

This is a draft paper written for the ‘Governing Academic Life’ conference, held at the London School of Economics, 25-26<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

<http://www.governing-academic-life.org/>

If you intend to reference this paper in your work, please check whether there is a more recent journal paper listed on my University of Lincoln staff profile:

<http://staff.lincoln.ac.uk/jwinn>

Thank you.

Joss Winn, Senior Lecturer, School of Education, University of Lincoln. LN6 7TS. UK.

[jwinn@lincoln.ac.uk](mailto:jwinn@lincoln.ac.uk)

<http://josswinn.org/tag/co-operative-university/>

# The co-operative university: Labour, property and pedagogy

---

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Conversion, dissolution, creation.....	7
Realising the Co-operative University.....	7
Existing models? John Lewis and Mondragon University.....	8
The worker co-operative form .....	16
Theory and method for the co-operative university .....	19
Work in the worker co-operative university.....	24
An academic commons.....	27
Pedagogy and institutional form.....	33
Conclusion .....	40
Postscript: A laboratory for the production of social knowledge.....	42
References.....	45

## Abstract

We are witnessing an “assault” on universities (Bailey and Freedman, 2011) and the future of higher education and its institutions is being “gambled.” (McGettigan, 2013) For many years now, we have been warned that our institutions are in “ruins” (Readings, 1997). We campaign for the “public university” (Holmwood, 2011) but in the knowledge that we work for private corporations, where academic labour is increasingly subject to the regulation of performative technologies (Ball, 2003) and where the means of knowledge production is being consolidated under the control of an executive. We want the cops off our campus but lack a form of institutional governance that gives teachers and students a right to the university. (Bhandar, 2013)

Outside the university, there is an institutional form that attempts to address issues of ownership and control over the means of production and constitute a radical form of democracy among those involved. Worker co-operatives are a form of ‘producer co-operative’ constituted on the values of autonomy, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity. In most cases the assets (the ‘means of production’) of the co-operative are held under ‘common ownership’, a social form of property that goes beyond the distinction between private and public.

I begin this paper by discussing the recent work of academics and activists to identify the advantages and issues relating to co-operative forms of higher education. I then focus in particular on the ‘worker co-operative’ organisational form and discuss its applicability and suitability to the governance of and practices within higher educational institutions. Finally, I align the values and principles of worker co-ops with the critical pedagogic theory of ‘Student as Producer’.

## Introduction

*“When numerous labourers work together side by side, whether in one and the same process, or in different but connected processes, they are said to co-operate, or to work in co-operation... Co-operation ever constitutes the fundamental form of the capitalist mode of production.”* (Marx, 1976, Chapter 13)

*“We recommend to the working men to embark in co-operative production rather than in co-operative stores. The latter touch but the surface of the present economical system, the former attacks its groundwork.”* (Marx, 1866)

Why should we be interested in reconstituting the university as a co-operative? To put this question another way, when confronted by the neo-liberalisation of the university (Canaan and Shumar, 2008), its marketisation (Molesworth *et al*, 2011), its financialisation (McGettigan, 2013), when the idea of the university is being “gambled” and has fallen into “ruins” (Readings, 1997), how should we respond? In a recent article on the financialisation of higher education, Andrew McGettigan concludes:

*“I am frequently asked, ‘what then should be done?’ My answer is that unless academics rouse themselves and contest the general democratic deficit from within their own institutions and unless we have more journalists taking up these themes locally and nationally, then very little can be done. We are on the cusp of something more profound than is indicated by debates around the headline fee level; institutions and the sector could make moves that will be difficult, if not impossible, to undo, whether it is negotiated independence for the elite or shedding charitable status the better to access private finance.”* (McGettigan, 2014)

Similarly, when writing for the London Review of Books about the use of injunctions to prohibit student protest, Brenna Bhandar concludes:

*“If there is anything alluring about property as a form, it lies in its mutability, its capacity to be something other than private and exclusive. It is in all our interests to support students, academic and support staff, outsourced cleaners and others in their struggles to reconfigure the ownership of the university, and seize democratic forms of governance the better to create and distribute the social goods that we produce collectively, in spite of current government policies and management strategies.”*

(Bhandar, 2013)

Both authors recognise that directly confronting the issues of property and worker control of the university is *key* to getting anywhere. Of course, the history of capitalism is also the history of people confronting the organising principle of wage-labour and private property. The over-riding and over-whelming logic of the capitalist mode of production is to divide and discard labour in the sole pursuit of value; “it promotes over-production, speculation and crises, and leads to the existence of excess capital alongside a surplus-population.” (Marx, 1991: 350) Higher education can no longer be understood apart from these outcomes and today, when the university has assumed the role and form of the factory (Moten and Harney 1999; Rikoswki 2012; Edu-Factory 2009; Smith 2000), its workers are increasingly compelled to seek more radical models upon which to base the idea of the university, the pursuit of knowledge and determination over their own lives. In a country like the UK where around 50% of young adults are entering higher education (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2013), this is clearly not just a question for university workers and their students, but for society in general.

The idea of a ‘co-operative university’ is not new, but neither has it gained much traction until recently. There is, of course, a great deal of research into various forms of co-

operatives, co-operative governance, co-operative history, education within the co-operative movement, etc. In 2011, there was a special issue of the *Journal for Co-operative Studies* (44:3), which focused on co-operative education, and a growing number of articles have been written about co-operative education in the state school system (Woodin 2012; Facer *et al* 2012). This reflects the growth in recent years of co-operative schooling in the UK. There is a large amount of literature that discusses ‘co-operative learning’, but its authors usually use the term ‘co-operative’ without reference to the co-operative movement. Pedagogy based simply on the idea of ‘co-operation’ or more often ‘collaboration’ is not enough, as will become apparent in this paper.

In my view, a co-operative university must address (1) ownership of the institution’s capital in common; (2) fully democratic governance based on a re-conceptualisation of labour; both of which serve to maintain a ‘safe space’ for (3) co-operative practices in research, teaching and learning. Clearly much work is required to resolve the issues that each of these three areas of praxis demand and it is beyond the scope of this paper to address them fully. However, here I intend to develop the theoretical justification for co-operative higher education, focusing specifically on the political nature of such a project and the relationship between the pedagogical framework and the institutional form.

I ground my discussion in Marx’s social theory and method. That is, a historical materialist, dialectical and categorical critique of capitalism. Marx’s work is useful here not only because he developed a rigorous critique of political economy that remains relevant today, but in doing so, he identified worker co-operatives as the most progressive organisational form; one that attacks the “groundwork” of capital i.e. labour and private property, through worker democracy.

## Conversion, dissolution, creation

A review of English-language literature<sup>1</sup> uncovers a small number of articles and conference items that specifically discuss co-operativism and higher education. We can roughly categorise these into work that focuses on three different routes to co-operative higher education:

- 1) *Conversion* (e.g. Dilger 2007; Juby 2011; Ridley-Duff 2011; Wright et al 2011; Boden et al 2012; Cook 2013)
- 2) *Dissolution* (e.g. James and Neuberger 1981; Juby 2011; Ridley-Duff 2011)
- 3) *Creation* (e.g. Haubert 1986; van der Veen 2010; Woodhouse 2011; Somerville and Saunders 2013; Social Science Centre 2013).

Next, I want to highlight what I consider to be the most significant contributions to this growing body of work.

### Realising the Co-operative University

Since 2011, over 500 state schools have been constituted on co-operative values and principles (Woodin, 2012; Facer et al, 2012; Wilson, 2013). It is out of that intense activity that the Co-operative College sponsored a report on ‘Realising the Co-operative University’ (Cook, 2013). The report discusses how and why universities in the UK might become co-operatives, what might appeal about it to academics and students, and the extent to which co-operative values and principles are already aligned with what we might think of as academic values and principles.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am conscious that the co-operative movement is very much a worldwide movement and particularly strong in countries such as Spain, Italy, Finland and in Latin America. Research into co-operative higher education therefore demands an international perspective; one which is beyond the scope of this article.

Cook's report is mainly focused on the *conversion* of existing universities to co-operative universities i.e. universities whose Governors, Senior Management Team and Academic Board decide to formally constitute the institution according to co-operative values and principles. Cook does raise a number of points that apply across all three routes of *conversion, dissolution* and *creation*, such as the legal title of 'university' in the UK; how to define membership; the size and organisational structure of the institution; and the advantages and disadvantages of workplace democracy. In summary, he regards the co-operative university as "an institution *in potentia*":

*"My investigation shows that in many ways the Higher Education sector already is co-operative. Many of the preferences, assumptions and behaviours preferred in universities are co-operative ones. Despite this the possibility of a co-operative university has not been considered by the sector. I suggest that this can change, and must change: the challenges universities face are too great, and the opportunities co-operative working offers are too pregnant with potential, to do otherwise..."* (Cook, 2013: 59)

Cook's report is important for helping us understanding the range of practical considerations and further research questions when pursuing the idea of a co-operative university. It builds on preliminary work that was undertaken by Juby (2011), Ridley-Duff (2011) and others during and after the UK Co-operative Congress in 2011 and has reinvigorated discussion around the idea of co-operative higher education in a practical way.

### **Existing models? John Lewis and Mondragon University**

Boden, Ciancanelli and Wright's work specifically focuses on the ownership and governance of a model co-operative university. They seek a "programme for reform" and propose "the creation and implementation of a Trust University model" (Boden *et al*

2012: 22-23), inspired by the John Lewis Partnership Trust. (Boden *et al* 2011) In their work, they discuss the problems of university governance at the state and institutional levels, and identify two “hazards” facing the higher education sector in the UK: the private appropriation of public resources and the manipulation of university degree programmes to serve the interests of business. The origins of these hazards, they argue, “lie in the governance failings of ownership, control, accountability and regulation.”

(2012: 17) The adoption of a Trust model for universities would respond to these failings and resultant hazards by provoking “imaginative responses to the challenge of securing universities and their knowledge products as social rather than private assets.” (2012: 17)

At the heart of the Trust University is “a model in which all university staff and employees, as beneficial owners, hold the organisation in trust on behalf of society as a whole.” (2012: 20) The property of the university would be held in a non-revocable trust and all employees (academic and non-academic) as well as students, would be designated as beneficiaries.

Furthermore, they argue for an “accountable social compact” between the university and its “surrounding society” so as to underscore the common ownership of the university.

(2012: 21) They recognise that such a compact is problematic in practice: Who is meant by ‘society’? How will that dialogue be maintained? How are ‘stakeholders’ accountable to each other? They propose that techniques of participatory action research may be helpful, as well as “search conferences” run by representatives from both the institution and the community, where each hold each other to account and “cultivate increased understanding of each others’ work life, hopes and worries.” (2012: 21-22) They also propose that the university would be regulated, first by trust law, and second by creating professional standards bodies, such as a national Council of Scholars, in the same way that the General Medical Council in the UK, regulates the practice of doctors. Such an

arrangement “would place scholars rather than managers at the heart of higher education policy.” (2012: 22)

Boden, Ciancanelli and Wright’s work is important in that it identifies a number of key issues relating to what they regard as problems of neo-liberal reform: Managerialism, privatisation and associated abuses of power. They point to the trust model “both as a legal form and as an aspect of social relationships” (2012: 17), which could potentially combat these problems. While they argue that all employees and students (and presumably some members of the local community) should become beneficiaries of the trust, at this stage they have little to say about how democracy would work in the Trust University, referring instead to the “complex and sophisticated system of partner-democracy” found in the John Lewis Partnership. Aside from the need to further question such a role model for universities, they do not discuss the effect that this form of democracy would have on the respective roles and relationships between academics and students, nor do they question how the subsequent pedagogical relationship would connect to the meaning and purpose of the university as an institutional form for higher education. In summary, they do not outline a coherent model of labour, property and pedagogy as the basis of a co-operative university.

Elsewhere, in their *Report on a Field Visit to Mondragon* (Wright *et al* 2011), they do begin to discuss the relationship between labour, capital and universities, through a positive discussion of Mondragon University, which is part of the largest federation of worker co-operatives in the world (Whyte and Whyte 1988; Kasmir 1996; Erdal 2011). Established in the 1950s, the Mondragon Corporation in the Basque region of Spain is a federated co-operative of 110 co-operatives and 147 subsidiary companies with over 83,000 workers (Mondragon Annual Report, 2012). The university itself is also a ‘second-order’, ‘co-op of co-ops’ consisting of four autonomous co-operative faculties (Engineering,

Business, Humanities and Education, and Gastronomic Sciences) with around 400 staff and 3700 students on six campuses. The history of the individual faculties stretches back to 1943 (Engineering), 1960 (Business), 1976 (Education), and in 1997 were they consolidated into a single university with the Faculty of Gastronomic Sciences being established in 2011. They offer a range of degree programmes at all levels (12 undergraduate and 10 Masters level, in addition to doctoral research), some of which are in collaboration with other universities and it recently established Mondragon International Education (MIE), which “aims to transfer the University’s model to higher education institutions in other countries”, with a current focus on South America. (Mondragon Annual Report 2012: 48-9) In addition to the university, there are 15 technology centres and R&D units within the Mondragon Corporation, employing over 2000 researchers. In their field visit report, Wright *et al* describe how the university is “run according to a profit-oriented business logic but always following the premise of being a not-for-profit entity.” (2011: 46)

Although referred to as a ‘worker co-operative’, Wright *et al* indicate there are actually three types of membership: workers (academics and professional staff), users (other co-operatives, businesses and the local community) and students, thus resembling a multi-stakeholder co-operative. Each membership category is a source of finance for the university. Worker members of the university must invest around €15,000 in the university, which can optionally be taken from their social security payments over a two year period and “thus, they materially revoke a social contract with the state, in favour of one with their co-workers.” (2011: 45) Workers receive a share of the organisation’s surplus in the form of a salary and this is distributed in anticipation of the year’s financial results and subject to go up or down. The personal investment that each worker has in the university is “crucial to creating a genuine understanding of what it is to be an owner.

Workers become personally but collectively involved in making decisions”. (2011: 45)

The collective drive towards individual gain is “mitigated” by constant discussion of the co-operative’s values and aims.

Student members of Mondragon broadly consist of individuals on conventional degree programmes and workers who are being up-skilled for new tasks elsewhere in the corporation. As a private university, it does not receive the substantial state subsidies provided to public institutions and charges students two-thirds of the full fees of €9000 a year, with the remaining third subsidized by consultancy and short courses. The university has also established a co-operative to employ students so that they can earn money to pay for their tuition fees while studying. (Wright *et al* 2011: 46) It is not very clear from their report as to the extent that individual staff and students are actually empowered in the decision-making of the university, which maintains a governing structure similar to that found in a conventional university, with the addition of a Faculty General Assembly comprised of one-third each of workers, users and students. “This is where the final decisions are taken on the basis of one-member, one-vote.” (2011: 48)

In conclusion, the authors of the field report argue that Mondragon offers an example of a real alternative to the neo-liberal university in a number of ways: 1) The employee/employer relationship is replaced by direct worker ownership of the university, arguably overcoming exploitation through the wage relationship, and similarly, students are not regarded as mere consumers; 2) The number of administrators can be significantly reduced and reconceptualised as ‘facilitators’; 3) Responsibility for the running of the university, from its pedagogical approaches to its financial strategy can be shared and undertaken collaboratively; 4) The importance of “structural arrangements and processual rules” are key to the successful governance of the university; 5) Likewise, a “shared ethos of solidarity and co-operation” is essential.

Their work on Mondragon and the idea of a John Lewis-style Trust University raises the important question of ‘what is a university for?’ At Mondragon, we learn that interviewees repeatedly emphasised that “the purpose of MU is to gear education, research and knowledge exchange to support the future development of companies or local institutions.” (2011: 53) As such, the institutional form of the university has been consolidated around this business-driven objective and the authors briefly recognise that this may not be desirable if we regard the role of universities to be the “‘critic and conscience’ of society” (2011: 54). Whereas the mission of Mondragon University appears to be non-ideological, as a private institution it could be regarded as an exemplary model of the ‘pragmatic’ neoliberal university. Its mission is largely functional in that it serves as the training and research arm of the Mondragon Corporation and local businesses. Indeed, their Vice Chancellor has stated, “there is no ground for research that has no return”. (Matthews, 2013) It is based on non-unionised employee ownership; its cleaners and similar service staff are sub-contracted from elsewhere; and it is constantly seeking efficiencies, with half the ratio of administrators to academics than the average UK university. (Matthews, 2013)

Indeed, in her critical, anthropological study of Mondragon, Kasmir (1996) points to the “myth” of co-operative, worker democracy in the Mondragon Corporation, a myth that is more often derived from the views of managerial staff rather than general workers. Her study, which was from the point of view of the worker, rather than the manager, found that as a co-operative, its “worker owners are not shielded from the forces of the world market” (194) and that “workplace democracy does not ameliorate [the] daily pressures” of having to operate in a competitive market-economy that ceaselessly requires improvements in productivity and efficiency. Kasmir also argues against the myth of co-operatives being apolitical institutions. She notes that where such views are

maintained, it results in worker apathy and that an emphasis on the co-operative as a business form, rather than a political form, “seems to generate commitment and activism among managers” while “workers do not make effective use of the democratic and participatory structures available to them.” (1996: 195) Ultimately, Kasmir argues, “the business form, rather than class actors, emerges as the agent for social change” and that we should “be sceptical of models that make business forms rather than people the agents of change.” (1996: 196)

Surprisingly, Kasmir also found that in Mondragon, co-operative workers “do not consider the firms *theirs* in any meaningful way”. She concludes, “property itself does not transform workers, though ideologies of worker ownership and cooperation do remake working classes in other ways.” (1996: 197) Indeed, a “central finding” of her study is that co-operativism “can divide working classes” as it transforms the consciousness of a segment of the class in contrast to other workers. (1996: 198) Kasmir’s study of Mondragon requires us to problematize the concept of ‘workplace democracy’ as it points to the practice of democracy being more successful when it is grounded in daily politics and linked to activism. She concludes, “If workplace democracy is to be genuine, it seems it must be premised on activism.” (1996:199) Such activism recognises that co-operation and co-operatives are “political and ideological constructs” that serve a variety of political interests. (1996: 200)

\*

I have given a great deal of space to the work of Cook, and Boden *et al*, not least because it speaks to a number of questions anyone will first have about a co-operative university, and because the *conversion* route is a strategy that we can begin to campaign for *right* now as part of the campaign for the public university. In doing so it will also prime academics

and students for thinking about the other two routes available to us: *dissolution* and *creation*.

The *dissolution* route includes related efforts to embed co-operativism within the university, while not formally and fully constituting the institution as a co-operative. In this way, academics and students could, either openly or subversively, choose to work towards co-operativism inside an otherwise conventional university. The *dissolution* route might be attempted in various ways, such as the establishing of research groups and centres as co-operatives; the development of degree programmes and modules that embed co-operative values and principles within them and thereby redefining, to some extent, the role of the student and teacher in the curriculum design, teaching and learning processes; or going further, the implementation of co-operativism at the strategic, if not the constitutional, level of the university (See July 2011; Ridley-Duff 2011 for lists of examples).

Although not specifically couched in the language of co-operativism, our work on ‘Student as Producer’ at the University of Lincoln might be regarded as a model for instituting co-operativism across the entire university curriculum (Neary and Winn, 2009). Student as Producer at Lincoln is a university-wide initiative, which aims to construct a productive and progressive pedagogical framework through a re-engineering of the relationship between research and teaching and a reappraisal of the relationship between academics and students. Research-engaged teaching and learning is now “an institutional priority at the University of Lincoln, making it the dominant paradigm for all aspects of curriculum design and delivery, and the central pedagogical principle that informs other aspects of the University’s strategic planning.” (Student as Producer website) I discuss Student as Producer in more detail in the latter part of this paper.

What I want to specifically focus on for the rest of this paper is the *creation* route to the co-operative university through further discussion of the most radical co-operative model: the worker co-operative. Other types of co-operatives, such as the multi-stakeholder, consumer and housing co-operative models warrant separate discussion at a later date.

## The worker co-operative form

*“A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise.” (International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), Statement on the Cooperative Identity, 1995)*

The co-operative movement’s identity is expressed through a number of values and principles (ICA, 1995). The values are the basis for the principles; the principles are the basis for action. All formally constituted co-operatives around the world identify themselves with a statement that is based on the ‘Rochdale Principles’ of 1844 and last revised in 1995. (MacPherson, 2007) The six co-operative values are: Self-help, Self-responsibility, Democracy, Equality, Equity and Solidarity. The principles are: Voluntary and Open Membership; Democratic Member Control; Member; Economic Participation; Autonomy and Independence; Education, Training and Information; Co-operation among Co-operatives; and Concern for Community.

*The World Declaration on Worker Co-operatives* (CICOPA, 2005) states that, “Worker cooperatives are committed to being governed by the above mentioned Statement on the Cooperative Identity.” The Declaration, approved by the International Co-operative Alliance in 2005, defines the “basic characters” of worker co-operatives in six statements. Those statements are concerned with the dignity of work and the importance of

democratic self-management; the free association of workers; that members of the co-operative collectively employ themselves to undertake the work; the distinction of worker co-operatives from wage-labour and individual self-employment; democratic decision-making; and autonomy from the State and other third-parties with respect to management of the co-operative and control over the means of production.

Worker co-operatives, employee ownership and worker self-management have a long and significant history in the international labour movement and have been the subject of numerous theoretical works, case studies and critical analyses (e.g. Vanek, 1977; Wajcman, 1983; Crouch and Heller, 1983; Rothschild and Allen Whitt, 1986; Mellor *et al*, 1988; Bradely and Nejad, 1989; Bayat, 1991; Coates and Topham, 2005; Shukaitis, 2010; Erdal, 2011; Ness and Azzellini, 2011; Bernstein, 2012). Here, I sketch an outline of worker co-operatives in the UK so as to understand the historical context in which a worker co-operative university would be situated.

The origins of the Co-operative movement in the UK are usually traced back to the industrialist, Robert Owen (1771-1858). Owen's generous but paternalistic outlook was inspired by Quaker and Socialist thought at that time and he sought to develop a detailed model for co-operative and communal living such as that at New Lanark. The modern consumer co-operative movement began in 1844 with the foundation of the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers Society, and their 'Principles' form the basis of co-operative identity today. In 1882, the Cooperative Productive Federation was formed to represent and develop worker co-operatives as distinct from consumer co-operatives until it ceased in 1968. Post-war support for worker co-operatives gradually developed out of individual philanthropic initiatives such as the Scott-Bader Commonwealth (1951), which would become the Society for Democratic Integration into Industry (1958) and after a decade this would consolidate several firms into the Industrial Common Ownership Movement

(ICOM) (1971) (Quarter, 2000). This should also be understood within the context of the growing Trade Union movement and the events of 1968 (Bayat, 1991: 20-23), when the socialist Institute for Worker Control (IWC) was formed. The IWC helped establish ICOM and organise a movement to extend the modest achievements of Scott-Bader. The movement at this time is notable for the overall growth of worker co-operatives and in particular the so-called 'rescue co-operatives' or 'Phoenix co-operatives', referring to a number of failing firms that were taken over by their employees, often after periods of occupation. (Mellor *et al*, 1988; Tuckman, 2011) Notable examples of these are the Fakenham Enterprises shoe factory in Norfolk (Wajcman, 1983) and the three 'Benn co-operatives', which were converted with the support of MP Tony Benn: Meriden Motorcycles, The Scottish Daily News and Kirkby Manufacturing and Engineering (KME). Out of this activity emerged a need to improve legislation relating to employee ownership and ICOM pressed for a change in legislation that resulted in the passing of the Industrial Common Ownership Act (1976), which reinforced and clarified the provision of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act (1965) (Axworthy and Perry, 1989).

Throughout the 1980s, all three of the major UK political parties advocated co-operatives, with Labour viewing them as "a true socialist approach to economic planning and development"; the Liberals seeing them as contributing to "a vibrant 'third sector' of employee owned enterprises to enrich our economy and society"; and the Conservatives supporting them under their policy of returning state-run industries to the private sector. (Mellor *et al*, 1988: 52-3)

In practice, political commitment to the growth of co-operatives was consolidated in the Co-operative Development Agency Act (1978), which led to the creation of a national Agency and a number of local Co-operative Development Agencies across the UK,

offering practical assistance to individuals wishing to start a co-operative during that period of rising unemployment. In 1989, there were 1400 worker co-operatives, the highest number ever recorded in the UK (Co-operative Research Unit, 1989).

In 2001, ICOM merged with the Co-operative Union to form the current Co-operatives UK, which is a member of the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), the trustee of the Co-operative College and retains a seat on the National Executive Committee of the Co-operative Party, aligned to the UK's Labour Party. In 2013, there were 497 worker co-operatives operating in the UK with a 27.5% share of turnover of all co-operatives. (Co-operatives UK, 2013)

Globally, worker co-operatives are represented by the International Organisation of Industrial, Artisanal and Service Producers' Cooperatives (CICOPA). It is a sectoral organisation of the ICA with 45 members in 31 countries, including Co-operatives UK. According to CICOPA, in 2010 there were 111,200 worker, social, artisan and worker-owned co-operatives worldwide (3725 classified as 'education') with 83% in Europe and 12% in South America. They are estimated to employ up to four million people. (CICOPA 2010)

## **Theory and method for the co-operative university**

In his report, Cook states that "Co-operative principles are academic principles. There is arguably a close alignment between co-operative principles and mainstream academic values." (2013: 19) I do not intend to discuss this argument here, but it does highlight how the entrepreneurial emphasis of both co-operatives and the modern university is commonly regarded as compatible with a concern for education, democracy, autonomy and community. As is well documented, universities are increasingly discussed in the

language of productivism, in terms of economic growth and the requisite reproduction and integration of the labour market. In the UK, the higher education sector is regulated by and receives funding from the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. The university can therefore be conceived as a ‘means of production’. Marx clearly defines the ‘means of production’ as “the instruments and the object of labour” (1976: 287), which, when combined with purposeful human activity, becomes a ‘productive force’.

*The simple elements of the labour-process are (1) purposeful activity, that is work itself, (2), the object on which that work is performed [i.e. raw materials or the product of a previous labour process - in our case 'prior knowledge'], and (3) the instruments of that work [i.e. technology, buildings, roads, etc.]. (Marx 1976, 284)*

If we regard the university as a means of production, we are referring to the configuration of its ‘instruments’ (e.g. technology, buildings, etc.), and the ‘object on which that work is performed’ (e.g. prior knowledge). In other words, the ‘means of production’ refers to the university’s structural, technological and bureaucratic configuration as a form of capital for the production of knowledge. The university incorporates prior knowledge into its production process and the knowledge it produces is offered as the ‘subject of labour’ elsewhere, resulting in capital accumulation (i.e. growth). The academic and student are brought together by this configuration in order to produce new knowledge through their labour. Knowledge is commodified in various ways, such as patents, research papers, consultancy, etc., and most importantly in the student’s sole commodity of labour power, which they sell in the labour market.

There is a danger, and to some extent a historically determined inevitability, that by advocating the worker co-operative form we reinforce and reproduce the university as a means of capitalist production. Although worker co-operatives are often established in opposition to the imperatives of the capitalist mode of production, they cannot simply

choose to exist outside of its social totality. Despite the possibility and emancipatory potential of reproducing social life in the interstices or ‘cracks’ of capitalism (Holloway, 2010), a fundamental premise of a historical materialist understanding of human life is that despite our ideals, desires and ambitions, our collective ability to act in the world is conditioned by the material conditions of production, and the way in which labour is actually constituted today:

*“The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the means of subsistence they actually find in existence and have to reproduce.*

*This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. Hence what individuals are depends on the material conditions of their production.” (Marx and Engels, 1975: 31-32)*

This position does not deny that individuals are able to speculate and imagine circumstances different to what materially exists, but posits that consciousness is an outcome of historical, material conditions and that our ability to actually *act* upon our ideas and *change* the course of history requires a rigorous, scientific understanding of the actual conditions of social life.

*“This manner of approach is not devoid of premises. It starts out from the real premises and does not abandon them for a moment. Its premises are men, not in any fantastic isolation and fixity, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions...”*

*Where speculation ends, where real life starts, there consequently begins real, positive science, the expounding of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men.” (Marx and Engels, 1975: 37)*

Much has been written about the relationship between the co-operative movement and capitalism, including work that focuses specifically on worker co-operatives as anti-capitalist or post-capitalist social forms. (e.g. Egan, 1990; Vieta *et al*, 2010; Jossa 2014; Wolff, 2012) I share the view of Shukaitis (2010), that worker co-operatives should be understood as the practice of an “immanent critique” (2010: 63) of the capitalist mode of production and its configuration of labour. I agree that “at its best such a project becomes a laboratory for the creation of forms of social cooperation and subjectivities that arguably would form the basis of a post-capitalist world.” (2010: 62) With some further clarification, I also share Shukaitis’ view that worker co-operatives might also be a “model of prefigurative politics.” (2010: 62)

In the political context, ‘prefigurative’ and ‘immanent’ represent two overlapping methodological approaches: On the one hand, prefigurative practices are the “embodiment, within the ongoing political practice of a movement, of those forms of social relations, decision-making, culture, and human experience that are the ultimate goal.” (Boggs, 1977) This is a *positive* standpoint that affirms not only the possibility, but also the availability of an embodied agency while acknowledging its historical and material limits. To the extent that worker co-operatives are prefigurative, this positive approach reifies the standpoint of the worker (labour) in the co-operative as embodying its own emancipatory kernel. This affirmation of labour has been the standpoint of almost all worker struggle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and as both a theoretical and strategic position, it must urgently be questioned (Postone, 1993; Krisis Group, 1999; Kurz 2014)

On the other hand, worker co-operatives can be understood as establishing a *negative* standpoint, as a practised immanent critique. Such a critique is what the Historian, Moishe Postone conceives as a reflexive attempt to critically confront “both the reality and the ideals of capitalist society, indicating the historically determinate character of both.” (Postone, 1993: 89) Thus, as a negative critique this particular co-operative constitution of labour points to what *is* and therefore what *is not* (but *could be*).

Understood as *both* positively prefigurative and as negative, immanent critical practice, we might argue that the labour of a worker co-operative “is not undertaken on the basis of what is but of what could be, as a potential immanent to the existent society.” (Postone 1993: 90)

In order to survive, worker co-operatives remain necessarily complicit in the reproduction of capital while at the same time working through its inherent and devastating contradictions. Understood in this way, workers must dialectically confront *both* the real conditions of social life and our ideals. This is made conscious by comprehending the theoretical basis of our practice *and* therefore the historical specificity of that practice. This is what Postone refers to when he says that “immanent social critique also has a practical moment: it can understand itself as contributing to social and political transformation.” (Postone, 1993: 89) As both prefigurative and immanent practice, the work of the worker co-operative must be adequately grounded in a theoretical framework that is able to conceive the historical moment in its totality.

If we are to negate the positivity of prefigurative practices through an immanent critique grounded in theoretical categories adequate to capitalist society, we might begin by examining the simple relationship between production and consumption.

## Work in the worker co-operative university

In his notebooks, Marx wrote that “Production, then, is also immediately consumption, consumption is also immediately production. Each is immediately its opposite.” (Marx, 1973: 90) The point he was developing was that production and consumption are somehow mediated. Later in his manuscripts, he goes into much more analytical detail about the production of use values and their exchange, showing how the apparent unity or immediacy of capitalist production and consumption is much more contradictory and volatile than earlier political economists assumed.

This idea was later expressed more rigorously in *Capital* in terms of the ‘value-form’. (Marx, 1976; Marx, 1978) For Marx, value was a fundamental category for his critique of political economy. He regarded it as a *real abstraction* derived from the particular character and configuration of labour in capitalism, which takes on a real, concrete and an abstract, social form. It is the abstract, social form of labour that constitutes the qualitative, commensurable substance of a commodity’s value, quantified retrospectively as ‘socially necessary labour time’. Value is comprised of ‘use-value’, corresponding to concrete labour, and ‘exchange-value’, corresponding to abstract labour; use-value being the utility of something and exchange-value being the realisation of the thing’s ‘value’.

Marx showed that the value-form of a commodity can be analysed on four levels, ranging from the most abstract ‘simple form’, to the ‘expanded’ and the ‘general’, and finally most concrete, ‘money form’. The simple form expresses “the secret of the entire value form” (Marx, 1978: 134) and consists of the ‘relative value form’ and the ‘equivalent form’. When two commodities are brought together for exchange (i.e. the moment that mediates production and consumption), they represent “two poles of the expression of value”. The two poles are “inseparable”. “Relative value-form and equivalent form are

moments of the same expression of value, which belong to one another and are reciprocally conditioning and inseparable.” (Marx, 1978: 135) Marx discusses the simple form in terms of the relationship between commodity A and commodity B, his examples being linen and coats respectively. He shows how in the exchange process, X amount of linen takes on the relative value form of X number of coats and therefore the coats are deemed equivalent to the given amount of linen. The relationship can be analysed inversely, from the point of view of the coats being relative to the equivalent amount of linen.

With great dialectical rigour, Marx goes on to demonstrate how this *abstract* simple form actually operates in society through the *concrete* use of money, which acts as a universal equivalent for all commodities. What is key here is that in capitalism, the commodity is the “economic cell form” (Marx, 1976: 90) from which we can dialectically analyse the capitalist mode of production and its determination of social life. The value-form of the commodity is the form through which we *actually* relate to one-another in society, not only as consumers but as producers, too. Marx argued that an individual’s primary commodity is his or her own labour power, or capacity to labour, which we sell for money. Therefore, we too are commodities that take on the reciprocally relative and equivalent poles of the value form in relation to one another. This is what Marx meant when he referred to ‘indirect’ labour i.e. labour that is mediated by the exchange relationship found in the value form. It’s emancipatory opposite, ‘direct labour’, requires exchange value (i.e. value) to be abolished and therefore the whole system of reciprocity instituted by capitalism be abolished, too. (Hudis, 2012; Postone, 1993; Marx, 1975)

What is key here though is that in a normal employer-employee relationship, the reciprocal exchange for labour power is, in fact, not reciprocal at all. Although the reciprocal exchange of commodities at first appears fair, the one commodity that is not

exchanged reciprocally is that of labour power, which is exploited in order to create surplus value for the capitalist. If labour power was not exploited and was exchanged with its true equivalent money value, the capitalist could not create a surplus and the whole mode of production would crumble. This is a fundamental contradiction of the capitalist mode of production, which worker co-operatives attempt to resolve by abolishing the employer-employee relationship and therefore the exploitation of the wage relationship. In doing so, relations between worker-owners of the co-operative are not mediated through the value-form (although their relations with people elsewhere still are), and they are in a stronger position to institute democracy in the workplace and address the division of labour and ownership of property.

The point I wish to make here, which is neglected by other writers, is that in addition to worker democracy in a co-operative university, the conventional exchange relationship between paid teachers (producers) and paying students (consumers) must be overcome or otherwise the value form, ultimately expressed as money, continues to determine the nature and character of the co-operative. In the first instance, the distinction and divide between teachers and students should be addressed through a reconfiguration of the division of labour so as to ensure that individuals in both roles contribute according to their individual capacity and need in the process of knowledge production.

Whereas in a conventional, capitalist university, there is a great *diversity of roles* and their respective contractual responsibilities (e.g. Senior Lecturer, Professor, Administrator, Undergraduate Student, IT Officer, Finance Officer, etc.), such a division of labour in the institution ensures that the *diversity of work* within any given role is limited. In a worker co-operative university, as I am conceiving it, there is a singular role of 'scholar' but a greater diversity of work and significantly less division of labour. Labour among members is not divided but is instead *direct* i.e. non-reciprocal, mediated by an

acknowledgement that individual's abilities and needs differ rather than an *indirect* exchange of labour mediated by equivalence i.e. money. According to the individual's capacity, the teacher is also a student, an administrator, a cleaner, and so on. The most capable members would make the most diverse and therefore enriching contribution to the university. This is not to suggest that the most capable scholars should be 'over-worked', burdened with menial work, or that everyone does everything. With a greater number of members partaking in undesirable but necessary work than is ordinarily the case, 'light work' would be made of such tasks and it is expected that more time would be available for enjoyable, satisfying and less alienating work. Also, a co-operative university need not do everything that a conventional university aims to do.

## An academic commons

*"The various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of ownership, i.e. the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relations of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument, and product of labour... Division of labour and private property are, moreover, identical expressions: in the one the same thing is affirmed with reference to activity as is affirmed in the other with reference to the product of the activity." (Marx and Engels, 1975: 32)*

Many worker co-operatives aim to overcome the division of labour through the rotation and sharing of roles and co-operation between other co-operatives. The division of labour was recognised by Marx and Engels as contributing towards the alienation of labour from its product and reinforcing the institution of private property. As I have argued, divided labour is, according to Marx, 'indirect' labour mediated through the value-form in the exchange process: the labour of divided individuals as well as their

product assume the roles of relative and equivalent commodities. Worker co-operatives can be understood as a form of instituted praxis that attempts to replace indirect labour with 'direct', non-mediated and therefore non-alienated labour. This requires that the property of the co-operative becomes 'social property', an alternative to the paradigms of private and public property. The legal basis for this in the UK is the Industrial Common Ownership Act (1976). (Axworthy and Perry, 1989) Thus, in a co-operative university where the labour of both students and academics is not divided into contractual roles but according to capacity and need, the property of the co-operative becomes the social property of all member-scholars. This form of property is also known as a 'commons'. Co-operatives UK's model constitution for worker co-operatives (nd.), includes the following option on 'common ownership', which is underwritten by the 1976 Act.

*“The Co-operative is a common ownership enterprise. If on the winding up or dissolution of the Co-operative any of its assets remain to be disposed of after its liabilities are satisfied, these assets shall not be distributed among the Members, but shall be transferred to some other common ownership co-operative(s), or to Co-operatives UK (or any body that succeeds to its function). If such residual assets cannot be distributed in this manner they shall be transferred to some other organisation(s) whose purpose is to promote and support the co-operative movement and common ownership enterprises. This rule may only be amended by Extraordinary Resolution.”*

This is a significant point of constitutional clarification. If a university were constituted on this basis, its scholars would *collectively* 'own' the means of knowledge production. Axworthy and Perry have summarised what this means for a 'common ownership enterprise':

*“They have no share capital, but are limited by guarantee. Their constitutions must provide that only employees of the enterprise or a subsidiary may be members, and all employees may be members subject to conditions relating to age, length of employment and other requirements, provided there is no political or religious discrimination. All members are to have equal voting rights at meetings. Assets are only to be handed over to the members for value. Profits are to be shared amongst the members. On dissolution, after satisfaction of all liabilities, assets are not to be distributed to the members but are to be transferred to a central fund maintained for the benefit of common ownership enterprises or used for charitable purposes. Lastly, the enterprise is controlled by a majority of those working in it and in a subsidiary of it, should one exist.” (1989: 657)*

Relating to their last two points, the Companies Act 2006 included provisions, since used by Co-operatives UK in their company models, which in effect require 100% of the workers to approve changes regarding the distribution of the co-operative’s assets. (Barlow, 2013) Implicit in this model of worker co-operative is that ‘common ownership’ is not ‘ownership’ as conventionally understood as private property shared among a designated group of people, but rather their status is more like ‘membership’, where workers produce and manage shared assets for individual, collective and long-term social benefit.

*“This kind of property is an amalgam of both private and social property. The member of an ICO firm is entitled to important incidents of title - control of the work place, participation in policy making, determining the disposition of profits - yet does not have legal title. As a result, the members cannot freely alienate their shares in the co-*

*operative. The democratic control of the co-operative and the requirement that only members be permitted to exercise a franchise within the structure give the firm many of the characteristics of public property, rather than simply private property held as an aggregate of individualities.” (1989: 660)*

Axworthy and Perry regard this form of property as the antithesis of that which distinguishes capitalist private property: “the right of free alienability”. They point to the co-operative’s defining characteristic of “non-distribution upon dissolution” (1989: 660) as ensuring that this form of property is particularly durable. It gives property a peculiar social life of its own, which is not simply a temporary composite owned by a collective of individuals seeking personal gain. The role of the member-worker in such a co-operative amounts to a social role of steward, thus differing from the more conventional roles of Trustee or Share-holder, neither of whom are required to be workers in the enterprise, as well as differing from the individual equity model used by Mondragon.

Marx recognised that such co-operatives are not *private* nor are they *public* in the way a joint-stock company is, despite joint-stock companies representing “the abolition of capital as private property within the confines of the capitalist mode of production itself.”

In *Capital* Vol.3, Marx argues:

*“In joint-stock companies, the function is separated from capital ownership, so labour is also completely separated from ownership of the means of production and of surplus labour. This result of capitalist production in its highest development is a necessary point of transition towards the transformation of capital back into the property of the producers, though no longer as the private property of individual producers, but rather as their property as associated producers, as directly social property. It is furthermore a*

*point of transition towards the transformation of all functions formerly bound up with capital ownership in the reproduction process into simple functions of the associated producers, into social function.” (Marx, 1991: 568)*

A ‘Common Ownership Enterprise’ fulfils Marx’s expectations regarding the property relations of joint-stock companies being a “necessary point of transition”. Common ownership is not simply the property of associated producers but truly a form of “directly social property”. It extends beyond the “the transformation of all functions formerly bound up with capital ownership in the reproduction process” by decisively breaking that link. Whereas the joint stock company is “private production unchecked by private ownership”, a workers’ co-operative is social or collective production governed by a legal form of social or common stewardship. Common ownership of the means of knowledge production among scholar-members of a co-operative university would therefore be a significant step towards a form of academic labour that is not alienated from its product in the way that private property enforces. If the university is a factory, better that it is a co-operative factory:

*“The cooperative factories run by workers themselves are, within the old form, the first examples of the emergence of a new form, even though they naturally reproduce in all cases, in their present organization, all the defects of the existing system, and must reproduce them. But the opposition between capital and labour is abolished here, even if at first only in the form that the workers in association become their own capitalist, i.e. they use the means of production to valorize their own labour. These factories show how, at a certain stage of development of the material forces of production, and of the social forms of production corresponding to them, a new mode of production develops and is formed naturally out of the old.” (Marx, 1991: 571)*

In his survey of Marx's work, Hudis (2013) summarises what Marx deems necessary to eliminate the conditions of alienating value production i.e. freely associated, non-alienated labour. It requires direct ownership and democratic control in the workplace, eliminating the social division of labour between ownership and non-ownership so that workers have a direct stake in the outcome of their labour.

This has also been discussed at length by Egan (1990) and Jossa (2005; 2009; 2012a; 2012b; 2014) in the context of a form of worker co-operative known as 'Labour Managed Firms' (LMF). Both Jossa and Egan argue separately that the specific characteristics of the LMF are compatible with Marx's emancipatory social theory. Egan offers a thoughtful and balanced discussion of the LMF understood as a dialectical response to capital and argues that "the importance of connecting worker management with class struggle lies in providing a measure of safe space in which labor-managed firms can challenge this class imposed limit [on efficiency]." (Egan, 1990: 81) He makes a compelling argument for the worker co-operative form on its own terms, concluding that the "potential for degeneration [of worker co-ops into capitalist firms] must be seen to lie not within the co-operative form of organisation itself, but in the contradiction between it and its capitalist environment. Degeneration is not, however, determined by this contradiction." (1990: 81)

Over several articles, Jossa examines the work of Marx and his views on worker co-operatives. Jossa regards the specific characteristics of the LMF as "decisive" (2005:14), arguing that they abolish wage labour by hiring capital rather than labour. Jossa's work is thorough but overall he is too certain of the emancipatory potential of the LMF form of worker co-operatives, arguing that the LMF overcomes fundamental Marxist categories of capitalism including alienation and the labour theory of value. (2012a). More recently, his position has changed somewhat, conceding that "democratic labor-managed firms

reduce the main cause of alienation” but “self-management would not root out those forms of alienation that are related to the working of markets and to shortage of commodities.” Much of Jossa’s work seems directed towards the goal of market socialism through the establishment of LMFs and it is only in his most recent work that he appears to come to terms with the intrinsic limits of that approach (McNally, 1993) and regard worker co-operatives as a dialectical mode of *transition* to post-capitalism.

## Pedagogy and institutional form

As I have discussed, in her critical analysis of the Mondragon Corporation, Kasmir (1996) concludes that we must “be skeptical of models that make business forms rather than people the agents of social change.” (1996: 196). Likewise Brew has argued that:

*“The relationship between teaching and research is intricately embedded within ideas about what universities do and what they are for. It is fundamental to what is understood as higher learning and to ideas about the nature of the academy. Understanding this relationship raises substantial questions about the roles and responsibilities of higher education institutions, about the nature of academic work, about the kinds of disciplinary knowledge that are developed and by whom, about the way teachers and students relate to each other, about how university spaces are arranged and used, indeed, it raises fundamental questions about the purposes of higher education.”* (Brew, 2006: 3)

This suggests that in developing a co-operative for higher education, the organisational form should be a conscious expression of the pedagogical relationship between teacher-student-scholar-members i.e. ‘scholars’. The pedagogical relationship is understood as a social relationship, which would be given expression through a reconceptualization of academic and student labour, guided by co-operative values and principles.

The relationship between teacher and student (i.e. scholars) is one of the core principles of an initiative I have been involved with since 2008 called ‘Student as Producer’. In this section, I want to offer a survey of recent work on Student as Producer by Neary and others (Neary and Winn, 2009; Neary 2010; Neary and Hagyard 2010; Neary 2012a; Neary 2012b; Neary 2012c; Neary 2013), and argue that it provides the pedagogical basis for a new form of co-operative higher education; one which attacks the groundwork of the neo-liberal university.

*“The idea of student as producer encourages the development of collaborative relations between student and academic for the production of knowledge. However, if this idea is to connect to the project of refashioning in fundamental ways the nature of the university, then further attention needs to be paid to the framework by which the student as producer contributes towards mass intellectuality. This requires academics and students to do more than simply redesign their curricula, but go further and redesign the organizing principle, (i.e. private property and wage labour), through which academic knowledge is currently being produced.”* (Neary & Winn, 2009: 137)

Student as Producer originates from and is formulated through a negative critique of capitalist social relations. It is concerned with “re-engineering” the university so as to redress the “dysfunctional” relationship between teacher and student; one that reflects the dysfunctional relationship between research and teaching in the modern university. It is both a theoretical and political project, a form of praxis that is being worked on in, against and beyond the university.

Drawing on Walter Benjamin’s essay, ‘The Author as Producer’, Neary’s emphasis is not only on the qualitative nature of the product (i.e. knowledge), but also on the process and means of knowledge production in the creation of social relations that are antithetical to

the organising principles of capitalist social relations (i.e. private property and waged labour).

In his work, Neary attempts to offer a radical pedagogical framework (not a blueprint) that is adequate to the challenges facing humanity and argues that it must be grounded in the politics of production rather than distribution and consumption. It offers a framework for the production of new forms of knowledge that are negotiated through the political struggle of student-teacher-academics (i.e. 'scholars'). He argues that higher education must be politicised, or rather, the politics of higher education must be made apparent. It requires the reorganisation of intellectual and manual labour, rather than its continued division. The modern university is fragmented, through its division of labour, division of disciplines, division between teachers and students, and in its current form, cannot produce the knowledge required for the sustainability of human life. Neary argues that the purpose of higher education is not the production of students for waged labour (i.e. employment), but rather the production of knowledge appropriate to the needs of humanity (in the face of emergency). Research is demystified as "work anyone can do". Higher education is therefore open, inclusive and accessible and all research should be informed by its own radical history. This does not simply apply to the Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, but also the theoretical and applied Sciences which have their own radical history e.g. *Engineers for Change* (Wisnioski, 2012) and *Science for the People* (Moore, 2013). One way to connect, or rather dissolve, traditional disciplines is through their shared radical histories. (Neary and Hagyard, 2010)

As well as Benjamin, Neary also draws upon the work of the Marxist Psychologist, Lev Vygotsky (1997), by arguing that the basis for transforming institutions of higher education is the transformation of the role of the student. For Vygotsky, the student becomes the student-worker. The role of the student is not simply that of becoming a

‘collaborator’, or the learner of skills, but as an active contributor to the labour process of the university (i.e. the production of knowledge), within which they find their own purpose and meaning.

The division of intellectual and manual labour is overcome through the recognition of education as a form of productive labour itself. By revealing the organising principle of knowledge production, the university becomes grounded in the productivity of its students. Through the transformation of the student and subsequent transformation of the organising principle of higher education, science and technology can be employed to transform society. The student becomes the subject rather than object of history - they make history - and humanity becomes the project rather than the resource. Teaching begins from the student's experience in a particular social context so that the student teaches themselves and are no longer alienated from the production of knowledge; they “recognise themselves in a world of their own design.” (Neary and Hagyard, 2010: 8)

Therefore, for Neary, Student as Producer and indeed the *idea* of the university is fundamentally a political project and as such, Student as Producer engages directly with and against the fact that higher education is regulated through the productivist paradigm of the State. Political subjectivity is “the essential objective reality out of which practical, critical knowledge is derived.” (Neary, 2012b: 3) The institutional form itself should support (i.e. be partisan to) this political project. Drawing on Paul Du Gay’s work, bureaucracy is *valued* as a moral and ethical process which does not exist independently of the political project but guards its constitution.

Student as Producer exists *for* knowledge and *against* the “knowledge worker”. It aims to use the language and protocols of the university subversively (i.e. as a way to ‘interoperate’ with the neoliberal university, the State, markets, etc.) without taking on its

form. It recognises that “the production of knowledge is immediately the production of subjectivity and the construction of organisation.” (Roggero 2011: 138) The institutional form is therefore constructed from the subjectivity of its members, which is formed through the co-operative, social production of knowledge.

It attempts to overcome labour in its capitalist form, which is a “fabrication” of the social relations of capitalist production. “Labour, as such, does not exist but is constituted only as a real abstraction.” (Neary 2012b: 9) With this pedagogical framework, the issue for the worker co-operative is to discover a way to practice non-alienated, non-abstract, direct labour. This is at the heart of the university’s research project: the discovery of a new form of social being. (Neary 2012b)

Reflecting on the Occupy movement, Neary and Amsler (2012) argue for the need to conceive the neoliberal university as a peculiar expression of commodified space-time. It is an “abstract space” ruled by the logic of abstract labour, whereby the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student is configured for the production of value. An opposing organisational form would seek to overcome the power of these abstractions by, first of all, re-configuring the pedagogical relationship so as to abolish knowledge in its commodity-form (use-value and exchange value).

Education “cannot be separated from ‘life’ in institutions” and so all aspects of the institution must be understood to be educational or pedagogical. The division of this labour in time and space is conceived holistically and materially as having a pedagogical purpose for society, for humanity, as a whole. All aspects of this co-operative production of knowledge are understood as appropriations of space-time thereby gradually overcoming the logic of capital.

If we “have rather lost control over the form, structure and function of academic knowledge” (Neary and Amsler 2012: 116), worker co-operatives might be a conscious attempt to *assert* control, *constitute* an organisational form, and *define* a different (i.e. democratic, horizontal, consensus-based) social structure for the production of academic knowledge. If “the space of the university is mobilised for the purposes of production through its commodification, abstracting, converting into exchange value, fetishizing and modularising” (Lefebvre 2008: 338), how can the worker co-operative form resist these imperatives? Is it simply a “diversion” that will inevitably degenerate (Egan 1990) or rather an “appropriation” of a different space and time, which through struggle as a form of immanent critique can aid the *transition* to post-capitalism? Must a worker co-operative for higher education *possess* a physical space in time, or can a new space-time be *constituted* through its legal form and extend to the whole of the “social universe”? If “it’s not about possessing territory. Rather it’s a matter of increasing the density of communes, of circulation, and of solidarities to the point that territory becomes unreadable, opaque to all authority” (The Invisible Committee, 2007), can the worker co-operative form be conceived and constituted existentially and ontologically? That is, how can we *become* the university in the form of ‘mass intellectuality’ (Neary and Winn, 2009; Virno, 2001), rather than ‘go to university’?

Early avant-garde Marxists, Vygotsky and Benjamin, provide the pedagogical foundations for Student as Producer, which Neary has developed. In a more recent paper (Neary, 2013), he critiques the ‘productivism’ of their Marxism arguing that labour and its reification should be the subject of critique in developing Student as Producer further. This implies that the organisational form for this pedagogical framework should itself be anti-productivist or post-productivist. A worker co-operative would have to reflect on how this redefines ‘work’ and how the organisation can be constituted in a way that

works towards abolishing exchange-value while asserting use-value as the form of social wealth derived from the concrete labour of its members. It would be a worker co-operative that sought to abolish capitalist work in its alienated and abstract forms (Jossa 2014a).

The educational mission of the co-operative university is to be determined by its scholar-members. However, drawing on the history of education in the co-operative movement (Woodin 2011), we can identify certain themes and practices in the overall curricula that would affect all its members.

Facer *et al* (2012: 331) identify four “dominant education traditions in the Co-operative movement, evident in both the historical literature and contemporary practice”. These are:

1. *Teaching about co-operation* – making visible the alternatives and challenging the social and economic status quo.
2. *Training for co-operation* – improving co-operative institutions and skills as economic and social resources.
3. *Learning through co-operation* – developing co-operative identities, dispositions and habits
4. *Co-operation for education* – establishing Co-operative schools, colleges and universities.

Interpreting these activities as an integrated political strategy and integrating them across curricula of study could be a means of counteracting the uses of higher education for capitalist valorisation, potentially forming a rigorous basis for resistance to capital. It could also act as a way of embedding historical and political subjectivity within the curriculum, which would help ensure that the co-operative remains critically self-

reflexive. As we have seen, one of the criticisms of Mondragon is that workers “do not consider the firms theirs in any meaningful way.” Kasmir argues that one of the lessons we can learn from Mondragon is that of the “importance of politics, the necessary role of organization, and the continuing value of syndicates and unions for transforming the workplace.” Likewise, Kasmir goes on to argue, “if workplace democracy is to be genuine, it seems that it must be premised on activism.” (Kasmir, 1996: 199-200)

Scholar-members of a worker co-operative university must regularly question how their mutual work can be reproduced as a critical, social project.

## Conclusion

Cook’s report for the Co-operative College is based on the assumption that a “Co-operative University would necessarily meet the legal definitions of a co-operative and a university, simultaneously.” The *creation* route does not assume this. It recognises that a ‘university’ in the UK is a legal title, but one which has meaning *apart* from legislation. Originally, a ‘university’ was simply a body of students and scholars who convened to undertake research-based teaching and learning i.e. ‘higher education’. The *creation* route to the co-operative university therefore might entail the creation of a co-operative for higher education which does not carry the legal title of ‘university’ in the UK. A legislated university *requires* a community of scholars. A community of scholars does not require a legislated university. It raises the question of whether the legal title in the UK of ‘university’ is something that the co-operative movement should ultimately be concerned with. Higher education and universities need not be synonymous. A ‘university’ may point to ‘higher education’, but ‘higher education’ does not necessarily point to a ‘university’.

Co-operation among co-operatives is a basic principle of the international movement. If Co-operatives UK, or the International Co-operative Alliance agreed to support the creation of co-operatives for higher education, it could do so based on the principles of ‘democratic member control’ and the ‘autonomy and independence’ of a community of worker-scholars. It may not award State validated degrees, but it could provide a higher education at the same level and confer awards that carry meaning, currency and weight beyond the institution. Alternatively, it could initially adopt a model similar to the UN University, which develops and runs degree programmes in collaboration with other higher education providers worldwide. (<http://unu.edu>)

In this paper, I have discussed how the worker co-operative form might be suitable for a university in light of how the international co-operative movement defines the ‘character’ of worker co-operatives and the re-conceptualisation of academic labour that this organisational form would imply. I have asserted that as it exists today, the university is a means of production which capital employs together with academic labour to re-produce labour in the form of students, and value in the commodity form of knowledge. A worker-owned and managed co-operative university would therefore control the means of knowledge production and potentially produce a new form of social knowledge. I highlighted the emphasis among worker co-operatives on ‘common ownership’ as a form of property relations that overcomes the distinction between ‘public’ and ‘private’ to produce an ‘academic commons’, such that all members of the university become stewards for the social good. Finally, I suggested that the distinction between teacher and student would necessarily be dissolved through a mutual political project and with it the division of labour, too. Assuming this was the case, a radically different method of curriculum development and pedagogy would be required. Drawing on Kasmir’s reflections on Mondragon that we should “be skeptical of models that make business

forms rather than people the agents of social change”, it follows that the organisational form of a ‘co-operative university’ should itself be derived from the pedagogical relationship between teacher-student-scholar-members i.e. ‘scholars’. I have suggested that the basis of this pedagogical relationship might be Student as Producer.

Neary makes the claim that the institutional form for "a radical new model of higher education in Europe and beyond" should be derived, first of all, from a political, pedagogical project that aims

*"to enable students to see themselves as subjects rather than objects of history, as teachers, writers and performers, rather than recipients of knowledge, and be able to recognise themselves in a social world of their own design."* (Neary 2012a: 247)

That is, the institutional form should not determine the design of curricula or the pedagogic relationship between teacher and student, but rather it should be an expression of it arrived at through a dialectic of political struggle, against capital and therefore against the capitalist form of labour. What is required is the emergence of an institutional form which adequately expresses the radical aspirations of academics and students who see themselves as subjects rather than objects of history: the worker co-operative, perhaps?

## Postscript: A laboratory for the production of social knowledge

*"Communism is for us not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence."* (Marx, 1975: 49)

In 2011, I helped establish the Social Science Centre, Lincoln, a co-operative for higher education (Social Science Centre, 2013). It began as an idea that my colleague, Mike Neary, and I had been discussing the previous summer, and was partly influenced by the network of social centres that exist across the UK and elsewhere. In May 2014, the co-operative held its third Annual General Meeting, its members run a ‘Social Science Imagination’ course, a number of arts-based community projects, and organise regular public talks. The SSC remains an experiment – on our own terms a successful one – that has allowed its members to both teach and learn at the level of higher education, and also reflect on, discuss and critique alternative and utopian forms of higher education. In academia, we might formally describe the SSC as an ‘action research’ project.

*“Action research is simply a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out.”* (Carr and Kemmis 1986: 162)

Thought of as an ‘action research project’, some members, including myself, are looking to take the next step in the research cycle. While not wishing to disrupt the continuation of the Social Science Centre in Lincoln, some of us are embarking on a second phase of research and action focusing on the idea of a ‘co-operative university’. The SSC is not a university but rather a small-scale co-operative model of free, higher education. It is a free association of people who come together to collectively produce knowledge. It is also a political project. We always intended that the SSC should remain small and sustainable in recognition of our existing commitments of work and family, etc. However, our work on the SSC has remained ambitious and has led to discussions around the idea of a ‘co-operative university’.

To be a co-operative, the organisation must be constituted as such by its founding members. Each year at our AGM, we read through our Constitution and other founding documents that I helped author over three years ago. They were written as a response to changes in the UK higher education sector at the time (and that continue), as well as setting out in an aspirational way, something we wanted to create. We wrote the founding statement (Neary and Winn, 2011) in a style that suggested it was already happening, that it was real, when it was in fact only real in our imaginations. It was what Marx might have referred to as “speculation” and our subsequent work has been an attempt at “real, positive science, the expounding of the practical activity, of the practical process of development”. (Marx 1975: 37)

From January to April 2014, the Social Science Imagination course focused on the theme of ‘Co-operation and education’, resulting in a national conference. Our particular focus was intended to challenge and revitalise this critical, utopian process and project, creating pedagogic space to reflect on, discuss and question our utopian, revolutionary idea of what higher education might be. Could be.

The ICA statement of identity was chosen to help initiate this critical, dialogical process. It is a carefully worded statement that unites millions of people around the world in the co-operative movement. We have to read it as such and draw out the key terms and ideas that are embedded in this historical text. It is a set of guidelines, rather than a legal definition; a compass, rather than a cage. What can we learn from it? How can the themes of autonomy, democracy, solidarity, equality, common ownership, etc. become *critical tools* that help us reflect on ourselves and give form to our desire for emancipatory education?

## References

- Axworthy, Christopher S and Perry, David (1989) The Law of Worker Ownership, *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 27:3, 647-686
- Bailey, Michael and Freedman, Des (2011) *The Assault on Universities: A Manifesto for Resistance*, Pluto Press
- Ball, Stephen J. (2003) The teacher's soul and the terror of performativity, *Journal of Education Policy*, 18:2, 215-228
- Barlow, Linda (2013) *All about Asset Locks!* Retrieved on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.uk.coop/thirdsector/comment/1781>
- Bayat, Assef (1991) *Work, Politics and Power. An international Perspective on worker's control and self-management*, Zed Books Ltd.
- Bernstein, Paul (2012) *Workplace Democratization. Its Internal Dynamics*, Red Sun Press
- Bhandar, Brenna (2013) A Right to the University, *London Review of Books blog*, Retrieved 17<sup>th</sup> February 2014 from <http://www.lrb.co.uk/blog/2013/12/10/brenna-bhandar/a-right-to-the-university/>
- Boden, Rebecca, Ciancanelli, Penelope, and Wright, Susan (2012) Trust Universities? Governance for Post-Capitalist Futures. *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 45:2, 16-24
- Boden, Rebecca, Ciancanelli, Penelope, and Wright, Susan (2011) Shopping around for a better way to operate? Try John Lewis, *Times Higher Education*, Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/414835.article>

Boggs (1977) *Marxism, prefigurative communism, and the problem of workers' control*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <https://libcom.org/library/marxism-prefigurative-communism-problem-workers-control-carl-boggs>

Bradley, Keith and Nejad, Aaron (1989) *Managing owners. The National Freight Consortium in perspective*, Cambridge University Press

Brew, Angela (2006) *Research and Teaching: Beyond the divide*, Palgrave Macmillan

Canaan, Joyce and Shumar, Wesley (2008) *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University*, Routledge

Carr, Wilfred and Kemmis, Stephen (1986) *Becoming Critical. Education, knowledge and action research*, Falmer

CICOPA (2005) World Declaration on Worker Cooperatives, Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from [http://www.cicopa.coop/IMG/pdf/Declaration\\_approved\\_by\\_ICA\\_EN-2.pdf](http://www.cicopa.coop/IMG/pdf/Declaration_approved_by_ICA_EN-2.pdf)

CICOPA (2010) Worldwide data. Retrieved on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.cicopa.coop/Worldwide-data.html>

Coates, Ken and Topham, Tony (2005) *Workers' Control: A book of readings and witnesses for workers' control*, Spokesman Books

Cook, Dan (2013) *Realising the Co-operative University. A consultancy report for The Co-operative College*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from [http://dbms.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/media/user/162789/Realising\\_the\\_co-operative\\_university\\_FOR\\_DISEMINATION.pdf](http://dbms.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/media/user/162789/Realising_the_co-operative_university_FOR_DISEMINATION.pdf)

Co-operative Research Unit (1989) Referenced by Sawtell, Roger (2009) A short history of worker coops. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://workerco-operatives.blogspot.co.uk/2009/07/part-2-surge-of-70s-and-its-aftermath.html>

Co-operatives UK (nd) Model rules for co-operatives. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.uk.coop/advise/modelrules>

Co-operatives UK (2013) *Homegrown. The UK Co-operative Economy*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June from [http://www.uk.coop/sites/storage/public/downloads/homegrown\\_co-op\\_economy\\_2013\\_final\\_0.pdf](http://www.uk.coop/sites/storage/public/downloads/homegrown_co-op_economy_2013_final_0.pdf)

Crouch, Colin, and Heller, Frank A. (1983) *International Yearbook of Organizational Democracy*, Volume 1, John Wiley and Sons

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2013) *Participation rates in higher education: Academic years 2006/7 – 2011/2012 (Provisional)*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/participation-rates-in-higher-education-2006-to-2012>

Dilger, A 2007, 'German Universities as State-sponsored Co-operatives', *Management Revue*, 18:2, 102-116

Egan, (1990) Toward a Marxist Theory of Labor-Managed Firms: Breaking the Degeneration Thesis, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 22:4, 67-86

Edu-Factory (2009) *Toward a Global Autonomous University: Cognitive Labor, the Production of Knowledge, and Exodus from the Education Factory*, Autonomedia

Erdal, David (2011) *Beyond the Corporation: Humanity Working*, Bodley Head

- Facer, Keri and Thorpe, Julie and Shaw, Linda (2012) Co-operative Education and Schools: an old idea for new times? *Power and Education*, 4:3, 327-341
- Haubert, Maxime (1986). Adult education and grass-roots organisations in Latin America: The contribution of the International Co-operative University. *International Labour Review*. 125:2, 177-192
- Holloway, John (2010) *Crack Capitalism*, Pluto Press
- Holmwood, John (2011) *A Manifesto for the Public University*, Bloomsbury Academic
- Hudis, Peter (2013) *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism*, Haymarket Books
- Invisible Committee (2007) *The Coming Insurrection*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://tarnac9.wordpress.com/texts/the-coming-insurrection/>
- International Co-operative Alliance (1995) Statement on Co-operative identity, values and principles, retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://ica.coop/en/whats-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles>
- James, E. & Neuberger, E. (1981) The University Department as a Non-Profit Labor Cooperative, *Public Choice*, 36: 585-612
- Jossa, Bruno (2005) Marx Marxism and the cooperative movement, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29:1, 3-18
- Jossa, Bruno (2009) Gramsci and the Labour Managed Firm, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 41:1, 5-22
- Jossa, Bruno (2012a) A system of self-managed firms as a new perspective on Marxism, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36:4, 821-841

Jossa, Bruno (2012b) Cooperative Firms as a New Mode of Production, *Review of Political Economy*, 24:3, 399-416

Jossa, Bruno (2014a) Alienation and the Self-Managed Form System, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 46:1, 5-14

Jossa, Bruno (2014b) *Producer Cooperatives as a New Mode of Production*, Routledge

Juby, Patricia. (2011) *A Co-operative University?* Conference presentation at the Society for Co-operative Studies Conference, Cardiff. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://joss Winn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Juby-2011-A-CO-OPERATIVE-UNIVERSITY2.ppt>

Krisis Group (1999) Manifesto Against Labour. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.krisis.org/1999/manifesto-against-labour>

Kurz, Robert (2014) The Crisis of Exchange Value: Science as Productive Force, Productive Labor, and Capitalist Reproduction. In: Larsen, Nilges, Robinson and Brown (Eds.) *Marxism and the Critique of Value*, 17-75, MCM<sup>2</sup> Publishing. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.mcmprime.com/>

Lefebvre, Henri (2008) *The Production of Space*, Wiley Blackwell

MacPherson, Ian (2007) *One Path to Co-operative Studies*, British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies

Marx (1866) *Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions, The International Workingmen's Association*. Retrieved 9<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1866/08/instructions.htm>

Marx, Karl (1973) *Grundrisse*, Penguin Classics.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick (1975) *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels Collected Works Vol. 5, Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.

Marx, Karl (1976) *Capital*, Volume 1, Penguin Classics

Marx, Karl (1978) The Value-Form, *Capital and Class*, 4: 130-150

Marx, Karl (1991) *Capital*, Volume 3, Penguin Classics

Matthews, David (2013) Inside a co-operative university, *Times Higher Education*,

Retrieved 10<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/inside-a-cooperative-university/2006776.fullarticle>

McGettigan, Andrew (2014) *Financialising the University*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://arena.org.au/financialising-the-university/>

McGettigan, Andrew (2013) *The Great University Gamble: Money, Markets and the Future of Higher Education*, Pluto Press

McNally, David (1993) *Against the Market. Political Economy, Market Socialism and the Marxist Critique*, Verso

Mellor, Mary, and Hannah, Janet, and Stirling, John (1988) *Worker Co-operatives in Theory and Practice*, Open University Press

Molesworth, Mike and Scullion, Richard and and Nixon, Elizabeth (Eds.) (2011) *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*, Routledge

Mondragon Annual Report (2012) Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from

<http://www.mondragon-corporation.com/eng/about-us/economic-and-financial-indicators/annual-report/>

Moore, Kelly (2013) *Disrupting Science: Social Movements, American Scientists, and the Politics of the Military, 1945-1975*, Princeton University Press

Moten, Fred and Harney, Stefano (1999) The academic speed-up, *Workplace*, 4, 23-28

Neary, Mike and Winn, Joss (2009) The student as producer: reinventing the student experience in higher education. In: Bell, Stevenson and Neary (Eds.) *The future of higher education: policy, pedagogy and the student experience*, Continuum

Neary, Mike and Winn, Joss (2011) *The Social Science Centre (Lincoln): a new model for higher and co-operative education*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June from <http://socialsciencecentre.org.uk/original-ssc-statement/>

Neary, Mike (2010a) *Student as producer: a pedagogy for the avant-garde?*, Learning Exchange, 1:1. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013 from <http://eprints.lincoln.ac.uk/4186/>

Neary, Mike and Hagyard, Andy (2010) *Pedagogy of excess: an alternative political economy of student life*. In: Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon (Eds.) *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. Routledge

Neary, Michael (2012a) Teaching politically: policy, pedagogy and the new European university. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10:2, 233-257

Neary, Michael (2012b) Student as producer: an institution of the common? [or how to recover communist/revolutionary science], *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*, 4:3

Neary, Mike and Amsler, Sarah (2012) Occupy: a new pedagogy of space and time? *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10 (2)

- Neary, Mike (2013) Student as Producer: a pedagogy for the avant-garde; or, how to revolutionary teachers teach? [v2] Paper presented at *Walter Benjamin, Pedagogy and the Politics of Youth conference*, London. [unpublished]
- Ness, Immanuel, and Azzellini, Dario (2011) *Ours to master and to own. Workers' control from the commune to the present*, Haymarket Books
- Postone, Moishe (1993) *Time, Labour and Social Domination*, Cambridge University Press
- Quarter, Jack (2000) *Beyond the Bottom Line: socially innovative business owners*, Quorum Books
- Readings, Bill (1997) *The University in Ruins*, Harvard University Press
- Ridley-Duff, Rory (2011) Co-operative University and Business School: Developing an institutional and educational offer. UK Society for Co-operative Studies. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://josswinn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Co-operative-University-Institutional-and-Educational-Offer-Draft-3.pdf>
- Rikowski, G. (2012) *Life in the Higher Sausage Factory*, Guest Lecture to the Teacher Education Research Group, The Cass School of Education and Communities, University of East London, 22nd March. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.ieps.org.uk/PDFs/lifeinthehighersausagefactory.pdf>
- Roggero, Gigi (2011) *The Production of Living Knowledge. The Crisis of the University and the Transformation of Labor in Europe and North America*, Temple University Press
- Rothschild, Joyce, and Allen Whitt, J. (1986) *The cooperative workplace. Potentials and dilemmas of organisational democracy and participation*, Cambridge University Press
- Shukaitis, Stephen (2010) Sisyphus and the Labour of Imagination: Autonomy, Cultural Production, and the Antinomies of Worker Self-Management, *Affinities*, 4:1, 57-82

- Smith, Neil (2000) Who Rules This Sausage Factory? *Antipode* 32:3, 330-339
- Social Science Centre, Lincoln (2013) An experiment in free, co-operative higher education, *Radical Philosophy*, 182
- Somerville, P & Saunders, G. (2013) *Beyond Public and Private: the transformation of higher education*. Conference paper. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://josswinn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Somerville-and-Saunders-2013-Beyond-public-and-private.pdf>
- Student as Producer website: <http://studentasproducer.lincoln.ac.uk>
- Tuckman, Alan (2011) Worker's Control and the Politics of Factory Occupation. Britain, 1970s. In: Ness and Azzellini (Eds.) *Ours to Master and Ours to Own*. Haymarket Books
- Vanek, Jaroslav (1977) *The Labor-Managed Economy*, Cornell University
- Vieta, Marcelo (2010) The New Cooperativism, special issue of *Affinities*, 4:1
- Virno, Paolo (2011) *General Intellect*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from <http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpvirno10.htm>
- Wajcman, Judy (1983) *Women in Control. Dilemmas of a Workers Co-operative*, Open University Press
- Whyte, William Foote and Whyte, Kathleen King (1988) *Making Mondragon. The Growth and Dynamics of The Worker Cooperative Complex*, Cornell University Press
- Wilma van der Veen, E. (2010) [The New University Cooperative: Reclaiming Higher Education: Prioritizing Social Justice and Ecological Sustainability](#), *Affinities* 4:1

Wilson, Mervyn (2013) *From Co-operative Schools to Co-operative Universities?* Presented at 'Co-operative university seminar', Institute of Education, London, 12<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

Slides available from <http://joss Winn.org/2013/12/co-operative-principles-in-higher-education/>

Winn, Joss (2013) Hacking in the university: contesting the valorisation of academic labour, *Triple C: Communication, Capitalism and Critique*, 11: 2, 486-503

Wisnioski, Matthew (2012) *Engineers for Change: Competing Visions of Technology in 1960s America*, MIT Press

Wolff, Richard (2012) *Democracy at work: A cure for capitalism*, Haymarket Books

Woodhouse, Howard (2011) Learning for Life: The People's Free University and the Civil Commons, *Studies in Social Justice*. 5:1, 77-90

Woodin, Tom (2011) Co-operative education in Britain during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: context, identity and learning, In: Webster, Shaw, Walton, Brown and Stewart (Eds.) *The Hidden Alternative. Co-operative values, past, present and future*, Manchester University Press

Woodin, Tom (2012) Co-operative Schools: building communities in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *FORUM*, 54: 2

Wright, Susan and Greenwood, Davydd, and Boden Rebecca (2011) Report on a field visit to Mondragón University: a cooperative experience/experiment, *Learning and Teaching*, 4:3, 38-56

\*

I maintain a bibliography of work specifically discussing co-operative higher education:

<http://joss Winn.org/2013/11/co-operative-universities-a-bibliography/>

For a recent, practical introduction to setting up worker co-operatives in the UK, see:

Radical Routes (2012) *How to set up a Worker's Co-op*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from  
<http://www.radicalroutes.org.uk/publicdownloads/setupaworkerscoop-lowres.pdf>

Co-operatives UK (2013) *The worker co-operative code*. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from  
<http://www.uk.coop/workercode>