

# **Pedagogy of Excess: *an alternative political economy of student life***

*1968 was an explosion, and the sound of the explosion still echoes...what interests me is... how, in the wake of that explosion, we can think of overcoming the catastrophe that is capitalism ( Holloway 2009).*

*What is revolutionary is excess, overflow and power ( Negri 2009).*

## **Introduction**

The pedagogy of excess is based on the premise that re-engineering the forms in which teaching and research are configured in universities has the potential to transform the nature of higher education in ways that undermine the current consumerist and marketised model.

The mainstream literature on the relationship between teaching and research at the undergraduate level is limited in scope and ambition, restricted to an orthodox pedagogic agenda involving the training of students as researchers or to enhance their enterprise and employability skills (Healey and Jenkins 2007). Where the writing on this subject extends beyond these restrictions it is limited to students solving problems to deal with the complexities of modern life (Brew 2006, Barnett 2000).

In order to fundamentally challenge the concept of student as consumer, the links between teaching and research need to be radicalised to include an alternative political economy of the student experience. This radicalisation can be achieved by connecting academics and students to their own radical political history, and by pointing out ways in which this radical political history can be brought back to life by developing progressive relationship between academics and students inside and outside of the curriculum.

A review of the mainstream literature reveals that where writing on this topic does

engage with more radical historical and political issues, for example Elton's engagement with the writings of Wilhelm von Humboldt, (1767 – 1835), the political implications of this engagement are not fully developed. The implications are that the laissez-faire liberalism that underpinned Humboldt's political project to create the University of Berlin in 1810, if carried through by contemporary universities, will make the appearance of the student as consumer more rather than less likely.

Is it possible to create a radical pedagogy based on the links between teaching and research to counteract the identity of the student as consumer? A radical pedagogy can be designed around another version of the student life, based on events in Paris, France in 1968. By making connections between the university and its own political history, and by developing a pedagogy that connects teaching and research at the undergraduate level, it is possible that a radical new pedagogy might emerge. It is the possibility of this new radical pedagogy that is described as a pedagogy of excess.

The essential aspects of this pedagogy of excess are that students can be enabled to transcend the constraints of consumerism by overcoming the limits of what it is to be a student in higher education. They can do this through collaborative acts of intellectual enquiry, working with academics and with each other, on subjects that look beyond their own self-interest and identity as students. This academic activity can include exploring the origins of – as well as progressive responses to - the general social crisis out of which the attempt to reduce students to the identity of consumer is derived.

This pedagogy of excess can only be sustained within the moment of a real political history. The pedagogy of excess emerges in a period that has seen strikes by academics and students around the world against the proposed marketisation of their higher education system ( Klimke and Scharloth 2008). The pedagogy of excess does not look for a repeat of 1968, but seeks to develop a critical academic project that builds on the radical political history of the university, inside and outside of the curriculum – in and against the current version of higher education.

## **Literature Review**

Much of the pioneering work on the relationship between teaching and research focused on the assumption that high-quality research would result in high-quality teaching. However, recent research has shown that there is no evidence of a direct positive relationship between research and teaching (Hattie and Marsh 1996). In fact, evidence suggests that the relationship between research and teaching is at best sub-optimal and at worst dysfunctional (Neumann 1994, Zamorski 2002). Brew (2006) has characterised the relationship between teachers and students in higher education as a form of 'apartheid'.

An alternative way to link research and teaching was proposed by Boyer (1990) who conceptualised the relationship between teaching and research in terms of the notion of scholarships: the scholarship of discovery – research; the scholarship of integration – interdisciplinary connections; the scholarship of engagement – knowledge applied in the wider community; and the scholarship of teaching – research and evaluation of one's own teaching. Boyer's work, and the report on which his work was based, has been influential in creating a willingness in higher education in the US and elsewhere to design scholarly learning experiences for undergraduate students (Boyer Commission 1998).

In the UK this development of the concept of scholarship has been taken forward by Griffiths (2004) and Healey and Jenkins (2007) who have designed scholarly based pedagogic models based on teaching that is research-led, research-orientated, and research - tutored. A generic term for this types of pedagogy is research-based learning.

Connecting teaching and research at the undergraduate level is now regarded as the essence of student centred-ness (Ramsden 2001), an important strategy in preparing students for the 'knowledge society' (Scott 2002) as well as for developing the qualities of professional expertise among undergraduates ( Weiman 2004, Brew 2006). At the same time, linking teaching and research in the undergraduate curriculum is seen to have the potential to promote inter-disciplinarity, and to challenge fundamentally the meaning and nature of research (Brew 2006). Where the evidence for the effectiveness of linking teaching and research stretches beyond the acquisition of academic and professional skills, research based learning is seen as a way of providing students with problem solving and coping skills for a complex world (Barnett 2000, Brew 2006).

Evidence for the effectiveness of connecting teaching and research at the undergraduate level continues to emerge in an increasing body of work, e. g., Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; Baxter Magdola et al 1998, Healey and Jenkins 2005 and 2007). However, the potential for further pedagogical advances, grounding research-based learning in the political history of higher education remains undeveloped.

This lack of engagement with the political history of the modern university is surprising given the prominence in the literature to the work of Wilhem von Humboldt, the political philosopher and educationalist. Humboldt is widely credited as having established the first modern European university in Berlin in 1810 on the principle of connecting teaching and research.

A notable exception to this lack of political engagement is found in the work of Lewis Elton. Elton's writings and translations have been important in promoting the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt in relation to the historical development of university education in Europe. Elton uses Humboldt's work as a way of arguing against the increasing interference in higher education by successive governments. Elton maintains that government interference is likely to endanger the future of universities in UK and in Europe (Elton 2008).

For Elton, as for Humboldt, the key to limiting state interference and promoting the interests of universities is the promotion of scholarship, and key to the promotion of scholarship is the way in which research and teaching can be connected in higher education. For Elton, as for Humboldt, research and teaching are to be connected in a process whereby students work together with academics on projects of real intellectual value (Elton 2008).

Elton is proposing no less than a new 'concordat' between state and university, to balance the rights and duties of both, and thereby create a climate of mutual trust between academics and politicians and state bureaucrats. Similarly, he is proposing an arrangement between university managers and academics so as to avoid the managerialist culture that pervades the contemporary university. Elton argues that this top-down management structure should be replaced with a more democratic, distributed and ultimately collegiate form of leadership and governance ( Elton 2002 232).

Elton does not fully develop the political implications of the points he is making, limiting the discussion of Humboldt's notion of scholarship to recent advances in managerial science, and to integrating research-based learning into professional staff development programmes ( Elton 2008a and 2008 b).

### **Humboldt's political philosophy**

An understanding of the implications of von Humboldt's political philosophy requires an engagement with his book *The Limits of State Action*, written in 1791 but not published until 1852. In this book Humboldt sets out the basis for his commitment to an extreme laissez-faire philosophy (Burrow 1993 xlix lvi). For Humboldt political philosophy was based on 'the proclamation of complete self-sovereignty of the individual' or 'extreme individualism' (Knoll and Seibart 1967 17 and 19). The state was to have no positive role in the area of social welfare, but was a necessary evil whose main purpose is to protect its members from external threats: every effort by the state to interfere in the private affairs of the citizens is to be 'absolutely condemned' ( von Humboldt 1993 16). Neither was the state to have any influence on education, which was to be a private rather than a public affair: public education was to lie wholly outside the limits within which the state should exercise its effectiveness ( von Humboldt 1993 52). While working for the Ministry of Education in Prussia von Humboldt had to temper his thoughts on public education, but he did not wholly abandon his reservations about the state and, with regard to his University reform, devised a model with considerable autonomy (Knoll and Seibart 1969).

Humboldt's impeccable liberal credentials make him no figure on which to base a critique on the concept of student as consumer. At the core of liberal theory lies the fundamental principles of consumerism: the concept of the individual freedom and pursuit of self interest in a context which promotes the self organizing nature of markets and denigrates state intervention. Schemes based on liberal social theory are, therefore more likely to move higher education further in the direction of marketisation (Zizek 2009). In order to develop a critical account of the student as consumer it is necessary to look elsewhere into the historical and political development of the modern university.

A more progressive basis for the development of a radical pedagogy that engages

critically with the concept of the student as consumer can to be found in the history and politics of the global student protest movement of 1968 and, in particular in Paris, France in May of that same year.

### **1968: The Poverty of Student Life**

The world - wide student protests of 1968, and, in particular, the events in Paris, France in May of that year, appear as a ready-made critique of the notion of the student as consumer and the increasing marketisation of higher education.

Although the student protest in France began in the universities of Nanterre and the Sorbonne, it quickly spread to include not only students but academics and workers, across the whole of France. The protest by the students and workers was not in response to an economic crisis, but was a reaction to the general crisis in French society as a whole, expressed in a variety of political, economic and cultural forms. These forms included a lack of democratic accountability in the universities and the national political system, an alienating technological and bureaucratic form of capitalism, and a culture of anti-war protest against French colonialism in Algeria and American imperialism in Vietnam (Ross 2002 , Gilcher – Holtey 1998, Nairn 1998, Seidman 2004, Singer 2002). Within the French universities this was experienced as an abundance of ennui and ‘the poverty of student life’<sup>1</sup>.

The protest movement culminated in a General Strike, which almost destroyed General De Gaulle’s government and very nearly succeeded in creating a new form of society (Ross 2002 , Gilcher – Holtey 1998, Nairn 1998, Seidman 2004, Singer 2002). The revolt was eventually suppressed but the protest has left a controversial legacy about its nature and significance. This legacy has been the subject of much debate among sociologists, historians, anthropologists, biographers and autobiographers around a series of issues that are pertinent to the pedagogy of excess (Gilcher – Holtey 1998). These issues include the relationships between the student and the teacher, the relationship between intellectual and manual labour, the relationship between the student movement and other social movements and the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Poverty of Life is a title of a pamphlet written by the Situationalist International , which includes a severe critique of university life, including the role played by students: On the Poverty of Student Life - <http://library.nothingness.org/articles/SI/en/display/4>

relationship between the university and its external environment. At the centre of these issues lies the question about the representation and production of knowledge, raising the question about the nature and role of the university, suggesting that a new form of university is possible based on democracy, self-management and social justice.

A key issue for the protest was the way in which the students engaged with the critical social theory within which the events were conceptualised. In France, and throughout Europe, the protests coincided with the emergence of a radical critique of orthodox Marxism based on previously unpublished versions of Marx's own work and other subversive versions of Marx's social theory that had been suppressed throughout the twentieth century.

Key among these critical theorists was the existential Marxist humanism of Sartre, whose work reinserted human agency (*praxis*) against the crude materialism of structural Marxism (Fox 2003 19), promoting a 'humanist philosophy of action, of effort, of combat, of solidarity' against 'the quietism of despair' (Sartre 1966, in Fox 2003 16). For Sartre human existence is constituted 'outwardly by its engagement and actions in the concrete world' (Fox 2003 16).

The students were inspired by the work of Walter Benjamin (Benjamin 1934) who expounded a radical theory of action and engagement based on the radical cultural movements of Dadaism, Surrealism and Russian Constructivism. Key to these critical cultural activities was involving the consumer in the process of production: where the reader becomes the author, and the audience becomes the actor, not only as the producers of artistic content, but as collaborators of their own social world, as subjects rather than objects of history.

Henri Lefebvre, a Professor in Nanterre during the protests, argued for the recovery of the concept of 'everyday life' as a critical and theoretical category, currently constituted by the 'bureaucratic society of controlled consumption' and experienced as boredom and banality (Lefebvre 1984). For Lefebvre the revolution must transform everyday life as well as the social relations of production. He argued that the irreducibility of human subjectivity is the key to revolutionary action. The impulse for progressive political activity was to be found in the human attributes of creativity and

desire, expressed as what he described as 'poesis', i.e., resistance to the alienating consequences of modern consumerism (Hirsch 1982).

In 'The Society of the Spectacle' (1970) Debord argued that the social world had been overwhelmed by capitalist relations of production, and that direct experience and the determination of real events had been reduced to the passive contemplation of everyday life (Jappe 1970). Debord and his collaborators in the Situationalist International, of which he was a founding member, argued in favour of direct action through the creation of situations which would reveal the absurdity of everyday life. These spontaneous political protests would be supported by local worker-student councils which would 'transform the totality of existing conditions' so that students and workers could 'recognise themselves in a world of their own design' (Debord 1970 para 179).

What all of these writings have in common is the application of Marxist social theory to a committed and concrete political action, against the condition of consumerism and the commodification of everyday life. What is remarkable about the events of May 1968 is the ways in which this theory was realised in practice.

### **Action Committees: Poesis in Motion**

May 1968 was a moment in which everything happened politically (Ross 2002 15) – an event that was pregnant with a new sense of 'creative political capacity in France and elsewhere' (Ross 2002 18). There was a feeling that 'politics is – everywhere and everything' (Nairn 1998 123), especially in education. Within the universities self-managing, democratic, non-hierarchical groups, known as Action Committees (*Comite d'Action Travailleur/Etudiant*), were established (Posner 1970, Ross 2002, Seale and McConville 1968). These committees comprised of between ten – fifteen members, academics and students, initially for dialogue and discussion, promoting 'constant criticism and self discovery' so that 'the movement was able to constantly radicalize itself' (Posner 1970 47). The committees went on to occupy campuses across Paris and France. The Action Committees coordinated demonstrations and demands, and made contact with the workers and other grassroots protest movements, dissolving the separation between workers and intellectuals through expressions of solidarity and the provision of information through various forms of creative political art, music and drama (agitprop). The aim of the Action Committees

was to abolish the current autocratic, non-democratic, industry-focused structure of universities with a system based on democracy and social justice (Ross 2002).

But, if the movement was defined by its theoretically informed organisational forms, something even more significant was occurring. Ross (2002) points out that the really transforming aspect of the protest was that the participants did not perform the roles that had been accorded to them by sociologists, journalists, historians and politicians, i.e., those who defined the events of May 1968 as a 'student protest'. The significant point, argues Ross, is that the students refused to act as students: 'In the so called "student action" students never acted as students but as revealers of a general crisis, of bearers of a power of rupture putting into question the regime, State, society' (Blanchot 1998 quoted in Ross 2002 25). This refusal to act as students was compounded by the students refusal to speak about student issues, choosing only to speak about 'common affairs' ( Ross 118), raising the protest to the level of society (Ross 2002 25). As Badiou describes it, the events of 1968 were 'something that arrives in **excess**, beyond all calculation...that proposes an entirely new system of thought' and which 'led infinitely farther than their [the students] education...would have allowed them to foresee; an event in the sense of real participation...altering the course of their lives' (Badiou 1998 quoted in Ross 2002 26 - emphasis added by author).

Key to the notion of revelation was the way in which knowledge about the events of May 1968 was to be produced, reported and recorded. Those involved with the struggle maintained that research should begin from contestation and revolt. In this way they aimed to break with the tradition of academic elitism so as to produce knowledge in a populist and highly accessible style (Ross 2002 117). This radical way of producing knowledge and presenting information was to be a form of 'direct communication' providing 'a new means of comprehension between different groups' (Ross 2002 114) so as 'to give a voice to those without voices' and to contest 'the domain of the experts' (Ross 2002 116).

In this way those engaged in the struggle sought to demystify the process of research. For the students and the workers 'We are in our way researchers, but this is work that anyone can do' (Ross 2002 118). A key means of dissemination of critical ideas was through graffiti art, scrawled on the walls of the city:

*Plagiarism is progress, history demands it*

*Boredom is counterrevolutionary*

*Be realistic, demand the impossible*

*We work, but we produce nothing .*

### **A Pedagogy of Excess**

The events of 1968 have had a profound effect on the development of higher education in France and around the world. The post '68 period saw the emergence of a new form of university: democratic (Scott 1995), postmodern (Lyotard 1999 ) and multiverse (Kerr 1963). The key feature of this new type of university was that universities had now become sites of contested space, not only for the control and management of the higher education, but in relation to the meaning and purpose of knowledge itself (Delanty 2001).

A central facet of the post '68 period was the development of progressive pedagogies in higher education based on 'left wing ideas', reflecting the radical political agenda that had been established by the students in Paris. Key to these developments was the engagement of students in the design of curricula, including deciding on the content of courses as well as forms of assessment; and, through the proliferation of independent study programmes, a recognition that undergraduate students were capable of creating knowledge of real academic content and value (Pratt 1997).

In the period since then university administrators and politicians have struggled to de-politicise the radical substance of these pedagogical initiatives, while at the same time contain and pacify students and academics through the imposition of increasingly managerial and bureaucratic strategies (Zizek 2009 ). Readings (1999) maintains that the concept of 'excellence' is the revenge of the university bureaucrat for 1968.

The events of 1968 provide a powerful historical and political framework within which to re-conceptualise the relationship between teaching and research in higher

education in a way that offers a challenge to the notion of student as consumer and the politics of marketisation. The problem is how to recover the radicality of the '68 agenda, in the current contemporary crisis. A progressive way forward is to connect current pedagogies that link teaching and research with their own radical academic history, and to develop them in a form that is appropriate for the contemporary situation. Key to this issue of connectivity is the relationship between action and progressive political theory. It is the relationship between theory and action, linked to contemporary struggles within higher education, that provides a framework for the emergence of a pedagogy of excess.

### **Action**

Key to the development of a pedagogy of excess is that during the struggles of May '68 the students exceeded their role as students – they became the revealers of a general crisis in society, and the personification of the ways in which that crisis might be interrupted and reconsidered, calling into question the principles and protocols through which the social was organised and controlled. In the process the students moved beyond the limits of where they might have expected their experience of university education to have taken them, exceeding their expectations about the potentials and possibilities of student life.

Through the reengineering of research and teaching at the undergraduate level, considerable advances have been made in developing a progressive agenda for students in ways that take them beyond the mainstream student experience. Through the process of real collaboration with academics the role of student as consumer is challenged, reinventing the student as the producer of knowledge of real academic content and value (Neary and Winn 2009). The strength of this approach is that the student becomes the student as producer rather than student as consumer, but in the mainstream model the student is still confirmed as student.

The extent to which these collaborations move beyond the mainstream teaching and learning agenda depends on the extent to which the politicised nature of higher education is made explicit, and the ways in which the knowledge that is produced is contextualised politically, as well as theorised critically. Teaching and learning is made political when it is based on an agenda of contestation and struggle rather than the managed consensus of university bureaucracies, calling into question not just

particular aspects of teaching and learning in higher education, but the nature and purpose of higher education itself. For a pedagogy of excess these contestations and struggles might include course content, assessment strategies and student fees, but a fully developed pedagogy of excess would look beyond student issues, to matters of more general social concern, 'common affairs', in which the interests of students are not the main issue.

The extent to which these forms of collaboration extend into projects that attempt to reveal the origins for the general capitalist crisis is a matter of negotiation between the students and their teachers, but clearly a framework can be established within which these revelations can occur. This framework might be extended to become the organising principle for the institutions of higher education as a whole.

### **Theory: alternative political economy**

What was learnt from 1968 is that practical action is made dynamic when it connects to social theory. In this context the theory of excess becomes an antidote to the concept of consumerism and a guide to social action.

The concept of excess as critical political intervention has its roots in Sociology (Bataille), Anthropology (Mauss), and Marxist social theory (Debord). If consumerism is based on the economic theory which demands that individuals act rationally and in their own self-interest (Fine and Milonarkis 2009), the category of excess is offered 'as an alternative to the rationalist calculation of capitalist exchange' (Kosalka 1999).

The concept of excess was most developed in the work of Bataille (1991), who offered the notion of excess as an alternative framework to the capitalist basis of exchange, replacing what he regarded as a 'restrictive economy', with a 'general economy'. For Bataille this more general economy would provide a humanistic and non-utilitarian basis for the organisation of modern society.

Bataille argues that the key to the organisation of any society was the way in which it dealt with the surplus that had been produced. Anthropology (Mauss 1922) had revealed the ways in which non-capitalistic societies distributed their surplus on the basis of generosity and abundance, as gifts, promoting a sense of social solidarity through sharing, with an emphasis on collaboration and consensus. Acts of

extravagant generosity afforded status and respect to the person who was doing the giving; and, as the gifts that were being distributed were often intimately connected to the person who was doing the giving, generating feelings of personal satisfaction and self worth. These acts of extravagant giving created a sense of obligation on the part of the recipient, leading to bonding between individuals and groups. This process of excessive distribution is contrasted with the consumerist exchange process of capitalist society which is characterised by dissatisfaction and alienation.

This promotion of acts of extravagant generosity might seem somewhat utopian in the context of the modern social world. However, this process of exchange described by the concept of excess is instantly recognisable as being at the core of the academic enterprise (Fuller 2002). The practice of academic excess has been given further impetus by online computing through, for example, the free distribution of teaching and learning materials on the world wide web, defined as Open Educational Resources (Iiyoshi and Kumar 2008). A pedagogy of excess would seek to promote and develop these activities as a counter to the economic and market driven restrictive practices that increasingly dominate the activity of scientific enquiry.

However, what the politics of student protest has taught us, during and post 1968, is that radical consumption is not enough. The key to transformation of capitalist social relations lies not in the politics of consumption, but the politics of production: not the productivism of Bolshevik communism but the revolutionary theory of production elaborated by Marx in the *Grundrisse* and *Capital* that points towards a post-capitalist society (Debord).

The essence of Marx's revolutionary theory of production lies in his theory of surplus value (excess) which provides the conditions through which the social world can be progressively transformed. According to Marx's theory of surplus value, labour is the source and substance of all value in a society dominated, uniquely, by the production of excess (surplus value). In capitalist society, surplus value (excess) is produced by the quantitative expansion of human energy in the process of industrial production. While the value of labour (human energy) is the value of all things (commodities), the value which labour produces is not fully recognised in the financial reward paid to workers (wages). The difference between the value of the reward and the value that is produced by workers constitutes the excess or surplus value. In the world of capitalist work excess equals exploitation.

The physical limitations of human labour, and the continuing resistance of workers to the imperatives of waged work, mean that human labour is removed by the representatives of capital from the process of production, and replaced by technology and science. For the labour that remains work is intensified physically and enhanced intellectually – with a clear distinction between mental and manual workers. As labour is the source and substance of all value this joint process of the expulsion and enhancement of labour is profound. On one side, the expulsion of labour from the process of production means that the production of surplus value (excess) breaks down, resulting in dramatic declines in profitability. On the other side, the release of labour from the production process provides the opportunity for labour – and, therefore, for society as a whole - to develop its full creative capacity, in ways that are antithetical to the logic of capitalist production. Both scenarios, singularly and together, spell crisis and catastrophe for capitalism ( Grundrisse 706 - 708).

In practice, capital has sought to restrict the development of disorganised labour through the politics of oppression and the imposition of scarcity, poverty, and violence. Yet the creative capacity of labour remains undiminished, as seen in May 1968 and by the continuing movement of protest against the law of surplus value in all its oppressive manifestations.

Higher education is directly involved in the development of technology, science and the production of knowledge. The student-academic is both the producer and personification of this form of knowledge, and, therefore, has a key role to play in re-engineering of the politics of production. Since 1968, and before, student-academics have played a central part in the world-wide protest movements against capitalist excess. They have been laying the foundations for a pedagogy of excess, whose main learning point is that the production of surplus value through the politics of oppression, scarcity, poverty and violence, is not adequate to the sustainability of human life. The pedagogy of excess is a learning process which promotes the creative capacity of people in accordance with their needs as social individuals (Kay and Mott 1982).

### **Curriculum development – a higher level**

May 1968 was a defining moment in terms of the struggle over the meaning and nature of higher education. The struggle has intensified as higher education has become increasingly politicised. Most spectacularly in the recent period French academics and their students protested in 2007 against proposed neo-liberal reforms, although with a much more pragmatic agenda than in 1968. There is a growing body of literature that is recording the world wide intensification of academic labour as well as struggles to subvert capitalist work ( Nelson and Watt 2004;, Bousquet 2008, De Angelis and Harvie 2009), and seeks to provide alternative models to the neo-liberal university ( Muhr and Verger 2006 , Santos 2003, Emery 2009, Ainley 2005 , Berry et al 2002, Rogoff 2005). Yet the movements of struggle in higher education remain diffuse and dispersed, unable to find a common language, or course of action i.e. curriculum, within which to articulate their fragmented agendas e.g. social justice, democracy, global citizenship etc. The pedagogy of excess is a radical educational project without a curriculum: a course of action. So what would such a radical curriculum look like?

The pedagogy of excess cannot get ahead of the protests out of which it has been constituted, nor seek to ground a new movement of academic struggle in the events of the past. The pedagogy of excess requires that the radical history of 1968 is connected to the contemporary situation by recovering the subversive inspirations around which a more radical form of progressive pedagogy might be invented. Such a pedagogy would involve inventing a curriculum that includes grounding the concept of excess in an alternative political economy, involving a critique not simply of the politics of consumption but the politics of production. This critical political economy would provide a theoretical framework within which to conceptualise the ideology of protest, but no blueprint for action. Direct action should be informed in this curriculum by the lessons learned from the history of struggle inside and outside of the academy. This connection with the history of academic struggle should include an engagement with other critical pedagogical discourses, including, and in particular, critical pedagogy and popular education ( Friere 2007, McLaren 2000, Rikoswki 2007, Amsler and Caanan 2008 ), as well as more recent ideas that have sought to connect academic struggles with the worldwide movement of protest: 'public sociology' ( Burawoy 2005), 'participative pedagogy' ( Lambert 2009), 'mass intellectuality' ( Hardt and Negri 2001 ) and 'academic activism' ( Castree 2000).

Working within this curriculum academics and students can develop networks of alternative research projects. A list for such projects has already been provided by

Dyer- Witheford ( 2004) and includes: the establishment of new indices of well -being beyond monetarised measures; the new capacities for democratic planning afforded by new technology; systems of income allocation outside of wage – labour; the development of peer to peer open source communications networks; research projects that seek to enrich critical political economy with ecological and feminist knowledges, and the formation of aesthetics and imaginaries adequate to the scope of what a progressive and sustainable humanity might become ( 90 -91).

The pedagogy of excess suggests that 1968 offers a much better model around which to organise resistance to consumerism and marketisation than Humboldt's liberal vision for the University of Berlin. The pedagogy of excess requires that the radical history of 1968 is connected to the contemporary situation by recovering the subversive inspirations around which new form of pedagogies were invented. In 1968 the idea that research was something that students can do, was a revolutionary political statement. The fact that by the beginning of the twenty first century these subversive motivations have been reduced to the technical imperatives of research based learning, should not conceal the intellectual power that is generated when academics connect with undergraduate students through their own research activities, nor the importance for the future of the academic project that these connections are made, and raised to the level of society.

## References

Ainley. P. (2005) 'For Free Universities', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 29 (3): 277 - 285

Amsler, Sarah S. and Canaan Joyce E. (2008) Whither critical pedagogy in the neoliberal university today? Two UK practitioners' reflections on constraints and possibilities, *ELISS--Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*, 1(2), <http://www.eliss.org.uk/PreviousEditions/Volume1Issue2/ViewArticle/tabid/72/itemid/43/pubtabid/73/repmid/411/>

Barnett, R (2000) *Realising the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*, Society

for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, Buckingham:

Bataille, G. (1991) *The Accursed Share, Volume 1: Consumption*, Zone Books, New York

Baxter Magolda, M, Boes, L, Hollis, M L, & Jaramillo, D L (1998) *Impact of the Undergraduate Summer Scholar Experience on Epistemological Development*, University of Miami, Miami

Benjamin, W. ( 1934) 'The Author as Producer' in M.W. Jennings, H. Eiland and G. Smith (eds) (2004) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 2, 1927 – 1934*, Harvard University Press, Harvard

Berry, J., Heise, H., Jackobsen, J., Slater, H. ( 2002) *On Knowledge Production*: Copenhagen Free University; [www.copenhagenfreeuniversity.dk/exchange.html](http://www.copenhagenfreeuniversity.dk/exchange.html)

Boyer, E. L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998) *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*, Stony Brook: State University of New York at Stony Brook. Available at: [naples.cc.sunysb.edu/pres/boyer.nsf/](http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/pres/boyer.nsf/).

Brew, A. (2006) *Research and Teaching: Beyond the Divide*, PalgraveMacmillan, London

Bousquet, M. ( 2008) *How the University Works*, New York University Press, New York and London

Burawoy, M. ( 2005) For Public Sociology, *American Sociological Review* 70: 4 – 28

Castree, N. (2000) 'Professionalisation, activism and the university: whither 'critical geography?'. *Environment and Planning A*, 32, 6, 955-70

Cohn-Bendit, D. (1968) *Obsolete Communism: the Left Wing Alternative*, AK Press,

Edinburgh and San Francisco

De Angelis, M. and Harvie, D. ( 2009) *Cognitive Capitalism and the Rat Race: How Capitalism Measure Immaterial Labour in British Universities*, *Historical Materialism*, 17 (3): 3 - 30

Debord, G. (1970) *The Society of the Spectacle*, Red and Black, Boston

Delanty, G. ( 2001 ) *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*, The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, Buckingham and Philadelphia

Department of Business, Innovation and Skills ( 2009) *Higher Ambitions: The Future of Higher Education in a Knowledge Economy* - <http://www.bis.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/publications/Higher-Ambitions.pdf>

Dyer- Witheford, N. ( 2005) 'Cognitive Capitalism and the Contested Campus', *European Journal of Higher Education*, ( 2): 71 – 93 , <http://www.data-browser.net/02/DB02/DyerWitheford.pdf>

Elton, L. ( 2008a) 'Collegiality and Complexity: Humboldt's Relevance to British Universities Today', *Higher Education Quarterly*, Volume 62, No 3: 224 – 236

Elton, L. ( 2008b) 'Continuing Professional Development in Higher Education – The Role of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning', *Practice and Evidence of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Volume 3: 193 – 208

Emery, E. ( 2009) *The Free University* , <http://thefreeuniversity.net/>

Freire, P. (2007) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Continuum, New York

Fox, N. ( 2003) *New Satre: Explanations in Postmodernism*, Continuum, London

Fuller, S. ( 2002) *Knowledge Management Foundations* , Butterworth Heinemann, Boston

- Griffiths, R. (2004) 'Knowledge Production and the Research-Teaching Nexus: The Case of the Built Environment Disciplines', *Studies in Higher Education* Volume 29 No. 6, 709–726.
- Gilcher- Holtey ( 1998) 'May 1968 in France: The Rise and Fall of a New Social Movement' in *1968 The World Transformed*, (eds) C. Fink, C, P. Gasert, P., and D. Junker D. ( 1998) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 253 – 276
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. ( 2001 ) *Empire*, Harvard University Press, Harvard
- Hattie, J. and Marsh, H. W. (1996) 'The Relationship Between Research and Teaching: a Meta-Analysis', *Review of Educational Research* Volume 66, No. 4: 507–542.
- Healey, M (2005)'Linking Research and Teaching Exploring Disciplinary Spaces and the Role of Inquiry-Based Learning', in R. Barnett, R (ed) *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, McGraw-Hill/Open University Press, Maidenhead: 30-42
- Healey, M. and Jenkins, A. (2007) 'Linking Teaching and Research in National Systems', paper prepared for International Policies and Practices for Academic Enquiry: an international colloquium, Marwell, Winchester, UK, 19–21 April. Available at: [portal-live.solent.ac.uk/university/rtconference/rtcolloquium\\_home.aspx](http://portal-live.solent.ac.uk/university/rtconference/rtcolloquium_home.aspx).
- Hirsch, A. ( 1982) *The French Left: A History and Overview*, Black Rose Books, Montreal
- Holloway, J. 1968 and Doors to New Worlds, in *Turbulence, Ideas for Movement* - <http://turbulence.org.uk/turbulence-4/1968-and-doors-to-new-worlds/>
- Humboldt, von W. (1970) 'On the Spirit and Organisational Framework of Intellectual Institutions in Berlin', *Minerva* Volume 8: 242 – 267
- Humboldt, von W. (1993) *The Limits of State Action*, Liberty Fund, Indianapolis
- Iiyoshi, T and M. S. Vijay Kumar, M. S. (eds) ( 2008) *Opening Up Education***

***The Collective Advancement of Education through Open Technology, Open Content, and Open Knowledge*, MIT Press -  
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=11309&mode=toc>**

Jappe, A. (1999) *Guy Debord*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles

Jenkins, A and Healey, M. (2005) *Institutional Strategies to Link Teaching and Research*. The Higher Education Academy, York  
[www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources.asp?process=full\\_record&section=generic&id=585](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources.asp?process=full_record&section=generic&id=585)

Kay, G and Mott, J. ( 1982) *Political Order and the Law of Labour*, MacMillan, London

Kerr, C. (1963) *The Uses of the University*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA

Klimke, M. and Scharloth, J. (2008) *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1965 – 1977*, Palgrave Macmillan Transnational History Series, Basingstoke and New York

Knoll, J.H., and Siebert, H. (1967) *Humboldt: Politician and Educationalist*, Internationales, Bad Godesberg

Kosalka, D. ( 1999) 'Georges Bataille and the Notion of the Gift' in *Historian Underground: Making History Relevant for Life* - unpublished paper: [www.sauer-thompson.com/.../Bataille%20and%20the%20Notion%20of%20Gift.doc](http://www.sauer-thompson.com/.../Bataille%20and%20the%20Notion%20of%20Gift.doc)

Lambert, C. (2009) 'Pedagogies of Participation in Higher Education: a case for research-based learning ' *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 17 (3), 295 - 309

Lefebvre, H. ( 1984) *The Revolution of Everyday Life*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick

Lyotard, F. (1979) *The Postmodern Condition*, Manchester University Press, Manchester

- McLaren, P. ( 2000) *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire and the Pedagogy of Revolution*, Rowan and Littlefield, Maryland
- Nelson, C. and Watt, S. (2004) *Office Hours: Activism and Change in the Academy*, Routledge, Abingdon and New York
- Mauss, M. 1990 (1922). *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, Routledge, London
- Marx, K. (1990) *Capital Volume 1* Penguin London
- Marx, K. (1993) *Grundrisse*, Penguin, London
- Muhr, T. and Verger, A. ( 2006) *Venezuela Higher Education for All: Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, Vol 4 ( 4), <http://www.jcep.com/?pageID=article&articleID=63>
- Neary, M. with Winn, J. (2009) 'Student as Producer: Reinventing the Undergraduate Curriculum' in L. Bell, H. Stevenson, M. Neary (eds) *The Future of Higher Education: Policy, Pedagogy and the Student Experience*, Continuum, London
- Negri, A. ( 2009 ) 'On Rem Koolhaas' *Radical Philosophy*, No. 154
- Posner, C. (ed) ( 1970) *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth
- Pratt, J. ( 1997) *The Polytechnic Experiment*, The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press, Buckingham
- Quattrocchi, A. and Nairn, T. (1998) *The Beginning of the End*, Verso, London
- Ramsden, P (2001) 'Strategic Management of Teaching and Learning', in C Rust (ed.) *Improving Student Learning Strategically*, Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford: 1 - 10
- Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA and London

Rikowski, G. (2007) *Critical Pedagogy and the Constitution of Capitalist Society*, A paper prepared for the 'Migrating University: From Goldsmiths to Gatwick' Conference, Panel 2, 'The Challenge of Critical Pedagogy', Goldsmiths College, University of London, 14th September 2007, online at: <http://www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=articles&sub=Critical%20Pedagogy%20and%20Capitalism>

Rogoff, I. ( 2005) *The Academy as Potentiality*, Lecture given at MODE05 conference, available as video recording <http://mode05.org/node/152> or text available at <http://summit.kein.org/node/191> ( accessed January 2010)

Ross, K. ( 2002) *May '68 and Its Afterlives*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London

Santos, Boaventura De Sousa (2003) *The Popular University of Social Movements*, <http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/universidadepopular/indexen.php>

Scott, P. (2002) *A Lot to Learn: we are all researchers now*, Education Guardian, 8 January, 13. Available at: [education.guardian.co.uk/egweekly/story/0,628918,00.html](http://education.guardian.co.uk/egweekly/story/0,628918,00.html).

Scott, P. ( 1995) *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*, Open University Press, Buckingham

Seidman, M. ( 2004) *The Imaginary Revolution – Parisian Students and Workers in 1968*, Berghahn Books, Oxford and New York

Singer, D. (2002) *Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968*, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Pascarella, E. and Terenzini, P. (1991) *How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (2005) *How College Affects Students (Vol 2): a Third Decade of Research*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wieman, C. (2004) 'Professors Who are Scholars: Bringing the Act of Discovery to the Classroom', presentation at The Reinvention Center, Conference, November 2004, Integrating research into undergraduate education: the value added. Available at: [www.reinventioncenter.miami.edu/conference\\_05/wieman/presentation.htm](http://www.reinventioncenter.miami.edu/conference_05/wieman/presentation.htm)

Zamorski, B (2002) Research-led Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: a Case- Study', *Teaching in Higher Education*, Volume 7 , No. 4: 411-427

Zizek. S. (2009) *First as Tragedy then as Farce*, Verso, London