiencies and organisational cracks, market structures and the State, politically, culturally and economically. In A Grammer of the Multitude, the Italian political thinker Paolo Virno argues that: “nothing is less passive than the act of fleeing, of exiting. Defection modifies the conditions within which the struggle takes place, rather than
presupposing those conditions to be an unalterable horizon; it modifies the context within which a problem has arisen, rather than facing a problem by opting for one or the other of the provided alternatives. In short, exit consists of unrestrained invention which alters the rules of the game and throws the adversary completely off balance.”


Some common ground lies with these thinkers. The subject ‘I’ of creative action exits to challenge
the privileges assigned to art and the personality of
the artist for another, and aligns the ‘I’s
‘outsidedness’ with other non-artistic practices,
with care labour of the home and children.

CHTO DELAT?:

Chto Delat (What is to be done?) was founded in
2003 by a group of artists, critics, philosophers,
and writers from St. Petersburg and Moscow with
the goal of merging political theory, art, and
activism. It is an internationally renowned Russian
art-activist collective preoccupied with the
representation of historicity within Russian culture.

What I mean by this is that in their defense of
negation and autonomy, Chto Delat meet the
demands of the present conjuncture through an
allegorisation, or as John Roberts describes in *Revolutionary Time and the Avant-Garde* of “fictive facticity” of the Russian situation, a re-historicised and politicised site of struggle for art.

CLINAMEN:

In the *Anxiety of Influence*, Harold Bloom takes up the term to describe the way in which writers swerve away from their predecessors, to move in another direction. Gilles Deleuze uses the term in *Difference and Repetition* to describe multiplicities. Jean-Luc Nancy, Jacques Derrida, James Joyce and Alain Badiou have used the term.

I make specific reference to the term in line with my agency and action as demonstrated throughout the dramatised Acts 1-3. The clinamen to act to
move in another direction against the grain of
concensus and participation, to stay silent when
I’m supposed to speak, to collude when I must
not, in search of another truth, real or fictional. I
first encountered the term when reading the
manifestos written by Tiqqun:

“This taste, this clinamen, can either be warded off
or embraced. To take on a form-of-life is not
simply to know a penchant: it means to think it. I
call thought that which converts a for-of-life into a
force, into a sensible effectivity. In every situation
there is one line that stands out among others, the
line along which power grows. Thought is the
capacity for singling out and following this line. A
form-of-life can be embraced only by following
this line, meaning that all things thought is
strategic.” (Tiqqun, *Introduction to Civil War*, Semiotext(e) intervention series 4, 2010, 20)

**CODED CINEMA:**

The Coded Cinema in Amsterdam was a self-organised pedagogic model I initiated. It was integral to the original doctoral project proposal in 2012, which in part, centred on the pedagogical potential of political cinema. To develop a better awareness of the world that might allow us to subvert the status quo within a community (here we might speak of the artworld, its codes and habits), where art is set to work on carrying out an analysis. I used the framing device of the cinema and the model of collective editorship by involving members of the Out of Line Lab (See Out of Line Lab), in search of a pedagogic process that might
critically dismantle the terms originality and copyright so upheld within cultural discourse and the value form. For the sake of my objective I rearticulated Godard’s premise “Making films Politically” to develop a tentative enquiry around political film; to create an other place that might push against or counteract the incessant stream of images with its own incessant perceptual regime.

(See Dmitry Vilensky in “What Does it Mean to Make Films Politically today? Once Godard made the claim that it is no longer enough to make political films: one must make films politically”)

http://eipcp.net/transversal/0307/vilensky/en)

A ‘research as art’ trajectory was not a reverberation of political film, rather it was about how to make film politically, how one ‘takes a stance’ and shows a learning process, a concept
employed by Bertolt Brecht in his Learning Plays of the 1930’s. In the world of proteiform film, there is a multitude of topics to be mapped out, historical turning points, cultural movements and social transformations to be built upon. One part of the question was how could these be mapped out in a manner that didn’t shut their reading down or impose an authoritative viewpoint? By avoiding heavily thematic programmes, up to ten films were screened back to back over a 24 hour period, with no information on start or stop times, giving the film audience space to transform and dislocate the film narrative through their own histories, relations to other films, their own circumstances, all the while interpreting and perceiving, setting up their own montages and lines of flight and thinking. The Coded Cinema ran a non-stop programme of
stolen, hacked and borrowed films in a small abandoned energy building, adjacent to the main building of SMART Project Space in Amsterdam (See Creative Industries) - the project’s host and its producer. The cinema ran 24/7. It was free and open to anyone who came to know of it by word of mouth or through a secret mailing list. We installed a drinks machine and a bin and there was a toilet at one end of the space. The walls and windows were painted black. Twelve cinema chairs were installed along three rows (up to twelve seats could be argued legally as private viewing and not public). There were no fire and safety installations and we risked being closed down immediately should the police find the place.
The Index

The project aimed to dismantle and throw away any idea of audience management, together with the artistic conventions of mere spectatorship as well as that of expert culture and of ownership. People could come and go as they pleased, day or night, there was no interpretive material beyond a list of films which could be characterised as interacting lines forming an essay in dislocation and discontinuity. Rather than having sense of a well-planned itinerary, no map was created to guide the visitor. It was a connective, conceptual trip with multi entryways, leaving behind the usual hierarchic discourse and not sure of its destination. In this way we could hold onto the provisional and exploratory spirit of the films. For neither the notion of so called disinterested spectatorship or the patronising version of participation, integration
and audience activation as seen in art events all over the world seemed desirable for the outcome of the project. Not wanting to lead, curate or author, I developed the film programmes together with the first members of Out of Line and the interns who I’d brought together to work collectively on the research. This production and these programmes were brought together based on film material we had ourselves, and given to us by friends, or illegally hacked from the internet. It was just the beginning of a de-centralised sampling and image mash-up, of forms that produce other raw materials for other stubborn and difficult forms of work. Seth Price, in his 2002 manifesto Dispersion writes: “anything on the internet is a fragment, provisional, pointing elsewhere. Nothing is finished”. By re-using films as parts of something
to remember, as bits of something larger, then lining them together in any random order, they become simple fragments of a sort of collective memory and of learning too, especially when this existing material is mashed together in a social context. This context was not only the site of production, but extended to the site and frame of the cinema as an unruly place where people could come together. True to its nature it became a place to meet, to have sex, to drink, to stay warm, to talk, to be, to sleep.

Visitors had access to the cinema using a 4 digit number code that opened the door. The changing code was in part a folly, creating the semblance of a private members list that I could argue in defence in case of legal repercussions at a later date. The
code changed monthly and was sent to members who joined the Out of Line Lab (OOLL) mailing list via SMART Project Space’s networks. The illegal nature of the project meant that neither the Coded Cinema entrance codes, nor its changing programmes could be advertised on film listings, newspapers, official websites etc. It was a pirate cinema with no legal standing, and it didn’t pay distribution rights for the films and risked breaching copyright law. We also risked closure for not paying the distribution rights and royalties.

The Coded Cinema was hugely appreciated and popular with different audiences, students who knew about it through our networks and word of mouth, the local neighbourhood and anyone interested in alternative programmes. The question
of whether it was embedded in its own local community and ideas related to the processes of gentrification could be discussed at this point. The answer is yes, that it was part of this process, but there are cracks in these processes too and there is much potential for countenance here. However, this would deserve its own thesis – as it would be an injustice to all too quickly brush over it and not attend to it fully.

The argument is more complex than a simple reading related to the Coded Cinema as was addressed very loosely by examiners during my transfer Viva. The discussion would have to draw on experiences relating to my detailed knowledge of the situation, the institution of SMART Project Space and its formation, which we carefully fought
for, defended and negotiated within that specific community over many years and the cultural and political context of Amsterdam, as well as the reasoning and atonement related to the cruel bankruptcy of the institution SMART Project Space in 2013 which we’d developed and received funding for inside the Creative Industries rubric and its economies.

Returning to The Coded Cinema, it was a successful project in its attempt to offer a de-regulated other place. The cinema was much loved and the ‘freedom of place’ cared for. Indeed, towards the final weeks of the project, someone(s) urinated all over the walls and chairs.

However, as the situation and knowledge became
clearer to me that the host institution, SMART Project Space was about to close in a grotesque way where one persons greed and power hungry capital interests had truly trumped the game, defecation felt well timed.

A fitting gesture to the bitter end of a much loved and important institution.

When thinking about practices that resist easy assimilation into the market driven system, the natural development of the Coded Cinema was the idea to set up an online film archive using open source curating. Anyone could join and have their say as a member of OOLL.
Our team would redact material and publish it online. The internet is a perfect model of the mass archive and of fractured and redrawn networks. It’s a great way to get people around an idea. I established relationships with the University of Amsterdam and several art schools in the city. By May of 2013, I was in discussion with the Dutch artist duo Bik van der Pol and their students from the two-year experimental masters programme *The School of Missing Studies* at the Sandberg Institute in Amsterdam. The School of Missing studies is a masters programme initiated by the artist duo Bik van der Pol’s at the Sandberg Institute in Amsterdam. This one time masters programme suggests a critical pedagogic model that explores the potential for collective learning, dissemination and knowledge production, and a research project
that addresses acute political, social and educational challenges. The objective was to develop collaborative projects and joint fundraising for these projects in 2014 within the framework of Out of Line Lab.

Table 2: Budget included in funding application to E-Cultuur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET E-CULTUUR: OUT OF LINE ONLINE</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Manager</td>
<td>€8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Editor</td>
<td>€8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Meetings (local)</td>
<td>€1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical design website</td>
<td>€3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and visual design</td>
<td>€6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting and maintenance website</td>
<td>€3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>€30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, accountancy, reporting</td>
<td>€3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent (x 22 months)</td>
<td>€3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity and Marketing</td>
<td>€3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>€10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT</strong></td>
<td>€40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cover</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Project Space production</td>
<td>€5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichting Democratie + Media</td>
<td>€5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondriaan Fonds</td>
<td>€10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimuleringsfonds Creative Industries</td>
<td>€20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COVER</strong></td>
<td>€40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, things were to take a sudden turn when my family and I decided in early October 2013 to move to the UK. This had consequences for the doctoral research projects I had been working on. I would have to rethink how to develop this project in Oxford. Would a city that I barely know, that has its particularities and privileges, provide me the appropriate infrastructure and backdrop for the objectives and sub-cultural practices I had been drawing on? Or would I have to renegotiate my research proposal entirely, taking these experiences further and usefully put them to work as coordinates for my future practice?

COGNITIVE CAPITALISM:

The profound effect neoliberalism has had on the artworld, its institutions and the art market, has led
to systematic changes across all types of art practice since the mid 1990’s. With neoliberalism came the knowledge economy and the emergence of new kinds of property relations covering information products and the privatisation of knowledge as so-called intellectual property (IP). In her recent book *This is Not Art: Activism and Other ‘Non-Art’* (2013), art theorist Alana Jelinek writes that the commodification of IP has had “deep implications for the artworld […] although knowledge has been an economic product in its own right since 1986 (through TRIPS International Trade in Intellectual Property), IP has become vitally important to the economies of the Global North since 1997.” (2013:35). While manufacturing and material base sectors had moved to the developing world, Europe and the US placed its
emphasis on ‘knowledge as property’. (The Corner House, “Political Organising Behind TRIPS” *Briefing Paper 32*, (Sturminster Newton, Dorset: September 2004).

This marked a significantly changed economical backdrop at the dawn of the twenty-first century, hypothesised as ‘cognitive capitalism’ by Yann Moulier Boutang, who theoretically draws on the Italian Operaist (Workerist) emphasis on living labour. In *Cognitive Capitalism*, Boutang writes: “one of the symptoms indicating that both the mode of production and the capitalist relations of production are changing is the importance assumed nowadays by institutional legal rights. Never has there been so much talk of property rights, by way of contesting them as well as by way
of redefining them” (Boutang: 2012, 47). Patents, computer software, art production and its very concepts, any intellectual activity in fact when put into communicative networks are a critical part of this new knowledge-for-profit economy.

The legal systems designed to protect and trade property such as copyright law and its legal referent ‘dematerialised property’ has implicated artworks and books in normative concepts of property and ownership. In other words, art production no longer stands outside the enclosure of private property and value forms but is fully integrated in commodity fetishism. Yann Moulier Boutang and others theoretically define the battle over intellectual property rights as the battle of the new enclosures, which has had far reaching repercussions for the artworld. Jelinek writes that
“the privatization of public funding, the
privatization of art’s value with the dominance of
art market and the privatization of knowledge –
long-established ‘alternatives’ to capitalism and the
status quo, as well as modes of dissent, no longer
exist because the structures that enable them no
longer exist.” (2013: 37). Jelinek compellingly
argues throughout that the contemporary artworld
replicates and reproduces neoliberal structures
which can be seen through; (1) the dominance of
the art market; (2) the artworld’s adoption of a
‘mixed economy’ funding structure that require
private money in order to qualify for public
funding; (3) the rise of the knowledge economy.
The artworld (to include the academy, museum
and biennale) widely reproduces the view (as
stipulated by funding policy) that the value of art
lies in its social and economic impact. “Work comes to dress itself in the clothes of the artists or of the university. The values of creativity only become capable of being exploited by an intelligent capitalism to the extent that they were promoted as a value, first experimentally and then as a norm of living.” (Boutang: 2012, 88). Under cognitive capitalism universities are sites of immaterial labour. The production of immaterial labour in training as the emergent commodity - the student, is taught and shaped by other immaterial labourers - the tutor. In his proposition on the complexity of what constitutes a factory of knowledge, philosopher and art theoretician Gerald Raunig argues in Factories of Knowledge that what made the factory a site of social struggle, today makes the university a key site of social struggle. Embedded
in the context of our increasingly precarious and dispersed social life, the university could be described as a ‘becoming factory’ of new economic and social assemblages. Raunig argues that these particular qualities might allow us to validate other forms of labour, life and resistance.

COGNITARIAT:
The ‘cognitariat’ is a follow on concept first proposed by the philosopher Franco Berardi (Bifo), identifying a new class of worker produced and reproduced on an enlarged scale under cognitive capitalism. Bifo writes of the disembodied cognitariat, “Nerves that stiffen in the constant strain of attention, eyes that stare at a screen and hands that type on a keyboard.” And provocatively continues: “a consequence of this
dis-eroticization of daily life is the investment of desire in work, understood as the sole space of narcissistic re-affirmation for an individuality used to seeing the other according to the rules of competition, that is as a danger, an impoverishment, a limitation, rather than a source of experience, pleasure and enrichment.” (Franco Berardi (Bifo), “What does Cognitariat Mean?” Cultural Studies Review vol. 11 nr. 2, September 2005, 57)

COMMODITY:
“A commodity appears, at first sight, a very trivial thing, and easily understood. Its analysis shows that it is, in reality, a very queer thing, abounding in metaphysical subtleties and theological niceties. So far as it is a value in use, there is nothing
mysterious about it, whether we consider it from
the point of view that by its properties it is capable
of satisfying human wants, or from the point that
those properties are the product of human labour.
It is as clear as noon-day, that man, by his industry,
changes the forms of the materials furnished by
Nature, in such a way as to make them useful to
him. The form of wood, for instance, is altered, by
making a table out of it. Yet, for all that, the table
continues to be that common, everyday thing,
wood. But, so soon as it steps forth as a
commodity, it is changed into something
transcendent. It not only stands with its feet on the
ground, but, in relation to all other commodities, it
stands on its head, and evolves out of its wooden
brain grotesque ideas, far more wonderful than
“table-turning” [as the tables start to dance—wenn
er aus freien Stücken zu tanzen begänne | ever was.” Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *Capital; Critique of Political Economy*, (Chicago: C.H. Kerr, 1907)

COMMONS:

The “root word is “*communis*”, Latin, derived alternatively, from *com-* , Latin–together, and *munis*, Latin–under obligation, and from *com-* and *unus*, Latin–one.” It thus points to either a specific group or the generality of mankind.” (Peter Linebaugh, *Stop Thief: The Commons, Enclosures and Resistance*, 2013, 202)

The shifting law of the commons has been invented and reinvented in various guises since the dawn of civilisation. Any given community creates
its own social practices and shared values, which in turn have a life and a history of their own and unique to itself. That’s how a commons works. A community protects the shared interests (informal and social) of the many and creates its own culture and law. “A commons arises whenever a given community decides it wishes to manage a resource in a collective manner, with special regard for equitable access, use and sustainability.” (David Bollier, *Think Like a Commoner*, 2014, 175)

The thirteenth century Magna Carta was a formalisation of the vernacular law of commoners that had been reproduced through social exchange. These laws are sometimes formalised through statutes and State law, though often this is not the case.
The Commons is a dynamic pact between individualism and collectivity. To answer the question “what common is, and whereof named common”, John Manwood wrote *A Treatise and Discourse of the Lawes of the Forrest* in 1598: “It taketh the name of Common, a communitate, of communitie, participation or fellowship, because that most commonly, where men have common of pasture for the feeding of their beastes, or cattell, many mens cattell do use to feedde there together.”

In the *Magna Carta Manifesto* published in 2014, Peter Linebaugh argues that “commoning is embedded in a labor process; it inheres in a particular praxis of field, upland, forest, marsh, coast. Common rights are entered into by labor.”
They belong to experience, not schooling…

Commoning, being independent of the state is independent also of the temporality of the law and the state. It’s much older. But this doesn’t mean that it’s dead, or premodern, or backward”. Only through constant vigilance can the law of the commons be safeguarded and therefore guaranteed, “commoning remains a bulwark against the abuses of formal law.” For this reason the Magna Carta has evolved over the centuries, repeatedly affirming the rights of commoners. However the Magna Carta was unable to stop the mass enclosures of land in the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, which destroyed people’s access and rights to land, and dismantled the social function of the commons. Four thousand acts of Parliament authorised the seizure of 15% of
English Common lands over several centuries, in what Linebaugh describes as a “massive act of state-sponsored privatisation.” This is known as the English enclosure movement. Enclosure translates into private property and capital, analysed by Marx as ‘primitive accumulation’.

Today’s new global expansion of capitalist relations is similar to the sixteenth century processes of primitive accumulation and the attack on commonly held lands continues today. The World Bank’s international monetary fund has allowed countries such as Nigeria for example to enter the competitive world market, a process in which communal property and lands were destroyed and people’s access to water denied. The illth of enclosure is the expropriated land from millions of
subsistence farmers leading to paramount pauperisation of workers and the criminalisation and persecution of the migrant that we see today.

The World Bank inserted a policy known as ‘War against Indiscipline’ that not only reproduces labour exploitation; it is an intervention to pull apart community bonds through the separation of production from reproduction, in what is a dramatic reproductive crisis that subsumes the whole area of personal relations.

What constituted the commons of 1215 when the Magna Carta was first drawn up was dismantled and commoditised over time, making way for the foundational process of primitive accumulation as analysed by Marx to reveal a new type of person – the individual, and a new type of worker, the
proletariat. There are now more proletarians on the
face of the earth than ever before in history; this
mass Hardt and Negri term the ‘multitude’. (See
Michael Hardt and Antoni Negri, *Multitude: War
and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, (The Penguin
Press New York, 2004), www.rebels-
library.org/files/multitude.pdf, first accessed 14
Dec 2013).

Today there are more and more demands being
made by the multitude to share wealth, and this has
given way to grassroots organisations and
movements of communing to safeguard common
resources. Peter Linebaugh calls this “actual
autonomous communism.” (Linebaugh, *Stop Thief*,
61)
David Bollier writes that the cultural code of ‘custom’ is an important element of the law of the commons. Custom is the socially determined internal dynamics of commons and this is the root of all law. It is a self-organised system and an adapting social contract, assigned to and by the community with a narrative that is linked to earlier generations.

While Wikipedia and other self-organised communities have arisen as the new Commons, what is the commons and communing today? Throughout the 1990’s the socialist illusions of much of the left disintegrated along with the apparent defeat of communism and the fall of Stalinist domination. This gave big power
diplomacy of the ideological right open space to make a steady advance.

However, the fall of communism on the one hand and the global movement that started with the struggles of the Zapatistas in Mexico to ‘reclaim the commons’ on the other, has put the issue of the commons back on the agenda and it has burst out into other arenas as vigilant movements to safeguard the rights and liberties of people. (Peter Linebaugh, *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons For All*, (University of California Press, 2008), 273.

CONSENSUS:

The logic of consensus implies that there is but one single reality and we must agree to it. If we agree with this then surely there is always something it excludes. In *The Space of Agonism*, Chantal Mouffe, in conversation with Markus Miessen, states: “Consensus is only possible on the basis of excluding something that cannot take place.” (2012: 31) If Mouffe’s statement is true, then the visible, thinkable and possible can only be interpreted in one way. In *Chronicles of Consensual Times*, Jacques Rancière writes of consensus: “This word only apparently exults the virtues of discussion and consultation that permit agreement between interested parties. A closer look reveals that the word means exactly the contrary: *consensus* means that the givens and solutions of problems
simply require people to find that they have no room for discussion” (2010: 1).

Chantal Mouffe proposes subverting consensus, not necessarily through the dynamic of a participating conflictual outsider as put forward by Markus Miessen, rather through someone who is from the community, who disagrees with the prevailing consensus and allows others to see things in a different way. (Miessen, 2012: 21)

CONTEXT:
I’ve argued throughout this project that knowledge is embodied. We do not begin our doctoral degrees empty of experience. In the field of art, we use this experience, this knowledge to articulate a view of the world. Yet it has been stipulated many times
throughout the course of this degree that researchers need to approach their work objectively. I disagree with this formulation. We carry our lives with us and this informs our work.

Before undertaking a DPhil in Oxford, I spent 20 years in the Netherlands. I left the UK in the mid 90’s to study postgraduate Fine Art at the Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunst. I was hungry and wanted to eat, sleep and be art. I wanted to be in Europe. Not on an island that already back then seemed to be floating away from Europe (that was two decades ago and it couldn’t be more telling today as we hit the omnishambles of Brexit). I worked as an artist and was represented by galleries in Rotterdam, Torino and New York. I received many prizes and was awarded grants and was one
of the fortunate ones able to sustain an art practice after leaving the protected spaces of the educational institutions I had attended. I sold my work to museums and collectors at art fairs and through the galleries who represented me. My work was reviewed in newspapers and art magazines. I enjoyed networking and would travel to any place, to be seen and circulate, not just my work but also all of my social labour. But over time I became dis-passionate producing not only too much work, but endlessly reproducing myself. The day I decided to stop making art was when my New York solo show was positively reviewed in Flash Art in August 2000. As an undergraduate student I would tell myself that I have a show of my work reviewed in Flash Art, I will know I’ve made it, it will be the measure of success, because
that is what we were taught to believe. I side-stepped. I wanted to work with others and collaborate. Not endlessly conjuring up work on my own in a studio, or frivolously travelling to exhibition and art fair openings. I started working as a curator and organised exhibitions in Amsterdam, Newcastle Upon Tyne, New York, Vienna, Basel and Rome. Oh, and I almost forgot Belfast. That was the best show. But not necessarily because of the exhibition. It was a reality check. A sort of wake up call. I had invited artists who made political work. And socially engaged artists. I called it ‘Underworld’. It was 2002. War was over, albeit somewhat tentatively. The world cup was on tv. The pubs were full, daytime too. The gallery was on the edge of a residential estate. The estate was painted in the
union flag colours red, white and blue. The Israeli flag was flying from almost every lamppost.

Boarded up shop windows. Primary Schools with barbed wire fences. Art. A far cry from the realities of life here. There was blood on the street that day.

I never liked football. There’s just something in that kicking. Nationalism and Internationalism in one rowdy roll. The gallery windows were stoned.

My political artists asked me if I would take them for a ride to see the much-mediatised trouble spots, recounting Phil Collins work “Holiday in someone else’s misery” that he made while living in Belfast. We drove around the city in my Peugeot 205. Plastic beer cups and blood on the street. We headed west, to the old linen area. The planters came here in the 16th century. The streets are named after people and places in Flanders. The
planters brought Flax from Flanders, to curb the Irish export market for linen. Marx wrote about the Irish problem. The blue print of colonisation. It was early July. Bonfires. Stacked high. Sofas, car wheels. Waiting leviathans. Skinhead teenagers roomed looking for bonfire estovers. You could feel the tension. There was excitement too. But fear sat in the backseat of my car that afternoon. We drove further west, deeper into the nationalist working class neighbourhoods of Short Strand. The colours green white and gold on every street. Murals and guns. Palestinian flags. It was sunny. I thought it was odd. I only remember Belfast in the rain. Windows rolled down. Passing along the peace wall. Army check point. Then on into the Shankhill, the loyalist working class. A scrawny swarm of kids. Sticks. Lots with sticks. In a cul-de-
sac. Over the hill, the white Tangi armoured tanks came charging at the swarm. Reverse and turn around. My political artists feared their lives that sunny afternoon. Where there is abject misery, Art changes absolutely nothing. So I reconciled myself with the idea that there must be hope, if nothing else, in this deplorable place I still call home.

Shortly after that I directed a non-profit artist run institution in Amsterdam before moving to Oxford early 2014, mid way through my second year of the DPhil. In those previous years meaning, engagement and production, within and around a multitude of artistic practices - running alongside the pressures and effects of neoliberal values and systems that organising an art institution on and off display encompass - have informed this
labyrinthine narrative. The point of juncture between organisatory cultural production and doctoral research providing me urgent intellectual sanctuary.

CONVIVIALITY:
The ever changing demands for emancipation by which the educational turn in art and curating understand the educational paradigm, shifted from a dominant, repressive institutional perspective of pedagogy and instruction towards cooperative, convivial, autonomous models of collective organisation that test how local, linguistic and situative knowledge is produced (See pedagogic projects by Chto Delat?, Tanja Brugera, Ahmet Ögüt, Pablo Helguera, Copenhagen Free University, School of the Damned).
Ivan Illich, the Austrian thinker known for his polemical work *Deschooling Society* published in 1971, developed a radical critical discourse around the praxis of informal education. Illich believed that ‘Universal Learning’ can’t happen in school within the hierarchical setting of relations and proposed the adoption of self-governed learning frameworks using “modern technology to make free speech, free assembly, and a free press truly universal and therefore, fully educational”. (Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society*). In *Tools for Conviviality* published two years later, he speaks of learning co-operations where complex social realities are ambivalent and enlists the term “conviviality” to describe “the autonomous and creative intercourse among persons” (Ibid). For Illich conviviality is in stark contrast to discipline and “forced adaption”
of the student, which for him is the dominant type of hierarchical organisation of the contemporary knowledge institution. (Gerald Raunig, *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity*, Semiotext(e) MIT Press, 2013, 45).

Controvert to the argument against conviviality posited by Claire Bishop in her publication *Artificial Hells*, where she refers to conviviality as only harmonious co-existence, Illich’s idea of conviviality could bridge Chantal Mouffe’s argument that democratic politics is agonistic, in productive conflict rather than consensual. Negotiated difference and tense interactions form different types of encounter to emphasise the multiplicity of relations that experience
camaraderie but are not free of tension and contradiction.

**CO-RESEARCH:**

Co-research (conricerca) is an Italian Operaist (workerist) methodology of joint research that forges collaboration between workers (in the broadest sense) and intellectuals. The post-operaist theorist, Gigi Roggero argues for a ‘we’ methodology where new common institutions can be built up inside the university and along the borders of the University. I find that this model offers much potential for the future autonomy of art’s doctoral programmes. Firstly, cognitive labour opens up the whole spectrum of production and the forms of labour that sustains contemporary capital. Authored collectively the methodology of
co-research moves past possessive individualism
(though there are more art collectives, individual
expression is still integral to the way art is taught,
the production of art and the art world) that allows
cognitive measure to quantify knowledge
production and social relations. Instead co-research
is an autonomous space where a new commons of
shared knowledge is aggregated.

Co-research draws on class composition, the
concept of living labour and living knowledge and
the production of new subjectivities described by
philosopher and art theorist Gerald Raunig as the
emergence of “organs of the transversal intellect.”
(Gerald Raunig Factories of Knowledge, Semiotext(e)
2013, 67). Often in the guise of para-institutions
these practices appear as demands in the form of
discursive events, publications and manifestos, autonomous education activities, free schools and bottom up alternative spaces, but set themselves apart in that they are able to withdraw (exit or desert) from the university and the privileged institutional site of the museum. We can align this alongside Michel Foucault’s assertion for the permitting of knowledges “that have been disqualified as non-conceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledges: naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity.” (Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France*, 1975-1976 (1997: repr New York: Picador, 2003), 7.
In the *Production of Living Knowledge: The Crisis of the University and the Transformation of Labor in Europe and North America*, Gigi Roggero describes the contemporary incarnation of co-research (conricerca) as a radical research method to produce counter-knowledge(s). Roggero suggests, “co-research is at once the production of knowledge and organisation, in which the boundary between the researched and the researcher dissolves, producing yet another convergence, transforming the object into the subject, and turning subjectivity into the new terrain of struggle just as it becomes a site for capitalist accumulation.” (Roggero, *Living Knowledge*, xi). Throughout the research project I consider a set of post-operaismo concepts: exodus, precariousation, subjectivity, bio-political production
and the common, as the next step to liberating a “no management” zone where autonomy and self-organisation finds a foothold. Radical knowledge production as forms of co-research are being put to work by the recent feminist, labour and student movements, to directly expose the unstable paradigm of the knowledge economy, and to assert in particular the present condition of labour and the capital relation with labour.

CORRECTIONS:

List of Minor Corrections, emailed 1 May 2017

1. The addition of:
An Abstract – a written text (one page) based on the abstract of the thesis that was given in the viva, to include:

A very brief summary of the main contents/themes/fields of the thesis;

A description for how the different elements of the thesis cohere;

2A) In particular, please clarify, how the analysis of “cognitive capitalism”’s context is linked to critical pedagogy (which paradigms were created in the 1960s and 1970s, i.e. before the hypothesis of “cognitive capitalism”)?
A reflexive account of its key points and achievements;

And a defined summary of the original contribution the thesis makes to the field of knowledge/practice.

An Inventory – a written text (one page) describing the four books based on the summary you gave in the viva, of what constitutes the submission, to include:

a sentence or two for each book describing what it is and why it is, and a short explanation of the form of submission;
to give a reflexive account/interpretation of the blank spaces, montage, oblique references and opacity (Books 1-3);

To articulate the argument for the role of being tactically within and strategically outside of the institution (which is the object of research, critique, and artistic intervention).

General guide for producing these two short documents:

You could reflect about question of ‘use’ of theoretical concepts in artistic practice, and specifically, in your project.
Also to clarify the use of quotations from classical authors of critical theory in your text which often are given without further commentary.

Collect the reflections about the scope and contributions of the thesis, otherwise shattered in the main body of the text as fragmented though interesting remarks, such as:

B1, p. 115 – ‘research in art can be defined as a set of ideas montaged together’.

B2, p. 178 ‘…this research seminar examines the politics of knowledge production under the hypothesis of cognitive capitalism and the forms of labour sharing it’. .. ‘current crisis of knowledge production and its direct link to knowledge
enclosures’. .. ‘how our knowledge can be organised an made common and how it might break with capitalist capture, how a resistant form of knowledge production might be found on the frontier of the university’.

B3, P. 318. Art as ‘struggle’ and ‘a process of intelligibility’.

Also: P. 346. “Gendered Methodology”

P. 396. – “Research on impact of cognitive capitalism on arts education in university of Oxford”.

B4. Index. P. 467 (author’s explication of the focus of the work):
“These works [3 books of the documentation] examine the knowledge economy as understood under the hypotheses of cognitive capitalism and its impact on contemporary art practice, taking account of its conditions of production within the local site of official art education at the elite university”.

“This doctoral project, in a counter movement, searches inside the less glamorous side of the university of ‘the becoming cognitive of labour’, a peculiar quality of the present transition, where knowledge production and the reconfiguration of labour intersect within the overshadowing hypothesis of cognitive capitalism”. (p. 583).

P. 677 “Writing as Activism”: 
“the thesis that doesn’t make an appearance”;
“unravels dividing points between the art practice and art theory”;
“a work of words” which “critically engages with and dismantles the academic form of essay, through the process of streaking”;
“ruptures academic form and tears it apart”;
”to construct something meaningful and complex in an unconventional way that requires other ways of reading and interpretation”.

in the Inventory, re book 4 – include your references to similar glossaries/tools of artistic research/practice; what is its specificity in relation to standard academic glossaries.
To decide about the status of the following in the books 1-3:

B1, P. 122 – ‘cognitive capitalism’ is a term of J. M. Boutang, not “Italian Autonomist Marxism”.

B1, p. 128. What is that “process of reciprocity Jean-Luc Nancy describes”, and where Nancy describes it?

B3, P. 372. – Seems attributing ‘lines of flight’ to Raunig, not Deleuze which is not correct.

If these have status of a part of a ‘transcript’, that cannot be changed, to stress this (in the Inventory).
In terms of the concepts/terms of the Index, the author refers to the post-Operaismo’s theories in the analysis of ‘cognitive capitalism’, and at the same time in the analysis of critical pedagogy the author seems more inspired by Chantal Mouffe and Ranciere and their understanding of the political – how compatible are those quite different theories and methodologies? Immanentism (philosophical Post-Operaismo such as Negris) vs. radical negativity (Mouffe), a critique of exodus, etc. How you reconcile those perspectives in your artistic practice? Maybe, a short clarification is needed - either here in the abstract or as a correction in book 4 The Index.

2. For book 4:
Amendment to/clarification of the existing definitions in the glossary as we discussed and you clarified in your viva as follows:

Specific terms/articles:

P. 470. Category ‘Affect’ – no references, or links. What is the tradition you’re relying in your understanding affect? This is not clear. Of course, it’s rather a glossary specifically used in your practical work, not an academic dictionary. But still, such categories should be slightly improved in terms of explanations and references.

Another example of the above is the term ‘Theoretical Antagonism.’ Zizek writes on “radical nothingness”, etc. – where? A reference?
P. 471 – category ‘Agency’ is explained by one quote from H. Arendt, in terms of action and reaction, add reflection of differences between ‘action’ and ‘agency’, or argument for their synonymy.

P. 487 Similarly, the entry “Art” is given as a quote from John Roberts’ book but without explanation. Elsewhere, you mention that you share both definitions of art based on the idea of Avant-garde (i.e., in particular, as the transdisciplinary) and, on the other hand, quote understanding of art as a professional discipline. How you combining both?
P. 501 – a description/article on the Chto Delat collective – what this would mean: Chto Delat preoccupied with “representation of historicity”?

P. 496-497. Quite unusual definition of avant-garde – via using “value-less” materials, as opposing commodification. Confer to understanding of historical avant-garde in Peter Burger’s classical “The Theory of Avant-Garde”.

P. 588 – the article refers to Paolo Virno’s notion of “empty space” – to give a reference to particular text by Virno.

Article “Agonism” explained via Chantal Mouffe, but do you have any criticisms related to Mouffe’s theory? For example, an “agonism” or
“antagonism” seems to be an entity ‘per se’, an ‘agonism for the sake of agonism’, abstracted from any political, social or class content in such presentation. Needs some brief reflection.

P. 501. ‘Klinamen’: how it is linked to your practice? As well as in case of a number of some other categories, this might need an explanation. For example, P. 619 – the category of Invisible – with a quote from Derrida’s Specters of Marx (the ghost’s ‘invisible visibility’). How is this linked to your practice? The point on ‘invisible’ is very interesting, but how it is related to specific ‘points’ of your practice (that is documented in the thesis)? Or give a brief comment in your Inventory for such cases in the Index.
P. 595 – You quote Nancy Fraser about the point that capitalism “used” feminism? Add a brief indication to this argument with more details.

P. 620-621 – An issue with logical incoherence in article ‘Knowledge Enclosure’: you write about ‘these contemporary forms of enclosure’ but particular forms (except of replacing critical humanities programmes) are not enumerated.

P. 626-631. ‘Knowledge Production’. You write that the neoliberal/cognitive transformation of the university happened in the condition when “…social relations have become collective and flexible” – add clarification of what do you meant by this?
P. 642-643. You mentioned a lot of fundraising activities around Smart Space, or Out of Line Lab, add context of what you think about fundraising and entrepreneurialism as a part of cognitive capitalism/neoliberalism

P. 648 – in Radical Education you mention Bruno Latour. Add how he is related to Radical Education

P. 652 Reproductive Labour – amend the title of this item as it is misleading, as you speak rather specifically about art and reproductive labour.

P. 660 – Subversion. “One proposal is to alter arts discourse by inserting subversive countenance into the very structures where life and labour under
capital is configured inside the institutions of knowledge and culture”. Insert your clarification.

Adding the following terms (with a brief presentation in couple of sentences) to the glossary with definition relevant to your thesis:

Delegated worker

Script

Transcript

3. Optional

In the spirit of the submission, as examiners, we would like to extend an offer to you to submit a document of responses to the viva. If you wish to take up this offer we would require you to submit this document with your minor corrections – we stress that this is an offer not an obligation and will
not be viewed as a requirement to be met in assessing your submission of minor corrections.

CREATIVE INDUSTRIES:

I negotiate the framework of the Creative Industries through my personal and far-reaching experience working in the cultural sector for more than a decade as the co-director of an internationally renowned art institution and creative industries incubator in Amsterdam before taking up my DPhil in 2012. SMART Project Space (SPS) was a non-profit artist run platform in the old west area of Amsterdam, comprised of gallery spaces for contemporary visual art, cinemas, artist’s studios, a theatre and a media café. My partner,
Thomas Peutz, founded it. He established it in the mid ‘90’s as a reaction to the Stedelijk Museum and its curatorial programme of predominantly male German painting under the directorship of Rudi Fuchs. Taking the initials S and M from the name ‘Stedelijk Museum’ and playing with the concept of domination and submission, he created the name SM art Project Space. He started from scratch with no budget and its programmes could only happen through the generosity and collaboration of others. The itinerant institution curated exhibition programmes, as well as producing various television programmes on night-time local TV showing the most current video art (albeit while you sleep). In 2000 the institution moved to its third building. I was one of 60 other artists, musicians, designers and filmmakers who rented a
studio there. As it was an artist run organisation I joined the team in 2001. Regardless of there being so little budget, we felt we could give the Stedelijk Museum a run for its money. And we did. We were young, ambitious and media savvy. We worked hard. We set about developing what would become one of the most important cultural venues in the City of Amsterdam and the Netherlands that was referred to as the a “Museum of the Future” by the Municipal Government in 2012 in its funding report, granting the institution EUR 300.000 per year, EUR 200.000 a year more than it had ever received. For the first ten years SPS was an itinerant institution with limited funding. We anti-squatted buildings that were earmarked for re-development and turned these into creative industry incubators, developing our own micro
financial systems through renting studios to artists and other creatives on short-lease contracts, before being forced by developers to move on to the next building. We found a group of investors who agreed to help us buy and develop a building specifically for our own purposes. Between 2004-2008, my partner and I developed plans for the financing (EURO 5 million), purchase and renovation of the Pathological and Anatomical Laboratories in the Old West of Amsterdam, as well as developing the artistic vision of the new institution. We liaised with potential investors, the banks, municipal and local council, the tax authorities, funding bodies and lawyers to become the first cultural co-operative model (SMART Estate) in the Netherlands to purchase and develop its own property, now well known in the sector as
a capital development project. We negotiated with
the Government a ‘first of its kind’ tax ruling
where investors could deduct their investment in
the renovation of the building from their income
tax. Eighteen private shares were sold for an
amount of EUR 50.000. Shareholders received
EUR 35.000 tax return on their investment. We
had set up the structure in a way to ensure no sole
shareholder could have full economical ownership
of the property. We were regarded as the first
cultural venue to define in all actuality the creative
industries, before Richard Florida coined it in his
questionable and much quoted book The Rise of the
Creative Class in 2002 at the end of the dot.com
boom. We were cultural entrepreneurs and one of
a so-called new breed of creative class, regardless
of our precarious and unpredictable economic
situation. After successfully running the organisation for more than 10 years, I decided it was time to go back to art school, to take some time to think, and to put a stop to what had become an over production of projects, money and people. Running an organisation of this scale was primarily about fundraising, income generation and human resource management. While curating was one of my core tasks, I spent most of the time with my hands on the economics of the institution. I left my role as director to take up my place on the DPhil. I remained a member on the governing board of the institution until April 2013, leaving after radically opposing decisions taken by the Supervisory Board. Members of the Supervisory Board were under pressure from one of the shareholders who was not a board member,
Frederik Schutte, a government lobbyist and coincidentally the chairperson of the cooperative SMART Estate, to structurally reorganise the institution into a holding, and replace the exhibition programme, filling the gallery spaces with more commercially viable enterprises in the creative industries (such as architecture bureaus and design and software companies who are there now). The Supervisory Board had been pressing the governing board (my partner and I) for some years at that point to organise blockbuster shows, to bring in more patrons and revenue and stop showing the politically engaged projects we were committed to. In conceding to the bully demands and gross allegations of untruths, the Supervisory board led by Frederik Schutte, removed the director and stipulated a gag order that prevented
him from speaking to anyone (staff, artists, press) about the unfolding circumstances. (Several months later, upon negotiation of the terms of termination of my partners contract, the Supervisory Board offered him EUR 5000 on the condition that he never speaks about this to anyone. He refused to be silenced by money). All meetings with the board were audio recorded by my partner. Frederik Schutte in the meantime bought out all the shareholders apart from two that are owned by my partner and myself (each at a value of EUR 35.000). Frederik Schutte is now the economic owner of the property holding most shares and has persistently attempted to devalue our shares from EUR 35.000 to EUR 9.000). The building was valued at EUR 3.5 million in 2012. It is speculated that it will be worth EUR 10-15
million in 2026 when it loses its cultural incubator status that caps square meter rental price (a fixed 20-year contract period from its purchase date in 2006 in which it is stipulated by the local government in the purchase agreement that the property can only be used for cultural purposes during this time), and after this period it can be sold on the commercial market for a commercial price. The non-profit institution SMART Project Space was forced into bankruptcy on 2 July 2013 after the newly instated director Jacqueline Gerritsma failed to gain the support of the cultural funding bodies for her new business plan and vision of the institution and lost the previously secured funding. Schutte and Gerritsma were attempting to make a restart. All the funding bodies pulled the pin on their subsidy
commitments (EUR 2 million over four years).

The organisation was pulled apart and the
inventory sold off. My partner and I have fought a
legal battle for 4 years now asking for the archive
of twenty years of projects, artworks that we
commissioned, where are the artist publications
and exhibition catalogues we made, where is our
intellectual property?

What remains is SMART Estate (of which the
chairperson is Frederick Schutte) an incorporation
that oversees the commercial activities of the café,
cinema and rental of artist’s studios.

This personal battle of the Creative Industries is
not over yet. The real story of the demise of
SMART Project Space will be written in acid.
CRITIQUE:

The etymological root of critique is the Greek ‘kritikos’, meaning ‘to discern’, ‘to distinguish’, or ‘to separate out’. We talk too often about ‘knowledge’, but I prefer to use a replacement word: ‘understanding’. This allows us to think about how ‘what we know’ is exchanged and shared between one person and another as a learning process. To underscore this Gerald Raunig’s essay “What is Critique? Suspension and Recomposition in Textual and Social Machines” gives character to it (Gerald Raunig, “What is Critique? Suspension and Recomposition in Textual and Social Machines”, www.eipcp.net/transversal/0808/raunig/en, first accessed 29 Jan 2013).
Research in and through art is a dynamic system and comes ‘alive’ when we interact with it as collaborators. It requires the ‘critical subject’, or the cognitive labourer ‘to put to work’ various forms of critique.

CULTURAL CONFINEMENT:

In October 1972, Art Forum reprinted a statement Robert Smithson wrote for the Documenta catalogue of that year. The statement was his contribution to the exhibition where he defined art spaces as sites of “cultural confinement”. Smithson writes: “Once the work of art is totally neutralized, ineffective, abstracted, safe, and politically lobotomized it is ready to be consumed by society. All is reduced to visual fodder and transportable merchandise. Innovations are allowed only if they
support this kind of confinement. [...] Confined process is no process at all. It would be better to disclose the confinement rather than make illusions of freedom.” (Robert Smithson, “Cultural Confinement” in Art Forum, October 1972)

DARK MATTER:
The American artist and activist, Gregory Sholette appropriated the term ‘dark matter’ from theoretical astrophysics to describe the glut of creativity and overlooked surplus of professionally trained artists that make up some 98% of the art world; a mass of practitioners who are invisible. Sholette writes: “This shadowy surplus plays a key role in the art world by purchasing art supplies, trade magazines, and museum memberships, while also serving the system in the role of studio
assistants, interns (often unpaid), adjunct teachers (always underpaid), art fabricators and installers and so on.

At the same time this dark matter “surplus” also forms the topographical boundary and backdrop upon which that smaller zone of successful artists and art institutions are brought into visibility.” See his essay “Artists, Embrace your Redundancy,” An Introduction to Gregory Sholette’s "Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise"

http://www.manifestajournal.org/issues/i-forgot-remember-forget/artists-embrace-your-redundancy-introduction-gregory-sholettes-dark#
DEBT:
The educational institution as a site of struggle is further confounded when thinking through the economic commitment many of us bear and the resulting mountain of debt we encumber when undertaking a three year course as the imperative of life long learning. In its orientation towards the market, the institution moulds us into competent and competitive subjects within today’s economic order. Student life is taken up with part-time precarious work. This precarity controls our time. Take for example my own dependency on free labour, self-exploitation and self-enterprise as a non-contracted ghost-writer and editor working for various institutions as outlined in the following personal budget:
### Income Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>£5,000.00</td>
<td>Ruskin School of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income</td>
<td>£6,500.00</td>
<td>Freelance editorial and text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Benefit</td>
<td>£3,168.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Grant</td>
<td>£450.00</td>
<td>Ruskin School of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£15,118.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Fees</td>
<td>£4,995.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fees</td>
<td>£1,960.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>£8,700.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>£1,440.00</td>
<td>Electric, Gas, Internet, Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Dinners</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Books</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School</td>
<td>£1,450.00</td>
<td>January - July only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>£4,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Out</td>
<td>£500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>£500.00</td>
<td>Children’s friends, birthdays,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>£3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>£600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>£31,445.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>£16,327.00</strong></td>
<td>Deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DELEGATED WORKER:

I, the writer and producer of the doctoral project negated the category of authorship, drawing on anti-organisational politics and ‘becoming agent’ based as on Deleuzian lines of flight. The writer here is not the author, rather in Acts 1-3, a performative agent, the ‘Delegated Worker’, shadows or trespasses and speaks on behalf of the writer. I appropriate the term ‘delegated worker’ from my supervisor, Dr. Claire Makhlof’s doctoral thesis on the labouring subject. This is an expanded idea of Claire Bishop’s notion of ‘delegated performance’ (see http://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=gc_pubs).
DESERTION:

In *Factories of Knowledge*, Gerald Raunig suggests desertion as a countermovement, and continues the line of thought supported by Edu-factory. However, he argues it should not be the type of desertion in the sense of military exit, rather desertion as resistance could be in the form of creating other worlds inside the repressive underbelly of the official educational institution. This could be brought about through the power of invention, intervention and dissent, a position tactically inside and strategically outside the system. Hegemonic arrangements of the system are never complete, it is not monolithic, therefore allowing spaces one might slip through, to create rupture and move along a separate path (Gerald Raunig, *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity*,
semiotext(e) 2013, 53). However, this sort of complicity is extremely fragile and risks co-optation by the system as a way of normalising and controlling it. He suggests temporary overlaps in the interstice between teaching and learning, not dissimilar to Bertolt Brecht’s strict form of learning play, his anti-fascist works developed in the 1930’s at a time of rising fascism in Europe. (Ibid, 57)

DISSENSUS:

In his 2010 publication *Dissensus*, Jacques Rancière characterises the innovative activities of aesthetics and politics as forms of dissensus. In other words, “the disruption that they effect is not simply a reordering of the relations of power between existing groups; dissensus is not an institutional overturning. It is an activity that cuts across forms
of cultural and identity belonging and hierarchies between discourses and genres, working to introduce new subjects and heterogeneous objects into the field of perception.” (Rancière: 2010, 2)

The activities of dissensus, by effecting an egalitarian disruption of the dominant order, radically challenge what is considered proper to the domain of social distribution.

DOCTORAL RESEARCH:

In *The Pleasure of Research* published by the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts in 2012, the Dutch educator and curator Henk Slager describes the importance of a doctoral research environment that offers novel, experimental sanctuary for pure, temporary autonomous artistic research. He stresses the importance of PhD research as the reformulation
and actualisation of the academy’s original task of creative autonomy. He concludes that doctoral research should be the core and consciousness of the art academy, supplying different forms of visual production and critical consciousness that is aware of its responsibility to push back the forces of neoliberalism and the homogenising rhetoric of the creative industries.

DOUBLE AGENT:
A spy who works on behalf of mutually hostile countries, usually with actual allegiance only to one. — Oxford English Dictionary

ECONOMY:
In the recent publication Revolutionary Time and the Avant Garde, John Roberts analyses the changes in
contemporary art through rethinking the Avant-garde. He formulates various terms and concepts to give shape to the new forces and relations in art. He defines the idea of art’s ‘first’ economy and introduces a ‘second’ economy that underwrites contemporary art production, artistic labour and arts reception. This second economy aligns to Gregory Sholette’s concept of ‘dark matter’.

EDUCATION:

“We can thus dream of a society of the emancipated that would be a society of artists. Such a society would repudiate the division between those who know and those who don’t, between those who possess or don’t possess the property of intelligence.” Jacques Rancière, The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual
Emancipation, intro and trans. by Kristin Ross,
(Stanford University Press, 1991)

The etymological Latin root of education lie in e + ducere which means to lead or draw out. In the Enlightenment sense of the word the highest goal in life is to inquire and create, to think critically and create alternatives to well worn models. The goal of education was to produce free people. The contemporary educational system demonstrates an opposing concept of education as indoctrination and a framework of following orders, which imposes a life of conformity and the opposite of freedom and emancipation that comes from Enlightenment.
EDUCATIONAL TURN:

A field of expanded academia that has been termed the ‘educational turn’ emerged in the 1990’s as a preeminent mode of address and knowledge production (See Tom Holert, ‘Art in the Knowledge Based Polis’, E-Flux Journal No. 3 Feb 2009). Using the discourse of social theory relating to education, the ‘educational turn’ coined by Irit Rogoff in 2008, describes a contemporary curatorial and artistic tendency on the theme of education, that uses alternative pedagogical methods and models to critique the hierarchical functioning of art academies and what has been called the homogenising administrative policy such as the Bologna Process of the EU member states. (Though not an Act, the Bologna Process is an agreement between 46 EU countries orientated
towards standardising university degrees. Critique has been formulated around the Bologna Process as it underscores, assessment and output and university ranking). In a turn away from the official art academy, educational praxis (education, research, knowledge production and learning) became a core feature of art production and curatorial practice across contemporary art’s globalised stage of the state sponsored biennale and museums, reflecting the artworld’s drive to underpin the corporatisation of official art education and the homogenisation of European education. At the same time it was a contested proposition with regard to contemporary knowledge production and its close alignment with cognitive capitalism (Marion von Oosten). More profoundly, one of the contradictions of this
educational turning today is that the high profile voices occupying the central thesis of the educational turn are the very same voices that seek to impose rigid policing of education’s ambivalent relationships and its borders inside the official educational site through processes of measurement and validation.

I had entered this doctoral project by aligning my concerns with an educational turn away from official art education, making the claim that official education in art has been superseded by the educational turn. Following the field of expanded academy that had informed many of my previous curatorial projects (Alicia Framis’s Moon Academy in collaboration with the European Space Agency (2010); Chto Delat?’s 48 Hour Seminar & Learning
Play ‘Where Has Communism Gone?’ (2011);

Tiong Ang’s ‘As the Academy Turns’ (2012)) my claim called on whether we still need official art education acerbically called on by Dieter Lesage in his E-Flux essay, ‘The Academy is Back: On Education, the Bologna Process, and the Doctorate in Art’, he writes: “if the art field becomes an academic one, then what an academy has to offer can also be found elsewhere, at other institutions and self-organised initiatives constituting the field of expanded academia”.

Lesage writes then we don’t need the academy, its function apparently being better served in the extra institutional space of the artworld.

To approach this uneasy proposition as it takes place inside the official educational space of an
elite university, I chose to take a position of
opposition against my original claim so that I could
fully test my own assumptions and essentially what
I felt were biases informed outside of academia. To
counter this I made the claim that the ‘educational
turn’ in art is finished and that while its effects
have not disappeared, it no longer constitutes a
viable transformative social or political practice. In
the framework of this doctoral project led through
practice, and by beginning at an end point, I set
about firstly denying the voice of the critical
educators and creative actors associated with these
efforts of the past twenty years – many of whom
penchantedly reside within and supervise the broken
walls of university art faculties – however
paradoxically tentative this might be. I came to
closer to an understanding that in the egalitarian
presupposition of the educational turn, what was to be a heteronomous encounter with the world, this ‘turning’ away from the official institution of art education did not realise its political claim to transform the communities they expressed concern about. Rather, these concerns facilitated discussions that circulated within an international cultural field where “knowledge is only knowledge” that talks to itself, but is not “the control of knowledge – that is politics.” (Bruce Sterling, Distraction, Spectra 1998). What is relevant here and in line with Dieter Lesage’s argumentation (Lesage avidly argues for the official art institutional education.) is the recognition that for the most part these contemporary modes of educational ‘turning’ did not take place inside the art academy itself. Rather, the expanded notion of the academy
turned inside the smooth public space of the museum and was rigged alongside the opportunistic rhetoric and economics of the global biennial – itself a closed system of recognition, acknowledgement, payment and gratitude. The more time spent away from the ‘outside’ arena of the art world, I came to understand that the failure of the ‘educational turn’ is that it did not play a role or was not strategically ‘put to work’ inside the devalued and hyper-regulated zones of European corporate art education as a way towards reimagining and deepening the notion of the academy and its role as such. If the efficacy of art itself is its power to produce effects outside of itself (Rancière), I took the university as a paradigmatic site and the last frontier of possibilities in this educational turning.
The incorporation of pedagogy into art was imported in fashionable exhibitions such as *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y* at MuHKA and Van Abbe Museum Eindhoven, see Irit Rogoff, “Turning,” *e-flux* journal, no. 0 (November 2008); Manifesta 6 (2006) an art school in Cyprus that was subsequently cancelled by the government authorities, see Mai Abu ElDahab, “On How to Fall With Grace – Or Fall Flat on Your Face,” in *Notes for an Art School*, ed. Mai Abu ElDahab, Anton Vidokle, and Florian Waldvogel (Amsterdam: International Foundation Manifesta; Nicosia: Manifesta 6, 2006), Anton Vidokle went on to realise the project in part as the *unitednationsplaza* in Berlin. Other examples, Copenhagen Free University, Night School at the New Museum (2008), As the Academy Turns as
part of Manifesta 8 in Murcia, are ascribed to the educational turn. For a comprehensive overview of the educational turn in contemporary art, visit Tranzit’s curatorial dictionary:

http://tranzit.org/curatorialdictionary/index.php/dictionary/educational-turn

In the continuum of advanced (global) struggles as they are profoundly felt today, and the continued onslaught of the global crisis, these pedagogic efforts of which I too have been part of, seem to have been unable to transform lives and circumstances in any real and meaningful way. Since the start of the new millennium, teachers and researchers, students and artists, curators and theorists were unable to foresee or grasp the extent of what was unfolding, debt, dispossession and
dislocation, while a new form of capitalist accumulation has hollowed out and destroyed the last vestiges of an education for the common good. This permanent crisis rolls over our social media feeds everyday, acknowledged by the mainstream media, students, governments and economists. The inability of the art world to transform education, follows on from the critical analysis on social art practice and its inability to actually intervene and forge real transformation of issues of social struggle, gentrification, prostitution, mass tourism, migration and so on, as mapped out by the Brussels based research bureau BAVO in their publication *Too Active to Act* (Valiz, 2010). It is this context that subtends the doctoral project *The Politics of Knowledge That Leads Elsewhere*. It disembarks from the recent discourse on the
educational turn, propounded by cultural theorists for more than two decades; Irit Rogoff, Florian Waldvogel, Anton Vidokle, Tom Holert, Dieter Roelstraete, Felicity Allen, Paul O’Neill and Mick Wilson, Beatrice von Bismarck and Diedrich Diederichsen, who took leave of the contested site of the academy, rather than deepening further the concept of the academy (Lesage). Many of these academic cultural theorists and practitioners could now be described as accreditors of the educational system and the processes of standardisation, efficiency and quantifiability of artistic research (See University Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK. Irit Rogoff has been a panel member of the Teaching, Learning and Research REF2014, http://www.aah.org.uk/jobs/142), and perform an integral part of university audit
procedures that Gigi Roggero terms “the empty shells of hierarchization and measure”.

(Inroduction to the *Production of Living Knowledge*, 4).

There have been some exceptions of course along the way, particularly the work of artists including Stephan Dillemuth, Tania Bruguera, Pablo Helguera, Ahmet Öğüt and Marion von Osten, who continue to see the critical importance of the educational turn to the art world.

This doctoral project, in a counter movement, searches inside the site of the university for ‘the becoming cognitive of labour’, a peculiar quality of the present transition, where knowledge production and the reconfiguration of labour
intersect within the overshadowing hypothesis of cognitive capitalism. Here lies the battlefield of knowledge production that underlines not only the crisis in education but also a double bind with the economic crisis. This doctoral project is a continuation of the practice of struggles (class struggle and inherent power relations) within and against knowledge production under the hypothesis of cognitive capitalism.

Since 2006, Edu-factory and Uni-Nomade, have grappled with and interrogated the notion of the university as a paradigmatic site of conflict and social struggle. Theorists, researchers and artists have challenged the mediated conditions by which we acquire knowledge, questioning the paucity of pedagogic theory that underwrites knowledge.
transfer in the corporate university through its
distribution of power structures, procedures of
validation and the extraordinary exercise of power
over who is allowed to speak, what is said and with
what authority that makes ‘really existing
education’ a site of profound conflict and
unhappiness rather than a responsive process of
transformation. Marina Vishmidt writes, “the
humanist open-endedness found in the radical as
well as the liberal ideals of education fits well with
the nostalgia for modernist autonomy defining the
state of play in art production, curation and all the
intermediate forms which traverse them. But the
educational impulse also promotes a state of play
that resists sacrificing the credibility, and the
possibilities, of the last several decades of ‘social
practices’. The promise of indeterminacy, or even
of self-determination, entailed in any education process is alluring, although beset by the pitfalls of valorising education when the way it is experienced by most people – as industrial and inimical to any non-goal orientated experimentation – tends to nullify political militancy, artistic inquiry or any risk-taking behaviour not mandated by an employer or workfare programme. Beyond economic imperatives, the unhappiness of the encounter between ‘education’ as an emancipatory trope and ‘really existing education’ can also be seen in the negation of indeterminacy by the class divisions which art institutions and education institutions live off in every sense.” (See Marina Vishmidt’s essay “Creation Myth” 28 July 2010, accessed 3 October 2015,
EDU-FACTORY:

From the student’s and precarious workers struggles, the slogan, “what was once the factory is now the university.” indicates a political problem and a possible knot that connects the term factory and university. (The Edu-factory Collective, “Towards a Global Autonomous University”, 2).

The slogan was an affirmation set in motion by the Edu-factory Collective. ‘University as factory’ is read here as a metaphor. Edu-factory presents the paradox to expose a potential referent for a counter-movement with the essential qualities of the factory, not only as a place of production, but also as an expanding place of struggle, resistance
and organising that takes place inside the university - as once was the factory in industrial capitalism.

Established in 2006, Edu-factory emerged as a form of struggle for cognitive workers in contemporary cognitive capitalism to radically rethink knowledge production, the constitution of autonomous institutions and the construction of the common, as social relations and political struggles are becoming increasingly immaterial.

The network argues: “these struggles allow us to read the materiality of the processes of knowledge production through social relations. Here the cognitivisation of class hierarchy, salary regulation and the division of labour, beyond the already surpassed dialectic between centre and periphery, between first and third world. In other words, these processes permit us to situate the new field
of conflict on a terrain where the processes of capitalist subsumption and valorisation, far from disappearing, are compelled to recompose the forms of command over the autonomy of living knowledge, after having been forced to definitively renounce their capacity to organize them.” (The Edu-factory Collective, ‘Towards a Global Autonomous University’, 5)

EMPTY SPACE:

I borrow Paulo Virno’s adopted Adornian term ‘empty space’ to describe the format of the seminar as a discursive site of arts emergence, its unmapped social relations and ideational forms within arts discourse. (Paulo Virno, The Dismeasure of Art: An Interview with Paulo Virno, interview by Sonja Lavaert and Pascal Gielen (2009). See
Act 3 of the research project emerges from the ‘empty space’ over time. It uses artistic praxis – as an eventual process to emancipate labour from its condition of becoming cultural and colonised through discourse. I draw on the post-workerist reconnection with and emancipation of the labour process, in this case, the reconnection between art and labour as in classical constructivism, “the worker becoming artist, and the artist becoming worker”. (Roberts, Revolutionary Time: 242-243)

EXIT VOICE LOYALTY:

I first came across Albert Hirshmann in a business management book. Then his name appeared again in Gigi Roggero’s publication *The Production of Living Knowledge* that I was reading while
researching the knowledge commons for Act 2 of this project.

Hirshmann has some traction in the post-workerist scene that Roggero is part of. Hirshmann revived the field of political science four decades ago when he wrote a perceptive treatise *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organisations and States*. He elaborated on two strategies for citizens and consumers to respond to their dissatisfaction, exit (for a member or customer to leave the organisation) or voice (for a member or customer to agitate, and influence change from inside the organisation). While loyalty might lead one to suffer in silence, the exit option is similar to fleeing from a nation or refusing to buy a product.
FEMINISM:

I keep a newspaper cutting on my wall that I use as a visual point of reference. It’s of me outside the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam with the Guerrilla Girls as a Guerrilla Girl, holding a banner saying “White Balls on Walls”. (see http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/1995/11/20/demonstratie-guerrilla-girls-in-amsterdam-7289040 and http://www.anp-archief.nl/page/2157961/nl ). I was twenty-two when the article appeared. At the time I was a postgraduate student at the Rijksakademie in Amsterdam. I was making performances and video works concerning the libidinal economy. On a dank November day in 1995, I stood on the steps of the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam. I was wearing a Gorilla mask. Käthe Kollwitz had phoned me in my
Rijksakademie studio the previous afternoon. She’d asked me if I wanted to join her and Frida Kahlo the following day, to rally during the press preview of the exhibition *The American Perspective*, which was about to open at the Museum. The Guerilla Girls maintain their anonymity by taking on the names of dead women artists. The exhibition represented a dialogue between artists in America and Europe at the end of the 20th Century. A selection of one hundred and twenty paintings from the Witney Museum collection in New York and one hundred paintings from the Stedelijk Museum collection in Amsterdam were brought together. Of all the artists in the exhibition only two were women, Georgia O’Keefe and Agnes Martin. While second wave feminism was a slow dying fish in the water for many who already believed we were fully
emancipated during my art school education of the post-modernist years in the mid 1990’s, it was empowering to have performed with these women as a Guerrilla Girl, albeit for one day. This profound experience, being cold and empowered all at once - an aping gorilla holding a banner - was the start of a journey that gave me the confidence to absorb, question and test the politically meaningful connection between feminism and contemporary art. Something I’ve approached many times is how important a feminist pedagogy is towards helping a younger generation of women oppose the material terms of gender-based oppression. To return to the newspaper clipping and thinking through what an education in the field of art is, that was the moment my practice
became profoundly politicised. I keep this in view as a vector point in that realisation.

It is from a place that sides with a current of feminist praxis known as material feminism that is informed by historical materialism in the broadest sense and which became particularly important in the early years of second wave feminism, which this project hopes to contribute to. My research has consistently engaged art as a platform for political intervention and has primarily focused on the impact of the knowledge economy on social art practice and the ‘educational turn’ in curating that appeared during the early part of the twenty-first century. Drawing on Marxist and feminist thinking, my research increasingly focuses on art and the production of an economic and gendered subject as it labours.
This project tries to configure a politically meaningful engagement of feminist social praxis with art as it is shaped by neo-liberal capitalism. According to data provided by the World Bank, this mode of production regulates women’s lives, keeping most women in poverty.

Feminist scholars such as Hester Eisenstein and twenty years later, Nancy Fraser, have argued that capitalism has used feminism to its advantage and continues today. Fraser writes:

“… a more complex and disturbing possibility: that the diffusion of cultural attitudes born out the second wave has been part and parcel of another social transformation, unanticipated and unintended by feminist activists – a transformation in the social organisation of postwar capitalism”.
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A meaningful feminist counter-offensive in art enunciates a left politics, a materialist or even Marxist feminism. There is an increasing appeal of Marxist art scholarship to artists in recent decades and particularly in the present. The depiction of women’s work and working women for example, be it waged or unwaged labour, has challenged the normatively male gender of the ‘productive worker’ making a visible imprint in the contemporary archive of the art world to reveal the ‘hidden abode of reproduction’ (Kathi Weeks) that is the invisible and un-monetised subject of capitalism.
Although we might say that we are in a dynamic feminist present, there remains a deficit in this field of enquiry in feminist art theory. Feminist politics requires that the arts must rethink the demands articulated during the ‘70s, canonised the golden age of ‘art feminism’ in the West. Feminism must re-introduce itself specifically as a politics. This implies both a feminist polis, a terrain of collective participation where power and interests are addressed. Given however the ideology of atomisation through self expression in the arts, which is necessary for the culture of competition that upholds the art world and its institutional spaces and places in terms of sales, visibility, recognition etc, can we insist on the practice of feminism as a form of social reproduction, as a process in and of itself, challenging authorship and
identity, rather than countering it only through theoretical writing in the capitalist art world? What I’ve tried to insert here throughout this research project is a fully practiced method of feminism as opposed to feminism as a mere concept to be discussed and written about in field of contemporary art?

The above clarifies an expanded framework of common inquiry across the spectrum of subjects and identities that occupy the contemporary art world. There is a resurgent strand of art practice that started taking shape in the early part of the twenty-first century where the artist identifies with the worker as a way to challenge the root of value relations in art and up-end the capitalist order. See the work of Mierle Laderman Ukeles, Lee Lozano,
Mary Kelly, Andrea Fraser, Ursula Biemann, Pilvi Takala and Mika Rottenberg, women artists who have ‘storied’ the entropic qualities of gendered reproductive and social labour. Much of this work is a powerful allegorisation of how this labour can be de-naturalised and shows it as an activity that can be evacuated of all its necessity and naturalness. There is an important attitude of negation here that understands antagonistic occupation, not only in art practice, but is aligned directly to the everyday life of women in general and their radical incorporation as workers in capitalist society.

Silvia Federici in her highly cogent book *Caliban and the Witch* interprets the historical suppression of woman under capital’s enclosures and addresses
“the increasing loss among new generations of the historical sense of our common past.” Federici calls for ‘commoning’ as an objective of feminism, and to make it the condition of our struggles. She outlines how the advent of capital devalued women’s social position, and how capital separated production from reproduction. Capital sustains itself by dividing binaries such as public and private, personal and political. This terrain of exploitation continues with the present intensification of witch hunting in Africa and Brazil where thousands of women are burned and hanged; these are the female subjects that she writes capital needs to abolish: the heretic, the healer, the disobedient wife or the woman who dared to live alone. Federici argues fervidly that we urgently need to construct an alternative form of
social cooperation and she underlines the importance of the continuity and transition of knowledge through situating our lives in common.

PAULO FREIRE:
The influential Brazilian theorist of dialogue and radical educator, Paulo Freire whose *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* was first published in 1968 and translated into English in 1970, created an approach to emancipatory education through which to transform systems of oppression and inequality. Freire argues: “In the culture of silence the masses are ‘mute’, that is they are prohibited from creatively taking part in the transformation of their society and therefore prohibited from being.” (See Paulo Freire, *Cultural Action for Freedom*, trans. Myra Ramos, New York: Penguin, 1975, 30).
Freire’s complex vision of pedagogical and political foundations asks for creative synthesis and ways of applying education that cannot be left to chance. He terms the hegemonic, mainstream form of pedagogic application “banking education” and delivers an alternative humanising pedagogy based on dialogue, critical questioning and praxis that aims to construct autonomous subjects who are able to liberate themselves. If we look at one of the two Enlightenment conceptions of education, one was the image of pouring water into an empty vessel, which could be equated with the banking model (and the second is the idea is that education is like assisting a flower to grow in its own way). Freire embraces a relationship of dialogue in which the teacher and the pupil become “jointly responsible for the process in which all grow”.
Freire writes “in cultural invasion, the actors… superimpose themselves on the people who are assigned the role of spectators, of objects. In cultural synthesis, the actors become integrated with the people, who are co-authors of the action that both perform on the world.” (See Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 68) The broad influence of Freire’s methodology endures today, not just in education but also in social art practice, as dialogue, critical reflection and participatory action. According to Freire, transforming the world requires an inversion of the “banking” model, and in its place, the construction of an emancipatory education, one of organising and of action. Freire inspired the movement “critical pedagogy” which has been applied by the Landless Workers Movement in Brazil, the Zapatistas in Mexico and
World Social Forums. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* Freire writes: “Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.” (Ibid) It is only by adopting this approach that we can challenge the ‘culture of silence’. (Paulo Freire, *Cultural Action for Freedom*, Penguin, 1975, 30)

GENERAL INTELLECT:

In order to approach the uneasy question of cognitive capitalism and cognitive labour it is necessary to understand the historical
circumstances and the various contemporary
approaches that can be assigned to knowledge
production, appropriation of the ‘general intellect’
and the educational paradigm. Marx briefly
introduced the concept of the ‘General Intellect’ in
the ‘Fragment on Machines’, part of his vast
unpublished notebook Grundrisse written in 1857.
(www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/gr
undrisse/index.html, converted to ebook by
rather optimistically predicts that the future of
capital depends not on (manual) labour power, but
rather on technology, as technology will have
reduced labour time, and for this reason sources of
economic value will be embedded in society in
general through the “development of the general
powers of the human head”; “general social
knowledge”; “social intellect”; and the “general productive forces of the social brain”.


Autonomist Marxists, Jean Paul Vincent, Antoni Negri, Michael Hardt and Maurizio Lazzarato have taken the concept of the ‘General Intellect’ as a liberating central term for understanding the current “post-fordist” economy and the endlessly mutating potential of human subjectivity itself, its verbal ability, cultural, technical, and ethical ways-of-doing-things. To understand this set of knowledges afforded to everyone they use a follow on term ‘mass intellect’ or ‘immaterial labour’ and
‘affective labour’ (Hardt and Negri). This “mass intellectuality” supports the commodity production of high-tech economies and is distributed through the continuous communication networks, in particular the Internet (Cognitive Capitalism and the Contested Campus, 73). Jean Paul Vincent writes that the general intellect is a labour of networks and a communicative discourse. (See Jean Paul Vincent ‘Les Automatismes Sociaux et le ‘General Intellect’, Future Anterieur 1993, 127). It is (in)formed and distributed within these complex networks and high tech communications that are the defining characteristics of cognitive capitalism. Autonomist Marxist’s argue that what it is unable to do however is to contain these networks. It is unable to fully take control of the general intellect’s rhizomatic connections. Following this, Lawrence
Lessig defines general intellect as a ‘commons’ as it involves cooperation and collaboration and is cultivated within these complex networks. Postfordist (cognitive) capitalism appropriates surplus value from the embodied social know-how of the general intellect, from our entire lives in all their completeness.

GOBLIN:

Helen Macfarlane, was a Scottish Chartist and a feminist revolutionary journalist and philosopher. She wrote under the pseudonym Howard Morton. Macfarlane is known for her 1850 translation into English of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

*Communist Manifesto* that appeared in a leading chartist newspaper the Red Republican in 1850.

Macfarlane specifically used the language of the forest commons. For example, “hob” was the name of a country labourer and “goblin” a precocious sprite belonged to folk discourse that presupposed the commons.

IDENTITY:

Our identity and agency is forged through our desires, passions, own stories and knowledge, and these perform an intimate relationship with power. Always fractured, identity tussles between being both willing agent and potential resister. It is through our stories, those we circulate and those
we seek, each one of us being the full embodiment of that partial and singular discourse which chooses to believe, to act, to flee, or resist.

THE IGNORANT SCHOOLMASTER:
Freire’s ideas preceded the provocative theory by Jacques Rancière in his tentative 1987 book *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* (subtitled *Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, English Translation 1991). Rancière interweaves historical record and philosophy to praise equality (one of Rancière’s enduring themes), locating oppression and subjection in the noble act of ‘explaining’. The book’s narrative centres round the work of the French revolutionary and educational philosopher Joseph Jacotet (1770-1840) who was exiled from France after the reinstatement of the Monarchy in
1815. He acquired a lecture post at the University of Louvain in the Netherlands. Jacotet had no knowledge of Flemish and his students were unable to speak French. He gave his students a bilingual copy of the widely read didactic novel Telemaque by Fenelon. His students quickly managed to write and converse in French without any form of explication. This took him on a philosophical experiment leading to a fundamental precept ‘Universal Education’, meaning that everyone is of equal intelligence. All that is required is to influence the will to learn. (Jean Philippe Deranty. *Jacques Rancière Key Concepts*, Acumen, 2010, 26) Jacotet suggests we learn only what we teach ourselves and that explication is not necessary to remedy the incapacity to understand. Thought should form from below, not through
hierarchical relations from above. Explication is the generative principle of the process of socialization, of inequality and the nexus of domination and submission that systematically creates the master and serf. He called this the principle of (re)enforced stultification. Jacotot’s method of teaching was one of emancipation, in that learning is a matter of will, “that every common person might conceive his human dignity, take the measure of his intellectual capacity and decide how to use it.” (Rancière, The Ignorant Schoolmaster, 17) The Ignorant Schoolmaster contains one of Rancière’s most critical assertions of contemporary life, that authority and knowledge equates to politics and this is defined by the inequality of intelligence. This structural inequality of our times kills the notion of the democratic
process and is a tool for silencing resistance of the constitutionally ‘ignorant’: “What stultifies the common people is not the lack of instruction, but the belief in the inferiority of their intelligence.” (Ibid, 29)

Though his ideas had fallen into oblivion by the middle of his own century, Jacotet’s eccentric intervention in the field of pedagogy allows Rancière to reassess democratic political agency, setting in motion a validation of the equality of intelligence, a process of subjectification through which the people might define for themselves how their living conditions can be improved. In order to sketch the relationship between politics and art, Rancière returned to Jacotet’s lessons in emancipation in his 2008 book, *The Emancipated*
Spectator (English Translation 2009). While contemporary art and social life have little in common with that of Jacotet’s two centuries ago, Rancière has used the theory to propose that many forms of revolutionary art, while attempting to activate the spectator, fail to notice intelligence at work in each spectator. Rancière writes:

“Emancipation begins when we dismiss the opposition between looking and acting and understand that the distribution of the visible itself is part of the configuration of domination and subjection. It starts when we realize that looking is also an action that confirms or modifies that distribution, and that interpreting the world is already a means of transforming it, of reconfiguring it.” (Jacques Rancière, Emancipated Spectator, 277). A conception of an emancipation of
the arts lies in the interpretive activity of translation, presupposing the equality of intelligence and the knowledge that any spectator is capable of translating and appropriating the material presented.

ILLTH:

John Ruskin called the unmeasured, unintended harms caused by capital markets “illth.” (David Bollier, *Think Like a Commoner*, 109)

IMMATERIAL LABOUR:

Distinct to the hypothesis of cognitive capitalism is the type of work under the information epoch that is termed ‘immaterial labour’ defined by Maurizio Lazzarato, Antoni Negri and Michael Hardt as the labour that produces the informational, cultural, or
affective component of the commodity. (See Maurizio Lazzarato, ‘Immaterial Labour’ in Paulo Virno and Michael Hardt (eds.) Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1996, 261)

Attendant to the discourse on ‘cognitive capitalism’ is the quality of work under the information epoch termed ‘immaterial labour’ defined by Maurizio Lazzarato, Antoni Negri and Michael Hardt as the labour “that produces the informational, cultural, or affective element of the commodity.” (Ibid: 261)

Under cognitive capitalism universities are sites of immaterial labour. The production of ‘immaterial labour in training’ as the emergent commodity, the student, is taught and shaped by other immaterial labourers, the tutors. An “extraordinary exercise of
supervision and surveillance, involving complex procedures of attributing rights to know and/or rights of access to knowledge which are at the same time procedures of exclusion” are applied (Nick Dyer Witheford, *Cognitive Capitalism And The Contested Campus*, 74).

The management of knowledge is a process “of producing success and failure, of integrating legitimating knowledges and disqualifying illegitimate knowledges, that is, ones contrary to the reproduction of capital. It needs individuals to know what they are doing, but only up to a certain point. Capitalist management and a whole series of institutions (particularly of education) are trying to limit the usage of knowledges produced and transmitted. In the name of profitability and
immediate results, they are prohibiting connections
and relationships that could profoundly modify the
structure of the field of knowledge.” (Ibid, 74)

INSTITUTIONAL CRITIQUE:
Simon Sheikh prioritises what Julia Bryan-Wilson
has termed ‘the curriculum of institutional critique’,
an internalised mode of auto critique inside the
knowledge forming institution that questions the
role of education in its socio-economic and hyper-
disciplined form. I align this with artistic labour,
performed in the local site of the pedagogic
seminar, as the activity of cognitive mapping
through discourse. The dialogic process in the
seminar room is a diffuse social system involved in
defining and fixing artistic standards, tastes, norms
and importantly, opinion.
INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROJECT:
Between September 2012 and May 2013 I was in the initial stages of developing an International network project that was to come together through an exchange programme. I was accepted onto the graduate research programme at the Ruskin School of Art with this project.

The aim was to imagine new self organised temporalities, collective work and “streaking” within a knowledge community. I was leading the research investigation and outlining the framework of International partnerships and workshops. The international partners included Geert Lovink, cultural theorist (Institute of Network Culture Amsterdam), David Graeber, Department of Anthropology, LSE London; Matthew Jesse
Jackson, Our Literal Speed, Chicago, and institutional partner Visual Artists Ireland in exchange with Templebar Gallery in Dublin, Void in Derry and Golden Thread Gallery Belfast. We would develop a series of pedagogic workshops along with a number of transversal artist run schools - Wael Shawky’s MASS in Alexandria, Chto Delat’s School of Engaged Art and the School of Missing Studies at the Sandberg Academy in Amsterdam. I completed six grant applications for funding (funding applications were as follows: European Cultural Commission European Voluntary Service (granted); E-Cultuur Creative Industries (not granted); EU Commission Corporation Grants (withdrawn); Northern Ireland Arts Council (not granted); Amsterdam Funds for the Arts (not granted); Leverhulme Trust (not
submitted)) to raise EUR 250.000 to support the exchange workshops during the period September 2014 and December 2015.

With my then thesis supervisor Malcolm Bull, I was in the process of preparing an application to the Leverhulme Trust where my supervisor would be the lead investigator. It was an exciting approach to a practice led doctoral research project and the start of my ideas around co-research doctorates in the Fine Arts, where the all participants collaborate in the research, thereby removing authorial positions. Application for funding was the most important part of the initial phase of the research.
### Budget: International Exchange Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium Lecture series 10x honorarium</td>
<td>€ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures travel and hotel</td>
<td>€ 4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium workshops leaders 5x</td>
<td>€ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop travel and hotel</td>
<td>€ 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reader (Sprinter)</td>
<td>€ 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 18,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**phase 4 - Alexandria/Oxford**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop and lecture programme</td>
<td>€ 12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical reader</td>
<td>€ 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel &amp; Travel</td>
<td>€ 9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update website &amp; publicity</td>
<td>€ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 26,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration, accountancy, reporting</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rental (x24 months)</td>
<td>€ 4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity and marketing</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final publication critical reader</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production costs exhibition</td>
<td>€ 18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 52,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam Fund for the Arts</td>
<td>€ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSBfonds</td>
<td>€ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverhulme Trust London (via University of Oxford)</td>
<td>€ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission Co-operation Grant</td>
<td>€ 65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>€ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts Ireland</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COVER</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was a timely and relevant body of work. Geert Lovink was my external Amsterdam based supervisor and I felt that his knowledge would prove to be very valuable when developing new ways to access dissenting knowledges. As I was living in Amsterdam, the primary venue for the first series of workshops was SMART Project Space. The organisation was also the main institutional partner making the grant applications for funding on the projects behalf. The outcome of these exchange workshops would have provided the raw material for my practice and would have resulted in three printed publications. The Dutch leg of this project was amputated along with the other activities at SMART Project Space. I had to consider how to twist this into another form when making the move to Oxford. The game plan would
look very different using Oxford as the main site.
Having settled in Oxford in January 2014, several weeks later my research project was invalidated during my transfer of status Viva. It was suggested that I should develop it at a national level only but knowing funding routes, I couldn’t see how I would find funding for this in the UK when one of the few places that finances such projects is the Leverhulme Trust who finance internationally connected knowledge exchange projects. As the project reportedly didn’t demonstrate an artistic practice, nor showed my own authorship, examiners didn’t validate it at my first transfer Viva. The possessive individualistic problematic of a practice led doctoral project set me on a new route that looks at the mechanisms and ways in which art practice as doctoral research is measured,
what happens when the value of the research is moved to another register. When located in an elite university context, I’m interested in how I position myself with regard to the problematic around the meta-discourse of art from a practice-led position and how this develops in a certain context of output evaluation at the University of Oxford.

INVISIBLE:

In Act 3 of the research project, I took leave as it where, from the contentious institutional space where learning and teaching takes place. A strike, an exit – a slow, procedural and tactical move, disappearing from visibility and institutional contagion. The intervention did not end at the point of the invisible, the passive removal of myself (a post-operatist mode of exodus). The
performative other, the intruder, the trespasser who spoke on my behalf, the other body of the intervention responded over scores of conversations, to make the strike accessible to others, where my voice, the absent student, the absconded, remains concealed as a continuum of the strike. This performative interruption was necessary in order to show the field of contention that learning and teaching actually is, but should not be.

Making visible the invisible draws on a Derrida citation: “For there is no ghost, there is never any becoming spectre of the spirit without at least the appearance of flesh, in a space of invisible visibility like the disappearing of an apparition. For the ghost, there must be a return to the body, but to a

**KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY:**

A diagnosis of the fields of contemporary knowledge and cultural work can be found in Gerald Raunig’s publication *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity*. When determining terminologies he writes: “Knowledge economy, knowledge age, knowledge based economy, knowledge management, cognitive capitalism – these terms for the current social situation speak volumes. Knowledge becomes a commodity, which is manufactured, fabricated and traded like
material commodities.” (Greald Raunig, Factories of Knowledge, 17)

KNOWLEDGE ENCLOSURE:

Reading through the lens of autonomist Marxism (general intellect, cognitive capitalism, immaterial labour, biopower, and multitude), in his essay “Cognitive Capitalism And The Contested Campus”, Nick Dyer-Witheford acknowledges an anti-capitalist ‘mirror world’ that rises within and against and the corporate university - “conceived and funded by policy elites as research facilities and training grounds for the creation of the new intellectual properties and technocultural subjectivities necessary to a post-Fordist accumulation regime”. Emerging within Universities in recent years are new movements
and struggles against the knowledge as profit economy that Dyer-Witheford writes is incited by cognitive capitalism’s expropriation of the university. These movements connect to social circuits and to other movements outside. However, he warns that dissent and revolutionary opposition may find themselves de-legitimised through the closures of intellectual space, the exercise of supervision and surveillance, procedures of exclusion (who has the right to know, or access to knowledge), the integration of legitimating knowledges and illegitimate knowledges, as well as the replacement of study programmes, those deemed of no use to industry, or considered as subversive as is happening in many university Arts & Humanities faculties throughout the UK. There are proposals to remove critical post-colonial

He argues that these contemporary forms of knowledge enclosures require the “pacifying and restructuring of academia” and this is compounded further by hiked student fees and mounting student debt. The risks are too high for student dissent.

New activisms are needed to disrupt the apparatus of cognitive capital and its adherence to continuous marketisation, activisms to build
networks of alternative research and counter flows from below. Dyer-Witheford stresses the role of the mass intellect within the university as key to new counter activisms. What capital seeks, he says: “in its invasion of academia is the creativity and experimentation of immaterial labour-power, qualities vital to a high-technology economy based on perpetual innovation.”

However, what is important is that universities have an element of porosity to them so that students can exploit through their research and teaching methods and can analyse and distribute knowledge otherwise marginalised. This could modify the field of knowledge. Dyer-Witheford concludes: “At the onset of the twenty-first century, cognitive capital is, in its self-appointed
role as planetary pedagogue, posing every major question that confronts humanity in terms of marketisation, monetisation, competition and profit. But the more insistently it demands that the general intellect respond to this catechism, the greater the likelihood it will start to get answers other than those it expects.” (Ibid, 91).

KNOWLEDGE FACTORY:

From the student and precarious workers struggles in 2005 the slogan, “what was once the factory is now the university” emerged, indicating a political problem or possible knot between the term factory and university. (The Edu-factory Collective, “Towards a Global Autonomous University”, 2) The slogan was an affirmation set in motion by the Edu-factory Collective. The ‘university as factory’
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is a metaphor that Edu-factory uses to present the paradox and to expose a potential referent for a counter-movement with the essential qualities of the factory, not only as a place of production, but also as an expanding place of struggle, resistance and organising – that takes place inside the university as once was the factory in industrial capitalism.

Raunig describes the potential of the knowledge factory “to understand the sites of knowledge production not only as sites of the commodification of knowledge and the exploitation of the subjectivity of all the actors, but also and especially as sites of new forms of conflict.” (Raunig, Factories of Knowledge, 51)
KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY:

Education reform has a genealogy of conflict. The transition from the post-war expansion of universities, to the commercial appropriation of the neoliberal university today has been a traumatic one (Nick Dyer-Witheford, “Cognitive Capitalism and the Contested Campus”, 74). During the social unrest of the 1960’s, the student cadre was a vital insurgent node that brought together the mass workers with new social movements making education a highly contested and significant site for economic, political and social ideology. Over the course of the 1970’s and 1980’s, governments of capitalist economies dovetailed State and corporate sector interests, cutting education budgets, as tuition fees and student debt continued to rise. The conditions were in place for the ‘knowledge
industries’, “research parks, private sector liaisons, consultancies and cross appointments with industry, and academic-corporate consortia burgeoned.” (Ibid, 75)

KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION:

The transformation of the university has occurred in an era when economic production processes are increasingly knowledge, high technology communication and affect intense, making social relations collective and flexible - “a labour of networks and communicative discourse; it is not possible to have a “general intellect” without a great variety of polymorphous communications”.

(Vincent 1993:127)
In contemporary capitalism knowledge and its management is a commodity. It is a central means of production in capitalist accumulation. Within capitalist social relations, knowledge production is a source of exploitation.

Adhering to this the post-workerist theorist, Gigi Roggero tolls the death knell of neoliberal politics in the opening to his extended analysis of the transformation of the university. In his 2011 publication *The Production of Living Knowledge: The Crisis of the University and the Transformation of Labour in Europe and North America*, Roggero ties the death of neoliberalism to the hypothesised emergence of Cognitive Capitalism and the condition of labour within it. He argues that neoliberalism is no longer able to constitute itself as a viable system and to
this end contemporary capitalism is in a state of crisis.

This conjecture Roggero argues has opened the potentiality for the autonomous organisation of labour that breaks with capitalist capture. Roggero places knowledge production and the university at the centre of this argument and refers to this as the “double crisis”, a term the Edu-Factory Collective (Roggero himself a member) defined as the crisis of the university and the global economic crisis. The university and the global economy are intimately connected to the transformation and transnational struggles of labour and production. Roggero writes, “it is impossible to understand the transformations of the university if they are not connected to the transformations of labour and
production.” (2011: 3). In exploring commonalities of both crises - he terms class struggle, power relations and production as defining characteristics of conflict within the university. As they are directly bound to relations of labour and production, knowledge production is the new battlefield for class struggle.

Tracing the composition of living labour, Roggero draws a line of convergence between student and worker. The student and worker were key figures in the global revolts of the 1960’s and 1970’s. Roggero sees a melding of the permeable frontiers of the university and labour market as work and life come closer together. The student/worker, “increasingly straddled with debt and facing a future without guarantees, the university becomes
only one of many possible sites for the production, acquisition, and sharing of knowledge, one where knowledge is subjected to a regime of artificial scarcity in a context of growing abundance.”

(Roggero Foreword ix) Cognitive capitalism’s control of living labour has been the target of the student’s and precarious workers struggles that took place in Italy and France in 2005 and 2006, London 2010 and Amsterdam 2015. Students and teachers revolted against their precarious employment, a lifetime of debt and the devaluation of their degrees. These compelling protests converged in struggles during the Occupation movements of 2009 and 2010 in wide parts of Europe and the US. (See the essay by the Edu-factory Collective, “Towards a Global Autonomous University”, www.edu-
A cynical and disenchanted relationship to work and the university is endemic among students who are required to be “entrepreneurial subjects and shrewd investors of their human capital.” Roggero, ix) Roggero argues that the university has become de-privileged as a key site of the transmission of knowledge production.

LEARNING PLAY:

“The Learning Play (Lehrstücke) is essentially dynamic; its task is to show the world as it changes (and also how it may be changed).” Bertolt Brecht, The Measures Taken and Other Lehrstücke, (Methuen Drama, 1977)
LIBERATION THEOLOGY:

*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, written by Paolo Freire is rooted in the Brazilian context of the 1960’s, an era of revolutionary struggle challenging social injustice and oppression by the oligarchies in Latin America as well as those of the First World countries. Brazil was right in the centre of a radical shift in catholic theology that took place after 1962 under Pope John 23rd, who gave the church authority to become involved in social change. This initiated ‘liberation theology’. This theology was an attempt to return to gospels of the early church that sought liberation from every form of oppression, to create a more just society. The theology was a call to action through the poor’s suffering against poverty. After the military coup in 1964, the government repressed any opposition
movement including the church, in response
making the church more progressive as it assumed
a decentralized and participatory role with wider
society.

When Freire published *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in
1968, liberation theology formally adopted by the
church in the same year. The leading figure of this
movement was the Bishop of Freire’s native city,
Recife. The priests, nuns and the many lay
catechists working for the church borrowed from
Freire’s work by going out into the villages and the
countryside organizing base communities,
emphasizing Freire’s concept of consciousness
raising, where a person understands his or her own
oppression and recognizes that he or she doesn’t
have to be passive and oppressed – that oppression
isn’t a law of nature.

LIFE-LONG LEARNING:

Life long learning implies a life long commitment to debt, to be paid off over a lifetime.

LIVING KNOWLEDGE:

Living knowledge is a post-workerist re-reading of Marx’s concept of living labour. It usurps the unstable paradigm of the knowledge economy, and asserts in particular the present condition of labour and the capital relation with labour’s negation and how it is to be framed. On the front line of this social struggle produces living knowledge, self-valorisation and the production of the common, where “the common must be produced before it is
defended, and in these experiments lie the seeds of a different model.” (Gigi Roggero, translators forward by Enda Brophy, *The Production of Living Knowledge*, Temple University Press, 2011, vii)

In his 2005 essay “Cognitive Capitalism and the Contested Campus”, Nick Dyer-Witheford, writes, “capital becomes more intellectual; universities become more industrial.” (Ibid, 76) The dialectical relation of the corporate university, and capital’s control of living labour has been the target of the victorious student’s and precarious workers struggles that took place in Italy and France in 2005 and 2006. These revolts which have been widely debated, connected with wider circuits of social dissent that draw a line from the Zapatista uprising in 1994, the Battle for Seattle protests in
1999 that ran on to Genoa, and were continued in struggles during the Occupation movements of 2009 and 2010 in wide parts of Europe and the US. (See the Edu-factory Collective, “Towards a Global Autonomous University”, www.edu-factory.org/edu15/images/stories/gu.pdf 18/9/2009 first accessed 3 September 2013)

Michael Hardt and Antoni Negri describe these recent anti-capitalist revolts in their influential publication *Empire* as the “multitude against Empire.” (Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Empire, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 2000, 93)

During the same period the artworld began to underline the fracturing of the classical image of
education and the declining conditions under which teaching and learning takes place.

MAGNA CARTA:
In 1215, after years of armed conflict when the monarchs of England were claiming larger areas of woodland at the expense of the commoners and the Barons, King John of England signed the Magna Carta otherwise known as The Great Charter. It was a treaty, a series of legal limitations on his power that gave protection against state terror, stipulating that all commoners as well as other members of society had the right of habeas corpus, trial by jury and the rule of law. Commoners depended on the forest for their food, pasture, firewood and building materials. Two years later the Charter of the Forest was added to
the Magna Carta law of the commons, which recognised commoners rights to use the royal woodlands, giving them the basic rights to subsistence.

NEOLIBERALISM:

Neoliberalism emerged as an economic philosophy in the 1930’s and is defined as a set of mechanisms within structures that maintain a capitalist model of ownership and accumulation.

Neoliberalism is a revised definition of economic liberalism that promotes support for privatisation, free trade, open markets and deregulation. It has become a pejorative term used by critics. It has been described as hyper-capitalism by American political science Professor Frances Fox Piven.
ORGANISATIONAL CRACK:

In management studies, when an institution fails (or willingly refuses) to acknowledge a member (worker) of its community, this is termed an “organisational crack”.

OUT OF LINE LAB:

In the early phase of this doctoral project, in October 2012 – April 2013), I set up a para-institutional organisation with the name Out of Line Lab (OOLL). Out of Line got its name from Jacques Rancière’s premise that our world is drawn and redrawn by lines that disrupt and connect forms of participation and disaggregation between collectivities and political allegiances, social organisations and aesthetic formations. My own identity as a curator, collaborator and mediator of
art encompasses relations of exchange. Within a specific field of knowledge [here the art field], these lines of connection are speculative proposals or experiments that travel along a path having no knowledge of an ultimate destination.

OOLL was the collaborative framework and legal structure that was to encapsulate this doctoral project; a cooperative framework run by and for members where everyone has an equal voice. This was an appropriate model for the socialised production that I sought. The Lab took up residency in one of the studios at SMART Project Space in Amsterdam (see SMART PROJECT SPACE). It was part of a close-knit artist community. While establishing the contours of what a co-operative might potentially be, I started
by inviting artists from my network to become
members of the co-operative. At the same time I
began fundraising for OOLL’s research projects
that were to be developed between 2012-2014.
Having found a notary to work for free (I use the
term ‘free’ paradoxically here, as a financial
exchange did take place between OOLL as a
charitable not-for-profit organisation and the law
firm, in the form of fiscal benefits from the
Government. Law firms are given tax incentives
when gifting their time/labour to registered
charities), it took almost half a year to finalise the
legal structure of OOLL. I could not use the Lab
for fundraising purposes until it was officially
registered with the Chamber of Commerce. This
was completed in May 2013. During the
intervening period I applied for funding for these
various projects through SMART Project Space, the institutional structure that OOLL operated immanently within. In February 2013, the project OOLL received its first grant of EUR 18,000 from the EU Commission for two European Voluntary Service (EVS) internships, one student from Spain and one student from Russia. This grant covered subsistence costs, travel and provided a daily allowance for a twelve-month period. This was start of a becoming-WE.

The Out of Line Lab was homeless and without an institutional partner on 2nd July 2013 when SMART Project Space was forced into bankruptcy and had to close all operations. This was deeply upsetting on many accounts, the shattering of a decade of work (SMART Project Space) and the
closure of OOLL that had so much potential, just as the doctoral project was starting to take form. I had made a funding application through SMART Project Space to the European Commission in April 2013. This was to support an exchange programme between several international partner institutions. The application was for an International Cooperation grant, and asked for an amount of EUR 200,000 over a period of two years. Following the commission’s regulations, I had to officially withdraw the funding application. Out of Line Lab was developing the following activities as part of this research:

- Coded Cinema and online archive
- Out of Line International Exchange
PARTICIPATION:

What I’ve sought during the doctoral project was the occupation of a particular role as a way to participate and to be part of the pedagogic process, which lies elsewhere, at a critical distance, operating beyond the dominant mode of consensus, by instigating zones of conflict. Within the remit of the official art educational institution, these zones facilitate an alternate production of knowledge. My exit and so-called boycott was not a way to leave the place where knowledge is produced, rather these three Acts that give form to
the doctoral project were an alternate way to enter it. “To participate, you need the possibility of choice, not simply participating in the creation of a consensus. Its necessary to have this choice that implies a decision between alternatives that can never be reconciled.” (*The Space of Agonism*, Markus Miessen in conversation with Chantal Mouffe, 31)

**PRECARITY:**

Precarity is a term used by sociologists to refer to the spread of contingent work and insecure employment within the labour market. The term is also used to refer to the subjective condition of those who experience insecure work.

PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION:
From commons to communism, from past to future, a pathway deeply rooted in my sectarian and divided childhood growing up in the troubled realities of Northern Ireland. It corresponded to an early understanding that the Irish famine was the result of the barbaric separation from the means of subsistence, a historical synecdoche of “primitive accumulation”. Peter Linebaugh writes: “When this conjuncture takes place in conditions of cultural or racial oppression, as it has in Ireland, the preconditions of communism arise.” (Linebaugh 203) Primitive accumulation is the term used by Marx in *Capital Vol. 1*, to describe “the
historical process upon which the development of capitalist relations was premised.” (Federici: 2004, 12) Marx conceptualised the recomposition of the proletariat’s social and economic relations, and how expropriation from the commons forms the corner stone of capitalism. Marx referred to this as a foundational process that reveals the structural conditions at the advent of capitalist society. Marx may have assumed that the violence of capitalist expansion “written in the annals in characters of fire and blood” would retreat “with the maturing of capitalist relations, when the exploitation and disciplining of labour would be accomplished through the workings of economic laws” (Federici: 2004, 12). If Marx could return in a time machine, he may be surprised to find our present phase of capitalist globalisation presents phenomena he
would have associated with primitive accumulation; seen in the world wide return and intensification of violence, expropriation of millions of agricultural producers from their lands, phenomenal plundering of natural resources, the ravages of war, persecution of migrant workers and the continued degradation of women.

RADICAL EDUCATION:

Theorists and historians, such as Noam Chomsky, Rosi Baidotti, Yves Michaud, Alberto Abruzzese, and Bruno Latour actor network theory and later experiments in reassembling pedagogy (bridging social science, politics & art) have attempted to find new ways to liberate institutionalised pedagogic structures, through utopian alternatives,
self-organised programmes, open source and co-operative strategies.

Radical education is also referred to as critical pedagogy and follows the pluralist tradition of Freire, Giroux, Illich and bell hooks. It must be seen as a political and moral project and not a method to teach prescribed subject matter. It is a way of understanding the performative nature of agency and its acquisition as a way to act in and shape the world. It draws attention to the relationships among knowledge, authority and power that controls the conditions for the production of knowledge.
RECIPROCITY:

The central theme of Jean Luc Nancy’s 1996 publication *Etre Singulier Pluriel* condenses Heidegger’s concept of *Mitsein* (see Sam Critchley, *Notes on Jean Luc Nancy’s Rewriting of Being and Time*).


REDACTION (METHOD):

1. Start by replacing all the text you want to redact with the word [INFORMATION REDACTED] in square brackets on either side of the text to be redacted.

2. Place white rectangles over information you want to redact. The white rectangles can be created by drawing long squares over the redacted text areas and colouring.
them with white highlighter. Do not delete
the text underneath the white squares to
ensure the white squares can be removed
to reveal the information if necessary.

Make sure you do this for all instances and
variations of the information. You need to
do this manually.

3. Save this version of the document as
   ‘Temp Redacted’ draft. This ensures you
   have two drafts of the document, the
   original draft and the redacted draft.

4. If a second person redacts the document
   use the method dot redaction (For further
guidance, see the redaction rule in Claire
Makhlouf Carter’s PhD thesis ‘Does She
Stink?: How do you engage with work
which rejects the complacency of shared
experience and benign relationships; and
how do you document the invisible worker,
the antagonist or even the stink of your
own fear.’ (2011). Change each letter of the
word to be redacted to a full stop. Do this
for each word that requires redaction. This
has to be done manually and is a labour
intensive method.

5. To create the final draft of the redacted
document, save the formatted document as
‘Final Redacted’ draft. This ensures you
have a redacted document that does not
contain any sensitive information and/or
information that can be uncovered or
shown.
REFUSAL:

There is potential in the actual subversion of meanings along paths that “prefer not too” - taken from the character of Bartleby from *Bartleby the Scrivener* by Herman Melville (1853) where he declines to do what is asked of him over and beyond his simple task of copying documents.

REPRODUCTIVE LABOUR & ART:

Arts focus on production and the importance of the labouring subject is a key development of the past twenty years. There is a resurgent strand of art practice that started to take shape in the early part of the twenty-first century where the artist identifies with the worker as a mode to challenge the root of value relations in art and up-end the capitalist order. In the 1970’s artists including
Mierle Laderman Ukeles, Lee Lozano and Mary Kelly identified with the worker and practiced feminism as a form of social reproduction to challenge authorship and identity, followed through since the 2000’s by Andrea Fraser, Ursula Biemann, Pilvi Takala and Mika Rottenberg, women artists who have narrativised the degenerative qualities of gendered reproductive and social labour, to de-naturalise this labour and show it as an activity that can be de-contextualised, evacuating reproduction of its necessity and naturalness (see Feminism).

RUPTURE:

“The common is produced in rupture and in separation” (Gigi Roggero, The Production of Living Knowledge, xvi)
The Brazilian educator Paulo Freire spoke of his own position being tactically inside and strategically outside the educational system. Hegemonic arrangements of the system are never complete. It is not monolithic, therefore there are spaces to slip through, from where we can create rupture and move along a separate path. He suggests temporary overlaps in the interstice between teaching and learning.

SCRIPT:

A script, a thesis. To be abducted. Removed from circulation. All that remains is the artWORK, the theory performed and recorded in four books. The performative agency of those who laboured, of
those involved, writing with the other, transformed by the other, who produced another kind of knowledge that modified my original script and made me see differently. I find myself in a changed reality. Contaminating my physical and mental space. What you may ask was in the original script? Seamless questions about art education as a site of economic and political transactions? Did I expose the failure of the official educational art institution to confront this? Perhaps. I went where I wasn’t wanted, trespassing as a way to go beyond truth, to expand our limitations. A work of fiction, a retelling, indebted to the subject that makes one write.
SEMINAR:

My experience of the DPhil research seminar format is a static frame in which we present modes of artistic practice and theory. It is not directed towards an active situation that one finds in educational projects that we’ve encountered a part of the ‘educational turn’ in art that take place in the extra institutional space of the art world in which the artist, the researcher and other participants are mutually entangled as collaborators in a learning process.

SHADOW WORKER:

The shadow worker is a surrogate life form through which I constitute and circulate an invisible presence present. The Shadow Worker slips through the dialectic of my silent absence and
my presence as a shadow and scrivener. Judith Butler speaks of the trace that remains from the other’s uncanny presence as absence – her present absence. (Judith Butler & Athena Athanasiou, *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political*, (Polity Press, 2013)) Dispossession between one and the other productively makes it operative to the vectors of exit, embodied by the (in)action in silent retreat. It requires a counter possession of another, one who could be fully present to the subject “I”, and be dispossessed by that very presence inside the operative space of the seminar. Athena Athanasiou corresponds to Butler by saying: “[…] presence, in its modality of becoming present to one another, can be an occasion of critical displacement.”
SOVIETS OF KNOWLEDGE:

Subversive dynamics and relevant lines of negation of cognitive capital’s control over how and what we communicate are being drawn by activist researchers, or ‘soviets of knowledge’ a term coined by Gerald Raunig in his 2013 publication *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity* to describe collective groups of activist researchers.

SPACE OF THINKING:

When faced with academia’s limits, test methods, seminar modules, its relations and economies, the production of the artist-subject has never been so contested. Simon Sheikh provides one answer to the contradiction by offering a dividing line between knowledge and thinking: “We have to move beyond knowledge production into what we

Knowledge in this sense inscribes you within tradition, historical practices and disciplines, “within certain parameters of the possible”,
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whereas thinking offsets this as a place of the non-disciplinary, in opposition to what has become normative. By doing so, Sheikh problematises the raw material of knowledge as fixed and with limitations, as he says “knowledge holds you back”, it eliminates and constrains through what it includes and excludes. Within this is a consideration of the emancipatory potential that is inherently associated with knowledge, but reveals at the same time its limitation.

STREAKING:

In Gerald Raunig’s recent analysis of art, education and post-fordism entitled, *Factories of Knowledge*, *Industries of Creativity*, he calls for re-appropriations of time through “streaking” time and industriousness in order to breach the neoliberal
regime. We see this form of streaking in the terms of Human Strike articulated by Tiqqun that was later adopted by the French art group Claire Fontaine, the Occupy Movement, the calm and mute Standing Man on Taksim Square in Istanbul in 2013, and the impossibly perfect character of Bartleby the Scrivener who refuses the rules by saying time and time again “I would prefer not to”.

STRIKE:

A protracted strike performs the exposition of the invisible visible. Stephen Wright, summarises this move: “[…] once we were aware of the frames invisible but powerful presence, that it is “just” art. There too, the adverb is revealing: just art, not the potentially more transformatory, corrosive, even censorship-deserving real thing. In short then,
while the frame is an almost magically powerful device, it is also a debilitating one. And this is the reason, I think, that an increasing number of art-related practitioners today are seeking not to broaden the frame still further – thereby pursuing art’s already extraordinary colonisation of the life-world – but to get outside of the frame altogether. Every year, more and more artists are quitting the artworld frame – or looking for and experimenting with viable exit strategies – rather than broadening it further. And these are some of the most exciting developments in art today, for to leave the frame means sacrificing one’s coefficient of visibility – but potentially in exchange for great corrosiveness toward the dominant semiotic order.”

(See Stephen Wright, “Users and Usership of Art: Challenging Expert Culture” 04-06-07, paper first

SUBVERSION:

When subversion appears in another register often tutors, curators, critics and artists fail to recognise the disruption, so internalised are neoliberal attitudes. While claiming it purports to genuine freedom of expression, throughout this research I’ve questioned whether the official educational art institution is actually capable of resisting oppressive, exploitative neoliberal values. My experience of the educational art institution is that
it reduces choice and freedom, resistance and alterity by imposing the normalising binary measurement of good and bad around the expanded practice of art. If this is true, what is to be done?

One proposal is to alter arts discourse by inserting subversive countenance into the very structures where life and labour under capital is configured from within the institutions of knowledge and culture – throughout this research (as witnessed by the Delegated worker and the Trespasser) to expose the labour invested in the production of this knowledge and reproduction of our lives under capital – to demonstrate it is possible to transform the site of knowledge production through one’s own agency.
THEORETICAL ANTAGONISM:

Slavoj Žižek thinks through philosophy as the site of theoretical antagonism, and the accumulation of theoretical positions that circulate around a radical nothingness. In his recent publication, *In Defense of Lost Causes* (Verso, 2017), Žižek writes:

“Better to do nothing than to engage in localized acts whose ultimate function is to make the system run more smoothly. The threat today is not passivity, but pseudo-activity, the urge to "be active", to "participate", to mask the Nothingness of what goes on. People intervene all the time, "doing something"; academics participate in meaningless "debates," etc.; but the truly difficult thing is to step back, to withdraw from it all. Those in power often prefer even "critical" participation..."
or a critical dialogue to silence, since to engage us in such a "dialogue" ensures that our ominous passivity is broken. The "Bartlebian act" I propose is violent precisely insofar as it entails ceasing this obsessive activity-in it, violence and non-violence overlap (non-violence appears as the highest violence), likewise activity and inactivity (the most radical thing is to do nothing).”

My art practice lives in the very tension, between the theories of true scholarship it tries to reconcile and validate itself with; between the falling apart and potential failure of the practice as it subverts this. All the while attempting to dislocate the antagonism by inheriting contradictory positions; to flee (post-operaist), to be silent, to come back
and use the voice agonistically (radical negativity) transform how we learn in common.

My artistic practice condenses knowledge production, to dislocate the antagonisms in its gaps and interstices, to subversively question the status quo in the context of today’s dominant culture and its symptoms: privatisation of the intellect, the increasing gulf between rich and poor, corporate theft of communally held lands and the commons, ecological devastation and the cumulative effects of new class struggles.

TRANSCRIPT:

A transcript. A labyrinth of dialogue. A work of
truth that cannot be changed. Conversations transcribed, overwritten, redacted and codified. Written by another – the scrivener, the protagonist par excellence, the shadow worker, the trespasser, the very embodiment of a supplementary distant appearance – carving out speculative paths as a vigilant learning process, to generate alternative spaces of working and learning together. A document evidencing the work of research to be disseminated at a future point in time beyond the present moment so that others too, students and tutors, may participate and garner the will to struggle within and against. There are common spaces of rupture from where we can lay bare the processes, exposing the structures of power relations as relations of oppression and exclusion
in order to transform these into a more egalitarian place of learning. For this, Acts 1-3 cannot be overwritten. The artWORK. A narrativised practice. A record of what happened and bringing into existence a method. A way to produce a reality for oneself in a way that the reality may be changed. To stand at a point beyond the narration so that a transition takes place between research and authorship, to break the rule of the researcher as author.

TRANSVERSAL INTELLECT:

The emergence of the ‘transversal intellect’ at the beginning of the twenty-first century, as argued by Gerald Raunig, draws “lines of flight from the old models of the avant-garde and universality.
Traversal organs are laboratories, discursive events, manifestos and art projects that have joined social movements, each time weaving humanising pedagogy to social struggle through breaches of insurrection, rupture and event.

The ‘transversal intellect’ emerges conjoining knowledge and struggles. In his essay “The Molecular Strike”, Raunig uses the term orgic to define modes of organisation that are orgic-industrious, which are not centred on around representation, are not hierarchical and are radically inclusive and unfold in everyday life. This form of organisation has no master and there is no privileged position for the intellectuals, for art or activism. See “The Molecular Strike”,
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I’d imagined Foucault’s heterotopia and had planned the viva to take place on a narrow boat floating along the river Thames in Oxford. Oxford gowns thwarted by a life vest and flanked by my supervisors.

In the end however, I chose not to make a performative intervention as part of the viva process. Rather, I was present with the examiners, alone with my living voice, the voice I’d silenced throughout Act 3: A Trespasser in the Room. The
Viva took place in the Old Masters Studio at the Ruskin School of Art, during which I attempted to render transparent the position and orientation of my own thinking and writing. I passed with minor corrections. Examiners extended me a generative offer to respond to the viva as an optional part of the corrections. I have included these in the Glossary under the name Corrections as a way to open up the examination further and make visible the process of measurement and of correction, so that others too can participate in the work so that it stays in process in this way. Again making visible the invisible. All corrections, modifications and overwriting are designated in white font, inside a black table.
VOICE:

Voice as a process refers to the human capacity to give an account of oneself and one’s place in the world. Voice as a value is recognising that voice matters. It favours ways of organising human life that value voice and discriminates against frameworks of social, economic and political organisation that deny voice or undermine voice.

(See Nick Couldry, *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism*, (Sage Publications, 2010), 2)

Its vernacular tone locates my subjectivity in a certain time and specific place. This inference of a particular identity and potential political position is restricted inside the academic enclosures. Voice has a value. Voice is discriminating. This failure ‘to
put voice into practice’ is further put to work as a working method. So when trying to locate this voice, in its effective articulation, something closes and shuts down the line of exchange that I’m interested in. This reflexive concern with the conditions of voice includes it being devalued and undermined, resulting in its possible eradication. The condition of voice will compromise the form. A process that obstructs the voice and dis-locates it would allow one type of voice to emerge and others not, and this could be inverted and utilised to challenge and disrupt the authoritative allocation of discourse.

Where is the voice that is un-located, foregrounding those who will not speak for themselves while excluding others? Might it be in
other registers, anonymously slipping between the
gaps and interstices? When dealing with knowledge
institutions that govern the definitions of cultural
meaning through the valorisation of research
production, the problem of a voice denied can’t be
overlooked, “to deny value to another’s capacity
for narrative – to deny her potential for voice – is
to deny a basic dimension of human life. A form of
life that systematically denied voice would not only
be intolerable, it would… barely be a culture at all”
(Ibid, 7)

The philosopher Judith Butler calls the process of
voice as “giving an account of oneself” (Judith
Butler, 2005) What happens to the on-going
conversation of this research when I refuse or
obstruct the voice as a process? Could this open
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the way to a viable exit strategy? Could I remove
my voice as a way to stop circulating, disappear
and place it somewhere else, in someone else?
Make the other speak my words? My words in
another vernacular? This could be a way to
consider how to leave the frame of artistic
visibility. Taking this as a starting point to
challenge expert authority by giving my voice to
someone else.

In the article “An Appreciation of Political
Economist Albert Hirschman” by Robert Kuttner,
Hirschman was apparently partisan to ‘voice’ as the
most effective strategy to instigate change, distinct
as a form of reciprocity between one person and
another.
In *Why Voice Matters*, the prominent media studies scholar, Nick Couldry gives a generative account of what politics after neoliberalism looks like and forms a new idea of governance based on social cooperation. He provides compelling insights into how the neoliberal economic model denies and undermines our capacity to speak and be heard. He uses an analytical framework that reasserts the narrative’s role in understanding human experience and draws on Judith Butler’s process of ‘giving an account of oneself’ as the essence of the politics of everyday life. Couldry explains the various levels at which neoliberalism’s hegemonic rationality creates meaning, and how it underpins the entire contemporary social domain. He uses voice as a *process* and voice as a *value* as two distinct categories.
of an effective analytic response to the current condition of neoliberalism.

WITHDRAWAL:
Since the 1990’s, the production of multifarious art practices, post-object, participatory, pedagogic and discursive practices, have become more politicised in an attempt to suppress the total commodification of culture. In the belief that institutions cannot be transformed, subversive dynamics and strategies of exodus (Michael Hardt and Antoni Negri), cessation of action and withdrawal from capital’s disciplining control over how and what we communicate, are being drawn in the art field by activist researchers.
WRITING AS ACTIVISM:

This DPhil research project is formatted between the thesis that doesn’t make an appearance (as it oscillates around the centre of so called immutable static knowledge) and the strongly conceptualised dramatisation of the practice as a type of transversal knowledge that moves along a line and is not fixed to a firm centre while it unravels the dividing lines between the two disciplines, between art practice and art theory. It considers the formulation of a work of words that critically engages with and dismantles the academic form of the essay, through a process of “streaking” (see STREAKING). Artistic theoretical reflection reveals tangible tensions when denatured by academic form; when it is pulled in, disciplined and controlled. I’ve set out to dramatise the discursive
space of my practice, that streaks through, ruptures the academic form and pulls it apart, to construct something meaningful and complex in an unconventional way that requires other ways of reading and interpretation.

“Contemporary art research aims at that point in sensible being where two ostensibly opposed modalities, the visible and the writable, image and text, are or become indiscernible. An artist may approach this task of research not just from the side of the image, but also from that of the text. One form this takes is for an artist to submit a PhD (‘practice-based’ or ‘-led’) comprised entirely of the written word, where text is practice or theory, as practice, both at the same time, but which in any case would be a specific work of
words. The question, of course, is what that ‘word’ is comprised of and from. Not the word after practice but the word as practice, not theory before practice but theory as practice.” (Jonathan Lahey Dronsfield, “Theory as art practice: Notes for discipline” in Art and Research, first accessed 12 November 2013, http://www.artandresearch.org.uk)

There is a genealogy of artists who have employed writing as practice as a way to dissolve established ideas of what visual art is. What I’m relating to here is a genealogy of artists who have used discursive essays and original narratives that blur the line between literary and visual art, where the visual isn’t privileged over other modes of practice. Some of the artists who attempt to disrupt the understanding of what art is in this way are Seth Price, Dan Graham, Adrian Piper, Katrina Palmer, Liam Gillick, Jill Magid, Bernadette Corporation, Chto Delat?, Claire Fontaine, Sarah Tripp and Slavs and Tartars. As a way to escape the institutions of the artworld, these works are often distributed through a number of platforms, newspapers, magazines, performance based lectures, online in PDF form or as novels to be
downloaded. Seth Price is interested in works being *invulnerable* to the system of the art market. In his PDF text work “Dispersion”, he writes:

“Suppose an artist were to release the work directly into a system that depends on reproduction and distribution for its sustenance, a model that encourages contamination, borrowing, stealing and horizontal blur. The art system usually corrals errant works, but how could it recoup thousands of freely circulating paperbacks?” (Seth Price, “Dispersion” PDF format 2008).
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