Antipode

Connectivity, Creativity, Hope, and Fuller Subjectivities: Appreciating the Responses to the Communifesto for Fuller Geographies

Participatory Geographies Research Group

http://pygyrg.org/

Gratitude and clarifications

First, our thanks to the colleagues who responded so diversely and productively to the communifesto for fuller geographies, and thanks also to *Antipode* for facilitating this symposium. The communifesto has already exceeded the expectations of those of us who drafted the original, in what could have been an uninspiring, stuffy university classroom in a session of the Royal Geographical Society with Institute of British Geographers (RGS-IBG) international conference in Edinburgh earlier this year (2012). It has stimulated further debate among critical geographers about creating spaces for mutual aid and strategies for collective resistance to the neoliberalisation of the university – and more! Indeed, via the symposium enabled, and responses elicited, by *Antipode*, we see the communifesto itself as a process, transcending the bounds of the document, becoming a part of a forum for scholars (and others) to do the intellectual work to 're-imagineer' the university in/with the world (see Routledge 1997).

Recognising a need for clarification on the context of the original draft of the communifesto, we would like to make some brief points before we respond to the other *Antipode* responses to the communifesto. The original draft was a spontaneous outcome of open and participatory discussion in that RGS-IBG session. We did not have any form of output in mind, beyond circulating it around the Participatory Geographies Research Group (PyGyRG) email list for comment: certainly, there was strong agreement in the session that we should resist the writing of any paper that could be co-opted within the coming UK 'Research Excellence Framework' (REF) audit process. After PyGyRG members' comments, the 'participatory communiqué' was duly amended, named (with surprising difficulty, and none of the capital

Antipode

letters gained with *Antipode*'s in-house style for document titles!), and consensually adopted by PyGyRG. At some point in this stage of the process, a suggestion was made to liaise with *Antipode* for wider circulation and debate of the communifesto. Thus, we wish to be clear that the draft of the communifesto which AntipodeFoundation.org hosts is an expression of PyGyRG's militant particularism (see Featherstone 2005; Mason forthcoming), and we return to offer more detail on this point below.

Further, in recognising such claims to particularity, we need to say that the communifesto has not been developed exclusively by geographers. The conference session included people from diverse backgrounds, including engineering, policy studies, environmental science, architecture and civil society activism, while the wider PyGyRG likewise incorporates people from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, not all of whom currently work or research from academic positions. Indeed, many of us straddle various positions. What is pertinent here is that (human) geography provides a space for PyGyRG members to come together on the basis of connectivity through participatory approaches, and commitments to issues of social and spatial justice through such approaches. This makes for interesting in-group debate, not least on how we can work across university and public domains – and avoid conceptualising such a binary – and the pros and cons of inter-disciplinary working, issues raised in responses to the communifesto. Thus the communifesto was never intended as fixed but rather as a work in progress, which the 'towards' in the title attempted to convey. Indeed, we look forward to incorporating critical elements of colleagues' responses into it, and to keeping the project going usefully ahead.

And this links to the issues caught up with communal writing. At the conference session, and at all stages of re/drafting the communifesto, we are concerned with producing a PyGyRG document/voice/action. That is, while not every member of the group was present at the session, or commented individually on drafts, we are concerned with reaching consensus that actively (re)produces us as a specific community, to enact mutual solidarities within and also to enable solidarities beyond. Consensus here does not mean complete agreement with all points, rather willing acceptance of the document/voice/action in its broader intent. It is

Antipode

beyond the scope of this paper to consider in-depth the politics and difficult practices of collaborative writing (see Cook 2012). We do wish to be clear that we are not claiming to speak for all individuals of PyGyRG on all aspects of the content laid out below[1], but take responsibility as a group for the positions set out here.

Appreciating responses

Let us begin our appreciation of the *Antipode* responses with a brief summary. There are points of connection and diversity that the reader may discern for themselves across the full responses; it is not our intention here to offer a thematic overview of them, rather to attempt some transparency regarding their critiques, in that this response does not attend to every point raised, given the dilemmas of communal writing alluded to above.

Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro discusses the wider political implications which he sees as problematic with initiatives such as the communifesto. Foremost, he critiques it as Eurocentric and a 'universalisation of the particular', pointing to the long-standing crisis of academia outside of 'Euro-academia', and productively signalling lessons that can be learned from existing practices elsewhere. Further, he argues that the political, social, economic and environmental crises listed are 'intrinsic to a capitalist mode of production', and, seen in this light, the communifesto appears spatially and historically naïve, giving only 'a narrow view of the context of struggle'. Conceptualising the university as a site of ideological production for a capitalist mode of production, he asks 'can one really expect a factory to be socially just?'. The task, Engel-Di Mauro argues, should not be to better universities but to go beyond them - to end them. To this end, he suggests that the communifesto cannot exist in isolation from existing organising efforts 'within even academic geography', and gives examples. He also raises concerns as to the 'thought-praxis' dichotomy in the language of strategy and tactics used in the communifesto.

Rich Heyman highlights the social and democratic historical justifications for education in the US, alongside its economic utility. He contends, however, that the latter utility is

---

[1] You can view individual comments on and further contribute to the communifesto project at
http://pygyrg.org/pygyrg/communifesto-for-fuller-geographies/

Antipode

currently being fashioned as the exclusive justification for research and teaching in the US context (and elsewhere), via a neoliberal rationale and infusions of financial and political capital. Heyman stresses the systemic nature of the assault on education, and exemplifies the need for strategic partnerships with unions, students and community organisations in the 'fight against the continuing redefinition of education in purely economic, rather than civic terms'.

Mark Purcell takes the long view, questioning whether we should at all set out to defend the public university and concluding not 'if it means struggling to maintain some measure of equality within a system we should abandon'. He then asks if there is anything about the university that is worth fighting for, turning to Aristotle's *schole* ethic to answer 'yes' to developing our human potential and communal excellence. Drawing on Marx and Rancière, Purcell proposes that *schole* demands going beyond a capitalist political economy and so must be a revolutionary project. He concedes that, in the short term, the public university should be preserved for its usefulness only in kick-starting the wider *schole* project. Ultimately, even if we could achieve a robust public university in defiance of neoliberalization, Purcell foresees a tension between state funding and *schole*, anticipating that the state would not be pleased with the ungovernable products of Aristotle's ethic. Purcell advises that we should look to learn from and support people who are already doing *schole* together.

In the first part of a two-handed response, Iain Hay identifies and agrees with 'the core tenets' of the communifesto: social and environmental crises and the ability for geographers to respond; the neoliberalisation of the university and dismantling of geography and other critical disciplines; and the need for scholars to support, reproduce and tend to our academic projects regarding social and spatial justice. However, he believes the communifesto exhibits a selfishness of ambition, self-centredness and a tribal self-preservation. He then suggests it needs [i] a preface which focuses on the contribution geography and geographers can make to the crises in the world; [ii] a clear set of objectives; and [iii] a new title more suited to the content as he reads it. In the second part, early career researcher Michael Scott considers the

Antipode

communifesto relevant and timely, noting the invitation for geographers and 'fellow travellers' to share our knowledges of the neoliberalising university. He posits that the encouragement of interdisciplinary approaches has served to collapse and thence endanger academic disciplines such as geography, as well as steering academics towards 'the creation of more streamlined policy performatives'. To resist such pressures, he suggests that we confuse the metrics of neoliberal knowledge production, by developing tactics of a cognitive and behavioural Aikido: saying yes to bureaucracy when we mean no, feet dragging, feigned incompetence and subversion of priorities.

Natasha Klocker and Danielle Drozdzewski (authors of a paper with the subtitle 'How many papers is a baby worth?') argue that the abstract ambition of 'the communiversity' (mrs kinpaisby 2008) is eroded by the material precariousness of academic employment which imposes individual survival as its hallmark. The synergy between academics with parenting responsibilities and those striving for more collaborative and community-engaged ways of working is stressed, since neither is valued in the neoliberal university, or adds value to the academic CV. The authors advocate an 'in-here' activism, working with the systems and metrics that have been imposed, to make the space for career diversity and for academics to have fulfilling lives both within and outwith the university. They call for concrete examples of 'alternative research productivity metrics'.

Identifying with the communifesto and its authors, Pamela Moss nevertheless admits she is not optimistic, but 'discouraged, stuck and tired'. Holding on to the desire to transform the university, though, she suggests a strategy whereby academics bring their 'fleshed, affective bodies – including their limits – into workplace politics' to make space for change. In the face of the prevailing neoliberal ethos of human resource management, which obfuscates exploitation, such an approach should engage an affirmative ethics, in order to gain from the experiences of discouraged, stuck, tired and ill colleagues. Certainly, she argues, our struggles must work to avoid the reproduction of discrimination in all of its forms across the university and broader society.

Antipode

[Sara Kindon](#) picks up on the collective 'angst and disappointment' which stem from the geopolitical and intra-disciplinary crises which drive the communifesto. She notes too, that despite its ambition to transcend the ethos of the neoliberal university, the communifesto is drafted in the language of rationality rather than imagination, stylistically mimicking the system causing crises. Acknowledging many existent demands on her limited energy, in responding to the communifesto Kindon is by turns overwhelmed, resistant, empathetic, cautious, and tired. Espousing them in theory, Kindon questions how committed she is to the 'communiversity and acadavism' in practice: is she too old, too comfortable, too academically successful, too institutionalised or even too good a neoliberal subject to really engage in collaborative resistance? Why should she disrupt an academia which benefits her? Because, she realises, the labour is too demanding, insensitive to her work as mother and activist, and because she hears the call for more relational, compassionate, affective and playful geographies - 'fuller subjectivities', perhaps. Ultimately, the communifesto leaves Kindon with feelings of connectedness, solidarity and hope. The range of comments offered in these responses are well made and have provoked us to further thought, effort and action on the communifesto. As already stated, we conceive this response as part of an on-going process to develop challenges to the neoliberal university (and wider world), and better support each other in doing so.

Recognising our particularity and towards connectivity
The communifesto will certainly benefit from a preface which includes greater clarity and context. We were naïve in presenting something beyond PyGyRG without key aspects of the group's and individuals' positionalities. However, we would contend that this naivety stems from lack of time to construct a comprehensive collaborative document due to other work pressures, combined with an enthusiasm to do exactly the engaging with other movements for social change that several critiques call for. We were/are keen to positively shape future securities (not only within university settings) through action. That clarity and context for the communifesto are added here latterly has been driven by the process itself, of responses asking us to do so: we see this as also positive.

Antipode

As a research group of the RGS-IBG, the majority of PyGyRG members are UK-based in terms of institutional or organisational employment, if not research or practice fields, although membership is open to all outside of this UK context (see footnote at the end of the original draft of the communifesto). We are a 'particular' grouping of scholars-activists-practitioners, and a clear reflection upon our situation, geographies and histories is needed to provide a more useful framing.

PyGyRG was formed in 2005, with its key objectives listed as:

- increasing the understanding and deployment of participatory principles throughout all aspects of higher education academic geography;
- stimulating and developing critical debate about participatory approaches within and beyond geography;
- encouraging the development of collaborative links within and beyond the academy, and working with non-academic organisations as partners in participatory ways; and
- ensuring that participatory research is firmly linked to debates around public policy, through meaningful collaboration with policy makers, the voluntary sector, activist and interest groups, and other vehicles for social action.

PyGyRG was formed to support, in the first instance, UK-based academics who felt and still feel isolated, undervalued and threatened by successive waves of neoliberalisation and marketisation of universities, specifically because of their action research and community engagement orientations. There was a desire to develop vital networking and infrastructure to collectively support the doing of research with community organisations and activists, and this continues to inform our thinking, action and strategising. Despite the current UK iteration of audit (REF) nominally recognising 'impact' beyond contribution to academic theory and debates, the prevailing dominant discourse and attitudes continue to produce a neoliberal logic, and exclude or devalue much of the ideological and practical approaches of PyGyRG members (see Pain *et al*. 2011). Critically, we recognise our relatively privileged struggle, especially given the marginalised positions of many of the communities and groups we work with. Nevertheless, that does not mean that we should not be self-organising and work to challenge a system that reproduces all kinds of inequalities. Indeed, PyGyRG aims to

continue to support and encourage a wide range of members and activities, while remaining critical and reflexive.

Thus, any sense of self-centredness or tribal self-preservation in the communifesto is unintended, rather PyGyRG needs to work through our 'militant particularism'. Raymond Williams' (1989) concept of militant particularism denoted resistance emanating from place-based action, which more recent work on activism in geography has built upon. Highlighting the permeability of place, Dave Featherstone (2005) proposes militant particularisms as relational, holding onto the local and context-specific *as a critical part of* producing wider solidarity across movements for social and spatial justice. In a similar vein, Paul Routledge (2003: 337) elaborates the notion of 'convergence spaces' to understand the political meeting of different resistant groups, wherein "movements need to develop a politics of solidarity capable of reaching across space without abandoning their militant particularist base(s)"; convergence spaces may be where working models are developed "for a new form of society that will benefit all humanity". Meanwhile, Mason (forthcoming) has noted that militant particularisms are mutable, not abandoned but (desirably) changed by interaction with other particularism in convergence space.

We aim here, then, to celebrate the productive tension between militant particularism and mutual solidarity, which we see evident in some of the responses' contestation of the communifesto. The communifesto will change because of such tensions, not abandoning its militant particularist base but developing with and from it. Specifically, we need to recognise that we all speak from where we are, and the communifesto is not intended to be universal/ist. Rather, we are looking for and intending to represent a particular position that is open to re-shaping broader securities and solidarities – a particular position that, as we alluded to above, is not fixed or single, but attempting to place participatory ways of working and PyGyRG as a community of interest keen to develop new connections and be outward looking.

For many members, participatory approaches continue to be implicitly and explicitly linked with 'activist geographies', engaging directly in efforts towards meaningful social change.

Antipode

Thus partnerships and alliances with social movements including trade unions, as well as students and community organisations are central to many members' praxis, and we have learnt much from others' organising and resistance. We need to avoid internalising this, but make explicit that points raised in the communifesto are intended to compliment and build solidarities with unions, students and communities – recognising the complex positionalities involved, as members are often also students, in unions and/or community organisations. Therefore, we should remain reflexive regarding our particular collective – and individual – identities in these partnerships: mutual enrichment cannot proceed by hiding the different circulations of power caught up in making connections across particularisms. In this sense our praxis draws on the need to engage in practices that facilitate social transformation; create spaces for creative action; negotiate power relations across differences in age, class, language ethnicity and so on; nurture a politics of solidarity that is reciprocal, including developing a relational ethics of struggle; and engage with emotions (see below) (Chatterton *et al*. 2008). This links the communifesto, in our understanding, more directly with all kinds of non-academic others who do not 'enjoy' the advantages, resources and, yes, privileges of contemporary, albeit neoliberal, academia.

While such particular activisms are embodied in/through particular sites, with people, place and space mutually co-constituted (Brown and Pickerill 2009), considering the relationality of our resistances, we believe, requires looking to long-standing feminist work that advocates a specific conceptualisation of scale. Such feminist critique draws global scales of analysis together with paying attention to the centrality of people's everyday experiences in different locations - "theorisations that see the body, nation and global as indicative of the same processes rather than as different scales" (Sharp 2007: 381). Useful on these points are Cindi Katz's (2001) work on 'countertopographies' and Danny MacKinnon's (2011) conceptualisation of the 'relational politics of scale'.

The original communifesto, then, was intended as an intervention precisely to move beyond what was then perceived as its shortcomings - Eurocentrism, naivety, isolation from existing efforts - always inviting and open to critique. Again, perhaps we could/should have been

Antipode

explicit in drawing out a set of key aims at the start. However, we shied away from this in an effort to avoid being too fixed and risking exclusions - we left the aspirations open to be enacted by individuals. This stems, at least partly, from the communifesto's determination to start from 'where we're at' in everyday practice; not ignorant of spatial or historical injustice, but acutely aware of the residual, ongoing and increasing injustice of the here(s) and now(s), of where we each are and how it affects us and our immediate colleagues, fellow workers, students and communities. These points go to broader underlying issues around the difficulties of consensus-building and the politics of protest. How may we avoid the impasse of taking no action unless it is revolutionary, while every action is critiquable as reformist because of the enveloping, permeating nature of capitalist relations? How can we challenge neoliberalism within a post-political or post-democratic condition (e.g. Ranciere 2006), in which a post-political frame sutures capitalism as inevitable and the market economy as the global structure of social order for which there is no alternative? In brief, should we aim to resist neoliberalism in the academy – or work towards the end of the university?

Such an internal/external (inside/outside, marginal/centre) quandary to struggle is familiar to all PyGyRG members, has been debated at many PyGyRG fora over the last seven years, and concerned several respondents to the first communifesto draft. We have experienced universities as elitist, inegalitarian institutions, enhancing inequalities in wider society. Yet those of us working within them remain uniquely placed to encourage people to take their own intellectual voyages, develop their *schole* (we return to this below) and work against the grain. Thus we argue here for thinking and resistance that, politically, seeks to "explode any dividing line between marginal and central" (Sliwa *et al*. 2007: 502). Likewise, Chatterton (2006) discusses a need to open up connections and counteract entrenched political/politicised positions, 'give up activism', and work to deconstruct binaries to enact transformative change. Articulating any central aims or objectives of the communifesto is, paradoxically, a critical issue and one for which we have no consensus 'answer' or position. What we do believe is that each of us can act to bring about at least a little of what we hope for: warm-blooded, positive, generous and imaginative acts which both support and inspire each other and our other others. To such concerns we now turn.

Antipode

Imagination, creativity and emotion

Unfortunately in this response, we have not managed to escape the structure, language and constraint of rationality that Sara Kindon calls for and enacts. We do, though, contend that bringing into being the collaborative writing process, and a consensus framework to praxis more broadly, is moving towards a more creative academe. Writing itself may be a call to resistance and action, a way of challenging inequalities (after Cixous 1991); what we want to emphasise here is that strategies and tactics may be imaginative and creative, and were discussed as such in some detail (and with a fair amount of laughter) at the RGS-IBG session. Those details were perhaps lost in translation to a written communifesto. Moreover, in imagining/imagineering challenges to neoliberalism in the academy (and beyond), we stress strategies and tactics as not dualistic *per se*: Strategy can be active as well as thought, tactics are continually rethought as they are enacted. We conceive a continuum of thought–action perhaps, along which tactics and strategies can slide and overlap. Think of a horizontal, circular 'slide' in a playground, with a super-slippy, non linear surface along which we can nudge/push ourselves and each other, in a game of 'tag' (the aim being not to get tagged by management) perhaps!

As several respondents point out, there is a risk of our own collusion, through processes of 'professionalisation', within productions of neoliberal governance. We must take seriously concerns around how we individually become a part of what we resist, and indeed benefit in some senses from that incorporation. There is a great deal of agonising among PyGyRG members regarding the paradox and pitfalls of doing - or trying to avoid - career promotion through activism. Many feel concerned that writing and publishing on such issues, especially in REF-able journals, perpetuates the very processes that we critique, even while we are using these channels to contest and criticise the neoliberalisation of the academy. There has of course been debate regarding the communifesto being on the *Antipode* platform, which itself fits with a desirable professional development mould/the 'good' academic. We recognise that herein lies another tension, but reach consensus on engaging with the *Antipode* symposium as part of an agenda that is *not limited to* communicating through the networks, journals and

Antipode

institutions that we also wish to challenge as part of the 'professionalisation' and neoliberalising of the academy. That is, we must continue to develop diverse practises of communication, too. There has also been debate regarding whether we should reference, in this document, PyGyRG members' (our own) previous papers: another dilemma we feel most uncomfortable with, trying to balance avoiding self-referentialism with maintaining academic credibility by drawing on previously peer-reviewed work of relevant empirical and theoretical concern.

Keeping such quandaries visible is vital, because an important part of our strategies and tactics must be to contest and undermine individualisation. We argue here for a re-finding and re-producing of those 'good bits' of the university, research and teaching that is collegiate, enjoyable, anti-divisive and anti-oppressive – what Rachel Pain (forthcoming) discusses as 'walking together'. Let's celebrate and extend them both figuratively and literally; make them more relational, compassionate, affective and playful; make them more subversive. In this vein, we should follow Pamela Moss's suggestion, be courageous and bring our affective bodies into political play in the workplace. Being playful does not equate to taking resistance less seriously, but fully appreciating the embodied commitment it requires.

Imagining ways to do this within everyday practices in institutional structures may not be as difficult as we perceive: The space-relations of many individualising procedures and practices are enforced by blinkered, compliant habituations rather than material constraint. We can seek to undo and hoodoo these - confound and confront them - together. Those of us in positions of (perceived, normalised, institutional) power can squeeze recognition of collaborative and community-engaged ways of working into the cracks in impact and assessment procedures. Let us not reiterate some neoliberal monster, but look to the potentialities and possibilities of developing and enacting our agencies and powers – following Gibson-Graham's (2006) call to conceive our struggles as interesting to grapple with, rather than insurmountable barriers. We support Klocker and Drozdzewski's call for concrete examples of alternative research (productivity) metrics. Maybe it's not too hard to

Antipode

imagine and create an online space for an alternative research excellence framework so useful, inspiring and morally-compelling that ultimately its value could not be ignored? We should also continue to challenge the material precariousness of academic employment, such as exploitive short-term contracts, that further entrenches competition between individuals, contributing to divisions within departments.

Linked to employment issues, we argue for real value to be afforded teaching alongside research – and included in any kind of alternative metrics imagined above. That is, NOT in a neoliberal framework of 'students as customers', entrenched in discourses of employability and the marketing of degree programmes in competition with each other. PyGyRG members with teaching and learning roles articulate a need to recognise and foreground students as knowledgeable agents, to avoid projecting one's own positioned account as some definitive 'truth', and to 'teach' with an ethics of reciprocal learning in line with their research ethics. Members offer examples of encounters with students who have changed their ideas, or who have decided to follow their interests rather than simply joining the queue for the next graduate employment scheme. Such students may not be the majority, but working within the confines of the university in the UK as it currently is, they tell us of the potential for change that exists within the frameworks that too often close down and hinder our work/lives. *Learning with* people that they do not have to conform to capitalism and neoliberalism's plans for them can often be one of the great joys of teaching. And, yes, connecting with student resistance and organising should be central in the communifesto project.

Imaginatively and creatively thinking about and enacting research, teaching and many of our other responsibilities resonates with the behavioural Aikido Scott suggests. Saying 'yes' when we mean 'no' (or 'no' when we mean 'yes', or even 'no-yes' when we mean neither) is just one approach in – once you open it up – a broad, big and beautiful landscape of resistance. See for example Eddy Kent's (2012) exploration of 'the possibilities offered by taking refuge', a tactical withdrawal that he calls 'wasting time'. That is *not* to abandon saying 'no' when we mean 'no', however, and there are times and places when, fuelled by moral anger at the

injustices of war, capitalism and environmental destruction, shouting and screaming 'no' is demanded. We should also, then, explore more creative ways of shouting and screaming 'no'.

In our resistance, however, we must remain acutely aware of the distinction between exploited labour, and the creative research and teaching work which we love and which can work against subjection and exploitation. We should not work all weekend to devise a revolutionary new lecture or prepare for a staff meeting, rather fit this within our contractual and bodily constraints. We should also be wary of the potentially discipline-destructing logics of interdisciplinarity as deployed by the neoliberalizing university, while recognising many of our own positions at and learning from the boundaries where edges meet. Activists often argue that creative resistance best emanates from the liminal spaces of the border (see Notes from Nowhere 2003). Thus we do not suggest a definitive 'anti-interdisciplinary' argument here – but rather support imaginative, artful and playful resistance to the erasure of critical disciplines.

Andy Merrifield (2011) argues that imagination and a focus on positive fragmented action, rather than cold-blooded analysis, can inspire and make space for resistance, giving us hope. Hope is an emotion that has been important to PyGyRG, and it is important here to think carefully about the emotions and affects of agency and resistance. However, we must be careful to outline our concept of hope, given that it is an emotion and concept that can be critiqued if simplistically employed in an apolitical framing (see below). We broadly understand "hope as an act of defiance, or rather as a the foundation for an ongoing series of acts of defiance, those acts necessary to bring about some of what we hope for while we live by principle in the meantime" (Solnit 2005: 163). For us, this resonates with Hage's articulation of 'hope on the side of life': hope as a bodily principle that 'drives us' to want to live, connected to the existence of 'something to live for' (see Zournazi and Hage 2002). Further, he links such hope to an 'ethics of joy' (joy as a change for the better in the body state), and describes hope as a sense of achieving greater capacity to act, associate with others, and be involved in your environment, as it occurs.

Antipode

Talking about hope brings us to the increasing body of work in which emotions and affect are recognised and researched as central within human society and experience (Jones and Ficklin 2012). Most PyGyRG members do not undertake participatory action research - however that process is co-constructed in different instances - or activism of various kinds only through rational decision-making: there are also fluid and emergent emotional and political motivations caught up in complex relational geographies of care (Lawson 2007) and responsibility (Massey 2004). Yet the significance of emotion and what it means for academic practice is anathema to how the academy operates within dominant neoliberalising processes (Askins 2009). We are seeing increasing demands on our time, ever more pressure to perform a diverse set of roles in a range of contexts, but within a limited audit and managerial culture, such that finding/making time and space for emotions - and creativity - is increasingly difficult. Many PyGyRG members are concerned that, as academics, we should be/become more aware of our own practices in excluding emotions, because *not* doing so jeopardises our emotional wellbeing.

Furthermore, we should also be explicit about the anger mentioned above – an emotion too often avoided. Victoria Henderson (2008: 31) critiques academics who write about hope from the comfort of their offices, discussing "feeling rules" whereby potentially disruptive emotions (and the political risks that they embody) are emotionally engineered by authorities and in institutional settings. Specifically, she excavates the ways in which certain feelings and behaviours are considered legitimate and others not. Hope is legitimate while anger must be controlled and disruption managed. Emotions such as anger can be a prime motivator for activists and academics, however, not least because it is a dominant emotional response to (perceived) economic and environmental injustices, and many academics - and PyGyRG members especially - are thoroughly angry (pissed off, actually!) at the neoliberalizing university, and the precariousness of work both on campus (e.g. contract work) and elsewhere in global North and South economies. Our hope and anger, then, are intertwined, and mutually co-productive: we feel anger at injustice, which drives us to use our capacities to act for 'something to live for' and 'hope on the side of life'; we feel hope regarding being

involved with others and our environment, such that we get angry when doing so in equitable and ethical ways is threatened.

Ending universities and doing *schole*

There has been much debate over the years among PyGyRG regarding whether ultimately the task should not be to better universities, but to end them. As a revolutionary project, Purcell's reimagining of Aristotle's *schole* ethic presents a way forward that is both grounded and inspiring, fulfilling Solnit's and Hage's conceptions of hope. Engaging in the struggle to maintain what is good-positive about the university as we know it, while also championing the public university against neoliberalisation, we can both bring *schole* into academia and do *schole* with other communities. One appropriate path forwards, we think, is to carefully optimise tactics for 'degrowth' – drawing on its main intellectual sources alongside its diverse strategies and actors (see Demaria *et al*. forthcoming).

We also suggest that we facilitate participatory decision making, reaching consensus through real engagement, throughout our places of work. Some of us have already instigated faculty and departmental meetings run along these lines, a small but often very playful step. The 'fuller geographies' sessions held at RGS-IBG conferences for the past four years celebrates the engaged passion and commitment of the late Duncan Fuller as a developing project, constantly seeking to expand the floor of the cage. These sessions have been open debate fora, and – as part of fuller subjectivities – such engagements could spread to other conferences as well as to other spaces in academia and beyond, and we hope that idea is taken up. *Schole* must also be a place of emotion as well of education, of feeling and thought, because that is key to going beyond a capitalist political economy, humanely and equitably. We think that Purcell's construction of *schole* fits well with participatory geographies. Returning to the need for examples of practical alternatives to the status quo, we can look to the creation of a space (virtual or otherwise) to act as a repository for ideas and examples – perhaps the Antipode Foundation wish to host such a repository? Through such ideas and processes, we trust that the communifesto project will remain live, fluid, militant and ever increasingly subversive. And we look forward to your participation.

Antipode

So, we stand by the title 'communifesto for fuller geographies' and embrace its (necessary) spirit - a shared statement with the purpose of helping to secure geographies which are in every sense fuller, and especially more connected, creative and hopeful. We hold an annual PyGyRG 'away weekend' in May (see the PyGyRG website – all are welcome!), and 2013's will include further debate and a re-drafting of the communifesto's strategies and tactics, critically reflecting on those responses to the initial proposal facilitated and hosted by the Antipode Foundation, alongside ongoing developments across group members.

December 2012

References

Askins K (2009) "That's just what I do": Placing emotion in academic activism. *Emotion, Space and Society* 2:4-13

Brown G and Pickerill J (2009) Space for emotion in the spaces of activism. *Emotion, Space and Society* 2:24-35

Chatterton P (2006) 'Give up activism' and change the world in unknown ways, or, Learning to walk with others on uncommon ground. *Antipode* 38(2):259-281

Chatterton P, Fuller D and Routledge P (2008) Relating action to activism: Theoretical and methodological reflections. In Kindon S, Pain R and Kesby M (eds) *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place* (pp216-222). London: Routledge

Cixous H (1991) *Coming to Writing and Other Essays* (trans. S. Cornell). London: Harvard University Press

Cook I (2012) 'My'/'our' writing. http://writingcollaboration.wordpress.com/2-myour-writing-2/ (last accessed 15 November 2012)

Demaria F, Schneider F, Sekulova F and Martinez-Alier J (forthcoming) What is degrowth? From an activist slogan to a social movement. *Environmental Values*

Featherstone D (2005) Towards the relational construction of militant particularisms, or, Why

Antipode

the geographies of past struggles matter for resistance to neoliberal globalisation. *Antipode* 37(2):250-271

Gibson-Graham J-K (2006) *A Postcapitalist Politics.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Henderson V L (2008) Is there hope for anger? The politics of spatializing and (re)producing an emotion. *Emotion, Space and Society* 1:28-37

Jones B and Ficklin L (2012) To walk in their shoes: Recognising the expression of empathy as a research reality. *Emotion, Space and Society* 5:103-112

Katz C (2001) On the grounds of globalization: A topography for feminist political engagement. *Signs* 26(4):1213-1229

Kent E (2012) Wasting time: Finding refuge while the tenure clock ticks. *Reviews in Cultural Theory* 3(2):32-42 http://reviewsinculture.com/special-issue/review3.html (last accessed 17 December 2012)

Lawson V (2004) Geographies of care and responsibility. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97(1):1-11

Mason K (forthcoming) Academics and social movements: Knowing our place, making our space. *ACME: International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*

Massey D (2004) Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler B* 86(1):5-18

MacKinnon D (2011) Reconstructing scale: Towards a new scalar politics. *Progress in Human Geography* 35:21-36

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

mrs kinpaisby (2008) Taking stock of participatory geographies: Envisioning the communiversity. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33(3):292-299

Notes from Nowhere (2003) *We Are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Anti capitalism*. London: Verso

Pain R (forthcoming) Impact: Striking a blow or walking together? *ACME: International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*

Pain R, Kesby M and Askins K (2011) Geographies of impact: Power, participation and potential. *Area* 43(2):183-188

Antipode

Ranciere J (2006) *Hatred of Democracy*. London: Verso

Routledge P (1997) The imagineering of resistance: Pollok Free State and the practice of postmodern politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22:359-376

Routledge P (2003) Convergence space: Process geographies and grassroots globalization networks. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28(1):333-349

Sharp J (2007) Geography and gender: Finding feminist political geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 31(3):381-387

Sliwa M, Spicer A and Svensson P (2007) Writing in the margins is being elsewhere. Always. *ephemera* 7(4):499-504

Solnit R (2005) *Hope in the Dark: The Untold History of People Power.* Edinburgh. Canongate

Williams R (1989) *Resources of Hope.* London: Verso

Zournazi M and Hage G (2002) "On the side of life": Joy and the capacity of being - a conversation with Ghassan Hage. In Zournazi M (ed) *Hope: New Philosophies for Change* (pp150-171). London: Routledge