

Intervention in lectures as a form of social movement pedagogy and a pedagogical method

Piotr Kowzan, Małgorzata Zielińska and Magdalena Prusinowska

Abstract

Despite the proclaimed crisis of the university, lecture halls attracted unprecedented attention from social movements in Poland in 2013. This paper presents interventions in lectures and analyses the consequences of such interventions, focusing on the learning of various actors. Our scope of interest includes protests revolving around academia, but we focus especially on interventions in lectures in Poland in 2013. We compared three cases of interventions in lectures with one from 2009, in which we participated, and upon which we had previously drawn a model of learning. As a result of this comparison, we added an external, watching subject to our model, because with the growing use of video recording, such interventions easily turn into a spectacle.

Introduction

There are many aspects of social movements' functioning that are pedagogical – they include learning of the movement's participants, as well as creating opportunities for learning of those outside the movement. Some authors recognised social movements' educational aspects in terms of the learning of individuals (see e.g. Cunningham and Curry 1997, Clover and Hall 2000, Dekeyser 2000), while others focused on collective learning (McFarlane 2011). In another article (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011) we described a university movement, called OKUPÉ, established at the University of Gdańsk, Poland, in 2009 (see also: Prusinowska, Kowzan and Zielińska 2012.) Looking at the movement from within, we described a number of types of learning in the movement, such as: 1) situated learning, or learning by doing, for example through taking part in a workshop organised by one member for other members; 2) more conventional learning at seminars with presentations, during which e.g. other movements' methods of action were presented; 3) incidental learning (not planned), for instance, learning to take responsibility for one's place; 4) collective inquiries into issues concerning the movement's and the local community's interests. These inquiries are an example of knowledge creation by the movement. An important part of learning within the movement was a demotivational side of learning – some members felt that they learned that effective action and cooperation was impossible, especially in bigger groups without clear rules.

Apart from learning of the activists, we felt that also the institution in which we acted had learned something – the evidence of which can be found in changed

structures and procedures at the university. Moreover, we claimed that “by intervening in the dialectic relation between people and the world (Miller 1981), social movements also educate the public” (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011, 265). Examples that we provided were twofold – one was stigmergic learning involving the creation of collective patterns of action that can be followed or copied by others. The other – was trying to intervene in the knowledge transfer that took place during one lecture by protesting. By coming to a meeting with the Minister of Science and Higher Education with banners, we intervened in the lecture, creating a constellation of subjects possibly leading to learning through detecting ambiguities of the world. We argued that social movements can be called “educators - provocateurs”.

We would like to focus in this paper on this specific type of pedagogical method, which we will call intervention in lecture (IiL). The main reason for this choice is that in 2013 there was a number of protests at public lectures in Poland, which were highly controversial and which forced us to revise and reconsider our previous analyses of this method. IiL is a method of action from the social movement repertoire, but it is also a pedagogical phenomenon. Its pedagogical aspect is grounded in the learning possibly occurring due to IiLs, but also in the fact that the classical pedagogical form of lecture is affected by it. Therefore, in this paper we would like to analyse IiL as a pedagogical method, and look at some consequences of its usage by social movements. After a short literature review, we will show our theoretical frames of reference related to IiL and lectures as such. Finally, we will compare and analyse four cases of IiL from the perspective of the rationale behind them, media coverage, the reactions to the interventions, as well as pedagogical implications of the protests. Our study is a comparative case study (Campbell 2010) with one case taken from our previous, more exploratory study (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011).

Authors' background

The authors of this paper are PhD students and former participants of a local university movement called OKUPÉ. The movement, consisting of students, PhD students, employed researchers and graduates of the university, had various goals, from those related to the campus (such as protesting against its fencing), to ones that were concerned with the conditions of studying and working in the Polish higher education. One of its methods of action was intervention into a lecture of the Minister of Science and Higher Education. Now the movement is latent, but we continue to be concerned with the state of academia, and we have, additionally, become interested in studying learning in social movements from an academic point of view.

Our participation in OKUPÉ was an example of militant research, in which we gathered information and studied the world around us in order to make certain community stronger through acting (Colectivo Situaciones 2007). The present inquiry also joins our academic and activist interests but now we cannot refer to a bigger group of people developing through this process. We are still trying to

understand our own actions and see them in a context, but we started our analysis of IiLs, for an academic reason, because our previous paper concerning this issue seemed to be over-optimistic in regard to the democratic dimension of such a form of protest. We realised this when contemporary right-wing movements included IiLs into their repertoire.¹ Thus, our goals are both academic and practical, which is commonplace in educational research. Contrary to traditional sociological work, where authors still feel they need to defend their involvement in the issues under research (see e.g. Wiewiorka 2014), in educational sciences the research is often conducted by educators themselves and aims at developing and improving pedagogical practice. We see our work as a part of this tradition. Our study of IiLs in the context of university is also an analysis of our working environment, where we both learn (as PhD students) and teach students. IiLs taking place in Polish universities influence our pedagogical practice (e.g., they create a horizon of what is possible in academia), therefore, as pedagogues we decided to study this phenomenon as an element of the academic environment and our practice. In a more general perspective, this analysis is a part of the broad field of studies on informal adult education and adult learning (see e.g. Brookfield 1991), in this case, concerning learning processes designed by and involving social movements.

Theoretical background

Learning as a result of IiL

In another article (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011), we analysed one IiL as a configuration of three subjects: the speaking one (the lecturer), the listening one (the audience) and the (out)standing one, that is, the protesters. We argued that the activists change the communication between the lecturer and the audience by their protest. They provoke and surprise the other two subjects and point to ambiguities in the world, and in the lecturer's message, showing their resistance to the ideology behind it. Thus, they play a part of an "educator-provocateur" (Rutkowiak 2011) and influence learning processes happening in the lecture hall. The subjects may learn about the content of the protest, but they may also learn resistance techniques. They can

"explore - after the initial astonishment - unsuspected connections between different domains of their experience (...). But before an effective surprise happens there are provocateurs, i.e., committed people who recognise the conventions of the place and decide to alienate themselves from the rest by starting the action, which encourages the audience to go beyond common ways of

¹ The growing popularity of the right-wing movement in contemporary Poland creates additional context for our analysis, as it suggests that we will see more of IiLs in Poland in the future. However, in this text we wanted to focus on the method itself, as used by both the right wing and the left wing, so we will not expand on the movements themselves.

understanding the world." (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011: 258).

As a result of the intervention, the audience is challenged to negotiate the words of the lecturer with the message of the protesters. In order to theorise this, we used the definition of education (Polish: *wychowanie*) by Romana Miller, for whom it is "an intervention into the dialectic relation between a human being and the world; it regulates their reciprocal relations by [taking] creative interaction concerning development of society and the individual" (Miller 1981: 122). In this article we will try to explain how contemporary cases of IiLs enrich our model of learning through IiL.

Heckling

There is little research regarding IiLs as such, but one can find relevant analyses in research about heckling. Proshanta Nandi defines heckling as a strategic "disruption of communication in public places [...] a form of symbolic aggression with varying purposes, but almost always involving the attempt to discredit a speaker or a point of view" (1980, 14).

Nandi points to the role of emotions in such disruptions, as these disruptions may not be planned but rather spontaneous, undertaken by individuals who perceive formal ways of dealing with their grievances unavailable. She refers to collectively supported heckling as bearing resemblance to social movements (1980). In our analyses we stress the importance of social movements' collective actions being pedagogical tasks, in which actions undertaken by protesters as a group have stronger educational effect on the public than individual activities. Therefore, we will not analyse individual acts of heckling, but only concentrate on IiLs as a collective form of disruption, belonging to the social movements' repertoire. Another difference in our approach is the aim to look closely into the particular context created by a lecture situation, and not as broadly as previous analyses of the heckling phenomenon, i.e. at artistic performances, parliamentary debates, stand ups and all types of public speeches. Nevertheless, heckling analysed as a social performance (including: a setting, audiences' expectations and their interpretative frames) is a point of reference to us.

Lecture as a pedagogical method

Before we describe interventions in lectures, we would like to look into the lecture itself as a didactic form and an event, since the two – lecture and intervention in it – are inseparable pedagogical methods – two sides of one event, with conflicting goals and actors opposing one another.

For the purpose of this paper we will define lecture as a teaching method consisting of an oral transfer of information and/or knowledge and its reception by the listeners. An interesting view on lecture has been given by Jan Masschelein and Maarten Simons (2002, 2012, 2013) who understand it as a public pedagogic form, which in its core means „a reading together and the

gathering of a thinking public around a common text” (2013, 109). According to these authors, the strategic goal of such a meeting is profanation, understood as disturbing, questioning or disrupting all kinds of stabilizations, fixations or crystallisations, to which a necessary condition is detaching ideas from their regular use. However, experiencing lecture as a particular form of being together is rarely so profound. The profane quality of lectures occurs rarely, because the whole process of lecture is formalised, or as Masschelein and Simons put it, immunised against creating knowledge together. It is also immunised against transforming individuals into community, which could make the lecturer intellectually indebted to everybody taking part in the encounter.

The immunisation – or formalisation of lectures – is a historical process which brought about some fixed qualities of lecture, e.g., that lecture is time-bound (it should usually take 90 or 120 minutes), it includes some questions at the end and often includes reminding all those gathered about hierarchies, divisions, as well as the importance of research methodology. Still, the lecturer may choose to conduct the lecture in a more or less immune way, that is, s/he may treat the discussion as a way of questioning fixed ideas or – on the contrary – s/he can ignore the questions. Immunisation makes some people less vulnerable (e.g. professors are asked different questions than students) and it prevents some topics from becoming an issue. Eventually, immunisation makes us see human subjects as individuals rather than collectives and protects them from transforming into more revolutionary subjectivities under the influence of collectively produced knowledge.

In the paper we will look more closely into public lectures, not lectures as part of an academic course, since the IiLs happening during regular lectures are rarely made public. The usage of the form of public lecture is characteristic for universities, but it cannot be limited to them. For example, in connection with the tradition of independence struggles, e.g. in the 19th century, when Poland was under foreign control and later, during World War II or the communist regime, there was excessive immunisation of lectures against the sharing of subversive ideas – preventive censorship was used and both students and professors could be arrested for what they said. In these times, public lectures were organised in private apartments, churches, workplaces etc., constituting the “Flying University” (Krajewski 4.11.2009). Also nowadays and worldwide, lectures are not only organised by academia, but they have become a part of social movements’ repertoire of action, especially lecture tours and teach-ins. Holding a lecture itself can be a form of protest, for instance, during strikes against cuts in education in 2004, students and professors organised a 72-hour physics lecture on Potsdamer Platz in Berlin (Guinnessy 2004). Moreover, both academia and social movements distribute online lectures in diverse forms, which makes these lectures more available and, thus, increases the tactical value of this pedagogical method.

Intervention in lecture as a method of action

To clarify the terms: intervention in lecture is a specific form of protest. It involves a direct confrontation of activists with the lecturer and challenging the audience in a lecture hall or another location where the lecture takes place, using different protest techniques, e.g. shouting, presenting banners, performances etc. Although particular activists may do different actions during IiLs, the collective character of this tactic is central to our understanding of the IiL. Collectiveness of the actions differentiates IiLs from individual acts of disruption (heckling). When we speak of protest, we treat it as a broader term, since it includes actions taken before and after the lecture and not necessarily at the exact place of lecturing. The protest can take a form of letters, boycotts, petitioning, hacktivism, etc. Such protests are, still, an important context for our analysis of interventions.

We would like to propose here two typologies of IiLs – one is based on the criterion of the object of the protest and the other – on the techniques used. Both typologies are based on actual IiLs that we got to know about. We started building typologies of IiLs by searching databases, and the Internet in general, for articles describing similar protests in other than the Polish context. We searched EBSCO using the term 'lecture', combining it with 'intervention', 'protest', 'dissent', 'social movement' and 'heckling'. Rarely did we get academic papers concerning the issue, though such events were covered extensively by academic press. We benefited from comments to some of those articles, where activists continued discussions referring to further sources.

A. Based on the object of the protest, we found six different types of lecture disruption, in which the object is:

- 1) the lecturer as a person – for example, the past of this person or membership in power structures, which may, according to the protesters, disqualify this person from speaking in public; an example can be interruption of a lecture of the former Pakistani president (Schaffer 22.10.2009);
- 2) the country or organisation where the lecturer comes from (e.g. during protests against meetings with Israeli ambassadors or politicians (Horowitz 17.10.2009; Lesslie 26.10.2012) – that is, the lecturer is seen as a part of a bigger institution and his/her own biography is irrelevant;
- 3) the political affiliation of the lecturer – e.g. in acts of protest as retaliation against “the leftists” who are thought to have gained control over the university;
- 4) the content of the lecture, e.g., homophobic arguments or creationism;
- 5) the form of the lecture – e.g., lecturing instead of discussion or discussion instead of a rigid lecture;
- 6) something outside the lecture and lecturer as such – e.g., if the protest is a

part of a student strike or a bigger protest against the authorities.

B. In terms of protest techniques we found the following types of IiL:

- 1) Collectively leaving the lecture during its course to reduce the number of audience, i.e., walk-out.
- 2) Unravelling banners during a lecture.
- 3) Chanting, singing or shouting – which can be either humorous, argumentative or offensive. An example can be chanting "Racist, sexist, anti-gay, Douglas Wilson, go away" – at a speech given by an evangelical pastor at Indiana University in the USA (Husk 2012).
- 4) Dancing or performing at the front of the hall.
- 5) Throwing items or other objects at the lecturer or into the lecture hall. Example: stink bombs thrown at Rudolf Steiner's lecture in 1922 (Rudolf Steiner 29.10.2013).
- 6) Electronic intervention in the lecture, such as calling the lecturer on Skype (especially if the lecture itself is mediated through Skype or other communicators) (Dziennik.pl 16.10.2013).
- 7) Arresting and/or attacking the lecturer – disruption from the side of the authorities. During the communist regime, in 1978, Polish authorities first arrested Adam Michnik and the next day organised an attack on his lecture held in a private apartment using violence and tear gas (Lipski 1985).
- 8) Moreover, a simple act of asking questions can be perceived as a basic intervention in a lecture, if the question or the statement made by the participant is aimed at challenging the lecturer's views. Still, the individual act of asking questions, even if they are meant to challenge the lecturer (see e.g. Dehaas 8.03.2013), is a part of the lecture convention itself and is rarely contested. We could, then, call it an IiL, only if it is a collective action, for example if a person from the audience is denied access to the microphone and other people amplify his/her voice by the use of human mic. This way, the act of speaking (asking questions) becomes a collective intervention (Tudoreanu 8.12.2011).

When it comes to all kinds of protests related to lectures and not only interventions, we can see other types:

- 1) Boycotting the lecture – usually announced.
- 2) Pressing the authorities to cancel the lecture, e.g. in Gdańsk far-right groups managed to cancel a debate by sending a letter to the rector and threatening that their members would come to protest (TVN24 25.02.2013).

- 2) Organising an alternative lecture – taking lectures away from lecture halls, teach-ins in movements of the 60's can be an example of lectures functioning as interventions. Moreover, holding lectures outside of university can be an element of protest against the institution itself.
- 3) Recording the lecture in order to use its fragments against the lecturer.
- 4) Blocking the entrance, so that the audience cannot get in (Paquette 2011).
- 5) Finally, being present at a lecture may also be controversial either because of the pressure (e.g. from the public opinion or the authorities) not to participate or it may be perceived as a sign of political protest (if the number of participants is so great that it shows support for the lecturer or the content of the lecture).

This typology, although it may not be complete, since this subject is very susceptible to new creative ideas, seems to support our conviction that liLs are a diverse field of social movements' actions, which is mostly overlooked in theoretical analyses.

Protests at lectures in contemporary Poland

The year 2013 was very intensive in Poland when it comes to IiLs. In order to show the intensity of the activities, we made an online [Timeline](#), showing some protests happening in Poland, related to academic lectures or protests against public lectures and speeches. The [Timeline](#) shows not only interventions, but also other protests related to academia. In order to find the information about such protests, we searched online versions of Polish daily press, information portals and used key-word internet searching. The list might, however, not be complete, since some smaller protests may have remained unnoticed.

In short, we could describe the main actors at the IiL scene as two sides of the political conflict. One would be the leftist activists, protesting against homophobia or against attacks on gender studies, and the other – far-right activists concerned with the nation, historical wrongs and anti-communism. The different protests were very much interlinked – the first IiL in 2013 was triggered by a cancellation of a meeting organised by the far right. The connection between the protests was sometimes characterised by “vengeance” (which could be paraphrased as: “If we could not have our lecture, you will not have yours.”) and sometimes by the fear of being associated with ones political opponents, because of using the same protest techniques.

Protests organised by the far right were most frequent in 2013, but it is not to say that IiL is an inherently “rightist” tactic. IiLs had been used in Poland by anarchist and leftist movements in their fight against right-wing organisations during the 1990's. One example involves an IiL at the University of Warsaw initiated by RAAF (Radykalna Akcja Antyfaszystowska/Radical Antifascist Action) and MRE (Młodzież Przeciwko Rasizmowi w Europie/ Youth Against

Racism in Europe), whose call for action resulted in interrupting a lecture by Bruno Gollnisch from the National Front (CIA 16.02.2013).

It is unclear whether contemporary movements chose this particular tactic consciously using past movements' actions as an inspiration or at least as a reference. In a broader historical perspective, previous usages of this tactic could be a framing element for the movements' actions in the present. However, if such actions do not become a part of the collective memory (that is, a live memory which forms identities, but which is also very selective), they might be limited to “history”, that is to “dead memory” as Halbwachs calls it (Olick and Robbins 1998).

Right-wing groups, such as NOP (Narodowe Odrodzenie Polski/National Rebirth of Poland) or NSA (Niezależne Stronnictwo Akademickie/Independent Academic Association) do not openly connect their use of IiLs to a possible point of reference from the history of right-wing IiLs, i.e., the 1930's Bench Ghetto at Polish universities, which forced Jewish students to take particular places in classes; during that time some lectures were interrupted by right-wing activists in order to prevent Jewish students from participating. Neither do they take an official stance to reclaim the tactic from the anarchists and the left. It seems that any reference to the 1990's is invisible or at least faded away.

Similarly, the left-wing groups of today seem to respond to the context created by the right-wing IiLs, rather than to historical movements. This, as a result, frames their actions as a dialogue with their opponents' choice of tactics. It is not a matter of simply copying each others tactics, but rather of a struggle, as CrimethInc. describes it, “[a struggle] for tactics and narratives – for the territory of struggle itself” (CrimethInc n.d.). For instance, the new context has been used to revive the memory of the past actions: after the intervention into Magdalena Środa's lecture (IiLMS), an anarchist website posted a text about an IiL in the 1990's, where the left-wing movements were intervening as a stronger group (CIA, 16.02.2013). This is an isolated example of historical perspective on IiLs from within the discussed movements, but it is coherent with the struggle to symbolically reclaim the tactic.

What also comes out of the [Timeline](#) is that most of the interventions in 2013 included some kind of performance, no matter if they were organised by left-wing or right-wing groups. There were also interventions where banners and shouting was used, or those where many different techniques were joined. The mixing of various protest techniques was very common. Another popular protest technique was an attempt to cancel a lecture. Many such attempts were successful, especially if they involved the far right – either as the protester or the organiser, which was explained by some of the rectors with security issues, that is, a threat of confrontation with the protesters.

Methods of analysis

We are going to describe in details three recent events and compare them with

our intervention from 2009. Since we were interested in how the method of IiL differentiates itself in the hands of different sorts of activists, we decided to compare the IiL we have conducted with those conducted by right-wing activists. We included also one event conducted by LGBTQ activists, in order for the analysis to show the variety of IiLs. At the time of our analysis (October, 2013) it was the only IiL conducted by left-wing activists that we found in our registry, which was the reason for choosing it. From the pool of events conducted by right-wing activists we chose two events, which had gained a lot of media attention and individual comments in online versions of articles in the daily press. We expected that the amount of comments in the media will compensate for the lack of insiders' perspective in these cases. There were a number of other interventions in Poland at that time, as we have shown, but these three – that is, the interventions in lectures of Magdalena Środa (IiLMS), Zygmunt Bauman (IiLZB) and Paul Cameron (IiLPC) – were most similar to one another in terms of the actions taken and artefacts used and to the one in 2009 (IiLMSHE), and, therefore, proved to be best suited for a cohesive analysis.

All the three interventions in which we had not participated, were filmed and videos were shared online (see the [Timeline](#)). Our analysis is based on these visual documents, as well as on media relations showing reactions to the protests. We have also analysed comments under online articles looking for: a) verbs describing personal transformations caused by the given event; b) references to alternative footage of the given event; c) testimonies from the supposed participants providing further details of the event.

Regarding a), our research failed to find comments declaring that interventions led to personal changes in knowledge or opinions. Regarding b), we found that post-production, such as adding text to videos or photos, eliminated the message from appearing in the mainstream media, but the number of views was massive anyway. Regarding c), there were very few actual testimonials in comments, rather quarrels about the interpretation of the actions. In general, comments were fierce and formed two-dimensional fights of supporters and opponents of the protesters. Since media coverage of the IiLPC was much smaller than that of other protests, we decided to write to one participant about inexplicit details of this intervention. We found his name in a news report and asked him a number of questions about his motivation, the course of events and his thoughts about the results of the intervention. We did not manage to contact other participants of this protest. We have not contacted organisers of the two other protests (IiLZB and IiLMS), since there was an abundance of activists' opinions published online.

Four interventions

Below, we will compare the four protests. First, we will shortly describe the course of actions in all four cases, and later we will focus on particular questions, such as motivations behind the protests, techniques used, media coverage and some consequences of the interventions. This will allow us to draw some

conclusions regarding pedagogical aspects of the interventions, later in the paper.

The lecture of the Minister of Science and Higher Education

First, we are going to describe briefly the protest we took part in, which we already analysed in another paper:

On 22 April 2009, OKUPÉ organised a public reading and discussion of the project of proposed reforms in Polish higher education. [...] Incidentally, the day of the discussion preceded the Polish Government's Minister of Science and Higher Education's visit. The visit was not broadly announced, even though it was a part of the 'public consultations' on the project. Deans of faculties were asked to bring 20 students each. Since OKUPÉ's meeting was the only public discussion about reforms, activists were able to collect questions for the Minister. They prepared banners, being afraid that formalisation of consultations would prevent them from asking questions. Some activists came in prepared T-shirts with the logo of the International Student Movement and a provocative question: 'How much are social sciences worth?'. As anticipated, the supposed consultations turned into a lecture. When it became obvious that there would be no time for questions from the audience (eventually, only three questions were asked [...]), activists unfolded two banners and stood with them next to the Minister giving the speech. The banners said: 'Wiedza nie jest towarem' [Knowledge is not a commodity] and 'odZYSKaj Edukację' [Reclaim your Education]. The audience applauded and the lecture continued in a new political configuration. Power relations changed as a result of this action, because the TV cameras focused mostly on the protesters, who were later interviewed, as was the Rector of the university and the Minister (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011, 257).

Magdalena Środa's lecture

The second of the events chosen, iILMS, happened on February 19, 2013. Professor Magdalena Środa (a philosopher, feminist and former Polish Government Representative for Equal Status of Men and Women, who can be perceived as controversial by the right wing due to her critical comments on religion and in favour of gender and marriage equality.) gave a lecture on „Morality of public life” in the Auditorium Maximum at the University of Warsaw. The lecture was fifth in a series of eight planned for that year. Simultaneously with the professor and the rector of the university, approximately 40 masked protesters (wearing masks of gorilla, a horse, a clown and balaclavas) entered the lecture hall through another door.

Because of the protesters' noisy and aggressive behaviour in the lecture hall, they were asked to leave and eventually they were effectively removed from the hall by university guards. The number of guards were doubled this day, because right-wing activists had announced a campaign of “regaining higher education” from the control of the left wing (Winnicki 13.2.2013). During the process of

removing the protesters, the entrance door was broken. Outside the hall, protesters started dancing to the music from their phones.

The protest was organised by NSA. The group was founded in 2010 and consists of students from Warsaw higher education institutions. They describe themselves as “committed students, who popularise patriotism with deeds and words” and who focus on the educational aspect of their activism (NSA n.d).

Zygmunt Bauman's lecture

The third IiL we have chosen happened on June 22, 2013 when the world famous sociologist Zygmunt Bauman held a lecture on “Dilemmas of social democracy – from Lassalle to liquid modernity” (Harlukowicz 22.06.2013). He was invited to speak at the University of Wrocław by The Ferdinand Lassalle Centre for Social Thought, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the Institute of Social and Political Philosophy at the University of Wrocław. His public lecture was a part of commemorating the 150 years of German social democratic party – since the founder of the party (the first labour party in Germany), Ferdinand Lassalle, was born in Wrocław. Four days before the lecture, under an article informing about the event at the website of one of the main Polish newspapers, “Gazeta Wyborcza” (Gazeta.pl 18.06.2013) one could read a statement signed as “NOP”, where a protest was announced.

The organisers were informed and police were present in the building at the day of the lecture. The protesters took seats in the lecture hall. When Bauman together with the mayor of Wrocław came there, they stood up and started shouting offensive and anti-communist slogans, e.g. “Nuremberg for the communists”. They unravelled banners with anti-communist symbols and the name of a local football club. After a couple of minutes police came, followed by the anti-terrorist brigade, and they removed the protesters. The audience welcomed the removal by clapping their hands. Soon, the organisers introduced the lecture and apologised for the protest to the lecturer. Bauman said that no apologies were needed and that it was him who should apologise for becoming the reason for the protest, but also said he was glad that the protest illustrated some of the topics he was going to talk about. The lecture continued with no further disruptions.

Paul Cameron's lecture

The last IiL we are going to describe was organised against the lecture of Paul Cameron, known for his controversial statements about homosexuality. He had lectured previously at Opole University (2009), but his other lectures, e.g., in Warsaw and Szczecin (2010), had been cancelled after protests. He visited Poland again in October 2013 to give a series of lectures. On October 22 he held a lecture in the Polish Federation of Engineering Associations in Warsaw.

Just after the beginning of the lecture a group of six protesters started a

happening. They stood up, took out placards (“GAY IS OK. Fuck you Mr Cameron!”) and a rainbow flag, then moved to the centre of the small lecture room, in front of the lecturer, and some of them started kissing. The protesters dropped to their knees pretending to be in pain caused by homosexuality and asked to be healed by Cameron (“Help us Mr Cameron, we are totally sick and we want to be free!”). Members of the audience and organisers intervened: someone shouted (“Get out!”) and some of the protesters were dragged out. A few participants tried to discuss with the protesters, e.g. asking them to first listen before protesting, others asked them to “adjust/conform”, after which the protesters started chanting “Away with homophobia!”. Members of the audience asked them not to shout, because they were disrupting the lecture. The video recording shows a discussion between protesters and some of the participants about the allegedly impolite form of the protest and the content of the placards. Later there was a scramble, in which a door was allegedly damaged, the police was called and security guards together with the organisers kept the protesters in the building (not allowing them to leave) – a type of citizen's arrest.

Motivation behind the interventions

What led us to our own intervention (IiLMSHE) was an opportunity to join the Global Week of Action “Reclaim your Education”, which had just started. Moreover, a new reform of Polish higher education had been announced. OKUPÉ organised a meeting, in which we discussed the reform and found some parts of it we were strongly against of. During the meeting, we found out that the Minister had just announced her arrival to Gdańsk the next day, as a part of public consultation. We decided to act and right after the meeting we started preparing banners and organising the intervention. There was no real discussion about which techniques to choose – the idea with banners has been quickly accepted by all the activists taking part.

During the second intervention, IiLMS, there were leaflets distributed, which explained that the action was taken as a response to cancelling a debate at the university in which leaders of several far-right organisations were supposed to meet. The leaflets were signed by NSA (a previously little-known organisation), which seemed to be associated with the National Movement (NM, an alliance of several far-right organisations), since NM published a statement of the protesters.

IiLMS was acclaimed by the organisers as a success, since it granted them access to the broader public, even if the media misrepresented their message, as the protesters stated on their Facebook page (NSA 20.02.2013). Interestingly, the organisers in their statement point to their source of tactics inspiration being hardbass, which – as they describe it – is a method involving dancing to a type of techno music in public spaces, used all over Europe to draw the society's attention to important issues, e.g. drug abuse (NSA 20.02.2013). Although NSA points to the European dimension of their choice, Miroslav Mareš, a Czech academic researching far-right movements, traces hardbass origins to the

Netherlands, and argues that Russian nationalists are the main inspiration source for the Central-Eastern European hardbass scene (Kenety 21.06.2011). This shows again that the transfer of knowledge and tactics may flow in surprising ways, even to the activists themselves. Such a rationale of NSA reveals that the action was aimed at a younger public, whose music interests it might appeal to. Nevertheless, “hardbass” was not deciphered in the media (as far as we can tell) and instead, it was mostly criticised as unexplainable barbaric behaviour, which even some of the supporters called dishonourable because of the masked faces (NSA 20.02.2013). NSA stated that they will continue to disrupt lectures at left-leaning universities:

Leftists and liberals have always tried to grab the public space, in a totalitarian manner, for themselves to disseminate their views. We state that, within framework of their promoted “equality”, as a student organisation, we will disrupt conferences at universities of leftist character, until there is real “equality” and patriotic groups will be included in debates at universities (NSA 19.02.2013).

NSA, similarly to LGBTQ activist, as we will show below, had to face its supporters' critique and their response concentrated on the affirmation of the direct action:

To the critics from the 'salon right'. Students in Warsaw, Radom and Gdańsk [Authors: places where IiLs took place] through their actions did more for the freedom of speech at universities than you with your babbling since 1989 (NSA 26.02.2013).

The action resulted also in support from the leadership of a right-wing group MW (Młodzież Wszechpolska/All-Polish Youth), Robert Winnicki, whose statement was published online:

I think that the fight with leftists, who are multiplying and ruling at universities, by using happening and humour is worth continuing. However, those who want to take it up, need to very carefully plan their actions, calculate the risk and possible manipulations, and, of course, they have to learn on their mistakes (Myśl24.pl 22.02.2013).

The third IiL described, the protest against Zygmunt Bauman, was another one organised by the far right. The rationale for the intervention was Bauman's participation in the military intelligence in his youth and being a committed communist at that time. In their statement, NOP wrote “We are protesting against inviting to a public university – that is, funded from our taxes – a person,

whose past in the communist terror apparatus should exclude him totally from the public life forever” (Gazeta.pl 18.06.2013). Apart from the communist rationale, the leaders of the protest were openly antisemitic (Harlukowicz 25.06.2013), and even though Bauman’s ethnic origin was not addressed in the protest, it might have played a role in the decision to organise it.

NOP is a far-right, openly nationalistic and homophobic political party with no seats in the parliament. It was founded in 1981 as a nationalist youth discussion circle, later it broadened its actions and became a nationalist movement, which evolved into a political party in 1992 (NOP 01.01.2011). It can be perceived as a type of social movement, due to its network of non-associated supporters and affinity groups, which involve for example football fans, who participated also in iLZB (NOP 24.06.2013).

Media attention resulted in a possibility to further describe the protest's rationale. In an interview, one of the participants, who was stopped by the police, stated that he would repeat his involvement in the iL because he felt that for Bauman it was “the smallest possible punishment” (Gazeta Obywatelska 12.07.2013). Also statements from the courtroom got out to a wider public through media, e.g. one defendant's statement that his involvement in iL was a civic duty (TVN 24 17.03.2014).

Finally, the intervention at Paul Cameron's lecture happened in order to protest against his anti-gay rhetoric. A participant of the protest in Warsaw, Krzysztof Marczewski, wrote in response to our questions that the protest was spontaneous, at least from his point of view, although there were people who brought some “rainbow gadgets” and printed the placards:

The protest was not organised, it was spontaneous. There were people from various groups and environments. [...] I went there to show to these people my objection against the ideology of hatred propagated by Cameron, and to protest against him spreading lies about homosexuals. I didn't expect that it would be possible to stop the lecture. But I wanted to stay there until the end in order to record and later describe Cameron's speech – unfortunately this was not possible, because everybody got a bit nervous (personal communication 31.10.2013, translated from Polish).

He also explained that he had been following Cameron's activity in Poland for a couple of years:

Once there was a success in cancelling his lecture at UKSW [Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw] after the case had been touted by the media. Unfortunately, later in Warsaw the organisers did not use lecture halls at public universities, but used the ones from private entities. I don't understand the consent to activities of this kind – after all, if Cameron propagated similar statements about any other minority group, he would face prosecution charges for

instigation to hatred and violence. Yet, he gets away with turning the society against homosexuals. (...) I went there because my heart told me to, I was motivated by frustration and the feeling of helplessness rather than hoping to achieve any measurable effect (personal communication 31.10.2013).

As we can read here, the IiL was the third choice of protest, when the first one (cancellation) did not work out. Contrary to other protesters, who wanted to protect universities from the ideologies they were against of, this participant wished that the organisers of the lecture had used halls at public universities, because then the lectures could have been cancelled. In such a case one would be able to appeal to the universities' role as public institutions, which belong to the society, while it was more difficult to cancel a lecture at a private property. The second choice of protest for the activist was recording the lecture and using it against the speaker, but this did not work out either, because the situation escalated.

Looking back at the typology of IiLs, based on the object of protest, and at the particular cases of IiLs analysed, we can see that one protest may target more than one of the objects described. Out of the four protests which we analysed – one was based on the figure of the lecturer (the past of the lecturer, IiLZB), another on the content of the lecture and the lecturer as well (lecturer as a person who tries to convince others that homosexuality is an illness, IiLPC), the third one on the political affiliation of the lecturer (seen as leftist and associated with gender studies, IiLMS) and the fourth one – the one conducted by OKUPÉ – against the form of the lecture instead of public consultation, against the content of the lecture (the new higher education reform), and also as a part of the Global Week of Action “Reclaim your Education”.

Still, it may be argued that the audience is the predominant object of protests at the lecture hall. It is especially the case when activists do not interrupt the process of lecturing but try to challenge the audience as if the lecturer's efforts in this regard were insufficient (as in IiLMSHE). In Masschelein's and Simon's terms such intervention would be based on the premise that the cardinal quality of a lecture should be profanation of the regular use of ideas. Some other protesters – even though they can share some tactics with those in favour of deep, transformative discussions among peers – may, on the contrary, base their actions on the premise that the process of lecturing is not immune enough and the audience might be vulnerable, that is, manipulated and misled (as might have been the case with IiLPC). Such vulnerability might occur because of the lecturer's baseless generalisations, inadequate research, being a secret lobbyist. In both cases, the protesters might think that the framing of the meeting eliminates salient questions.

Intervention techniques

If we look again at our typologies of protest techniques within IiLs, we can gain additional insight into tactical decisions made by the organisers of the four IiLs.

The choice of protest techniques was clearly linked to the supporters' preferences. During IiLMS and IiLZB there was a strong representation of football fans among the protesters and it seem to have influenced the choice of techniques. Moreover, football fans were targeted as possible supporters of both movements. IiLZB was a mixture of two types of protest techniques mentioned in our typology, that is, an interruption by unravelling banners and by shouting – reminiscent, in style, to football stadium chants and banners. While in IiLMS protesters wanted to enter the lecture hall to conduct their performance in front of the audience (type: dancing or performing), they were not allowed to enter and had to perform outside. Nevertheless, the performance had its impact both on the lecturer and the audience. In this case, the type of dance used – hardbass – was clearly bonded with football fans and right-wing organisations in Central-Eastern Europe (Smolík and Vejvodová 2013).

IiLPC and IiLMSHE represent a type of protests where very small groups (4-6 persons) intervened. The former is an example of “protest performance” (i.e., activists pretending to be “dying of homosexuality”), but there were also flags and posters used. The latter intervention involved only unravelling banners as its protest technique. Although there was also an attempt to ask questions during the Q&A session by one activist holding the banner, who simply raised her hand following the typical academic etiquette, it was easily ignored.

In each case, the choice of a particular technique influenced the protest's reception – both by the media and by the audience. It had also some impact on the consequences for the protesters, as we will show below.

Media coverage

The IiLMSHE was shown in the local media, there was an interview with the Minister, but the organisers have not heard of any wider coverage of their protest. They themselves published information about the intervention on their blog.

After the IiLMS, the video recording of the dance in masks, outside the lecture hall and featuring fights with the security went viral in the internet giving ground to heavy criticism of the protest to the extent that some right-wing leaders suspected that the whole protest was just a left-wing provocation.

The third protest (IiLZB) was shown in the mainstream media, for example at the website of “Gazeta Wyborcza”, where also the whole video of the lecture was published. Later the newspaper published opinions of seven public figures condemning the protest (Gazeta.pl 23.06.2013), as well as interviews with academics calling for excluding organised groups from universities (Wodecka 24.06.2013). Comments under these articles included heated debates (396 comments after the first article), where supporters of NOP fought with those who condemned the protest. A piece of an article from Wikipedia about Bauman's biography was quoted a number of times, but much of the argumentation on the side of the far-right activists focused on claiming that

communism was more deadly than fascism.

After the first intervention into Paul Cameron's lecture, Catholic media showed their outrage by referring to the protest as a crude attack of “LGBT/homosexual militant groups” (Ozdoba 23.10.2013, Gość.pl 23.10.2013). Other media, e.g. “Gazeta Wyborcza” (in its internet portal “Gazeta.pl”) referred to the incident stressing controversies around Cameron himself: “In the capital city lecture of a known homophobe, Cameron, was interrupted” (Gazeta.pl 24.10.2013).

Not surprisingly, those protests that were most controversial, brought most media attention. The controversiality meant here doing something against the culture of the particular place (dancing in masks at a university, that is, bringing what was called barbarianism to the place where knowledge and civilisation is valued) or against cultural norms (threatening violence against a respected and famous professor). Moreover, the recording of the interventions by protesters themselves or by the audience was crucial for gaining media attention.

Some consequences of the four interventions

Obviously, after no more than a couple of months from the protests, we cannot speak about all the consequences of the protests we described, nor do we have methods to study them. We can, however, show some very immediate reactions to the interventions, which may suggest their consequences.

The IiLMSHE did not cause any consequences towards the protesters, and it is impossible to say if it changed the course of the reform in any way. The only consequence seems to be the feeling of a common goal that united the protesters and some of the audience, who saw the intervention and applauded it.

After the IiLMS, which has been shown in the mainstream media and the video of which went viral, the same day, the prime minister commented on the event. While referring to the film “Cabaret” he said that the happening cannot be dismissed as if “nothing has happened”, since such aggressive behaviour at the university seems to be a new trend, which needs to be objected. Prof. Środa gave a few interviews referring to the past communist regime, when socialist youth organisations were attacking informal lectures of the political opposition, which eventually led to closing the project of the “Flying University”.

After the IiLZB, the football club “Śląsk Wrocław”, whose symbols were on the banners, condemned the protest and said that there was no place for nationalism at their matches, which was a reaction to the claim that the fans of their club constituted a big part of the protesters. Other consequences of the protest included the mayor's reaction, who said that there was no place in Wrocław for “the nationalist rabble” (there were other cases when far-right groups attacked e.g. left-wing cafes or marched through the city, but the mayor had not reacted at that time), he gave additional funds to the police to fight nationalist crime, and decided to fund programmes promoting tolerance. Also the Minister of Science and Higher Education (the exact person whose speech we protested four years earlier) tweeted that she hoped courts and police would secure that universities

would again become places of academic debate and not unrest (Jałoszewski 24.06.2013) and later wrote a letter apologising to Bauman for the protest (Pezda 24.06.2013). 15 protesters were arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

In the aftermath of IiLZB, NOP was able to conduct actions in order to mobilise new members and supporters, even using attacks on them and the media attention to their advantage. Firstly, after the intervention some participants were interrogated by the police and NOP's website gave tips on how to behave under such a situation and where to call for legal support, which showed how organized and prepared to support its members the movement was (NOP 22.06.2013). Moreover, the city president attacked NOP in the media (suggesting its banning from the public life), which gave NOP a chance to respond – their website informed that they would not be intimidated by such threats and they addressed “all Polish nationalists” to join NOP. This call was followed by links to informations about the history of the movement, registration forms for membership and to information on how to support them financially (NOP 24.06.2013a). The website reported also support from other conservative groups (NOP 24.06.2013) and presented the movement spokesman's statement: “I think that the whole action was conducted in a cultural manner.” (NOP 24.06.2013a). The trial of this IiL's participants was also used to show support for the movement, e.g. NOP's website informed that during the trial one of Solidarity movement participants was there to show his support (NOP 18.03.2014). There was also a fanpage created on Facebook, calling for a solidarity picket outside the court (NOP n.d.). The picket took place and possibly showed the defendants that “they are not alone”, as one NOP member stated (TVN 24 17.03.2014).

The protesters at the fourth IiL – IiLPC – were photographed by the police. They were accused of causing property damage and of insulting the lecturer, and, finally – fined. Marczewski, who was not a part of the group preparing slogans on placards or bringing the rainbow flag, but joined the protest, explained to us that reactions to the IiL were mixed in the LGBT community:

Well, I got some information from many people from the so called community that they were uplifted by this action in some way. But then I also heard a lot of criticism, that it [the IiL] is damaging, because it puts us in one row with neonazis from Bauman and Środa [’s lectures], shows us as aggressive and so on. And that it would be better to discuss with Cameron and his supporters in a factual way, using scientific arguments. But I think that it doesn't make sense, because these people are not interested in such a discussion and getting to know the arguments of the other side. (personal communication 31.10.2013)

The next day after IiLPC, Paul Cameron held a lecture at Opole University. During Question and Answer part of the lecture, Cameron referred to the incident that took place the previous evening. He stated that it was positive that

the protesters who interrupted the lecture were arrested (this was a civil arrest) unlike the protesters who had crashed the American Psychological Association (APA) meetings in the sixties. In his opinion, such treatment may prevent protesters from pressuring authorities into accepting their claims (he referred to crossing out homosexuality from the list of disorders by the APA). Instead, he compared protesters to children:

I am called, what... the leader of the homophobes [...] Guru of the homophobes. Consider this. They have not come with the champion who wants to discuss facts. I am substantiating. If they could defeat my facts they would come and they would say: You're wrong here and here and here. Instead, like little children, they call names: homophobe, homophobe. Phm... Children call names because they can't think. We're adults, we can and if they had the facts, they would bring the facts. All they have is name calling. (transcribed from video – inter.blog TV 23.10.2013)

Comparing these four interventions we can see that IiLMSHE brought fewest negative consequences to the protesters, probably because the lecture was not stopped and the protest was peaceful. IiLPC, on the other hand, where norms of the audience were transgressed and where vulgar words were used against the lecturer, brought not only fines to the protesters, but they also experienced physical violence and were verbally abused. Yet, only IiLMS and, especially, IiLZB engaged politicians, who promised a change in their politics – although contrary to what the protesters might have hoped for. The reason seems to be that these protests targeted people rather than issues (see our typology above) and they targeted well-known individuals. IiLZB targeted the guest of the president of the city, who came to the lecture by himself, and probably therefore, his reaction was strong.

Learning from interventions

In order to look closer at IiL as a pedagogical method, we need to establish, who the learner is and who wants to put themselves in the educator's position. In the paper we wrote on learning in OKUPÉ, we proposed analysing lecture disruptions as a configuration of three actors – the speaking one (the lecturer), the listening one (the audience) and the (out)standing one, that is, the activists. Also artefacts, such as banners, played a role here, which we interpreted according to Latour's (2005) sociology of non-humans: "The unexpected presence of banners challenged the audience to negotiate the words they heard from the authorities with the words they saw from the activists." (Zielińska, Kowzan and Prusinowska 2011, 258). We suggested that the notion of "wychowanie" (in Latin: educare, in English: education/formation/upbringing), defined by Romana Miller, could be useful here.

But how does it look in the case of other, different IiLs?

First, let us look at the configuration of actors in these social performances.

Although in all the lectures analysed, there is the lecturer (the speaking subject), the audience (the listening subject) and the activists (the outstanding subject), it seems that another subject no less important is the media (the mediating subject) and the audience watching videos from protests or reading about them online or in newspapers, which we could call the watching subject. In the case of IiLMSHE, only some fragments of the protest were reported in the mainstream media and there was no video recording taken by the participants, so the clue of the event took place at the actual lecture hall. Contrariwise, in the other three cases it is not only the lecture where the protests happened, but it involved also:

- 1) preparation before the intervention – in the case of IiLZB and IiLMS, the organisers of the protest warned about it, so everybody could prepare for the event, also the watching public. It seemed nearly as an invitation for a spectacle.
- 2) media war – different media showed the protests differently, depending on their political affiliation. One could also see a growing role of post-production of the recordings.
- 3) mobilisation on internet fora – supporters of the protest not only encouraged the protest of IiLZB before it happened, but they also fought battles on arguments after the intervention.
- 4) discussions following the protests – since protests involved much controversy, many opinion articles followed, mostly written from the normative perspective of what the university or debate should or should not look like.

Although we do not know it for sure, it seems that it is the watching public who was the most important target of the three recent protests, rather than the audience present at the lecture. If we look at who the audience at the lecture was – then for IiLZB, IiLMS and IiLPC it consisted mostly of the lecturer's supporters, i.e., people who were interested in the lecture's topic or who had interests in sustaining the event. This was contrary to the attitudes of students coming to regular university lectures, which seem to be more diverse or accidental.

This is especially evident when we look at the audience's reaction to the protest, which involved in all three cases clapping to the lecturer's words, sometimes clapping to the police (IiLZB) and aggressive attitude towards the protesters (IiLPC). If it had not been for the media and the watching public, the intervention would only be a way to show the lecturer and his/her supporters, that s/he is not welcome in the city/university and that one is against his/her ideas or past or present memberships. Adding media to the scene allows also for another rationale for the protest – to show the public that such lectures are organised (while they should not be) and bringing the public's attention to the issue. In the case of IiLMSHE this was not needed, as the audience was diverse and it was enough for the protesters to convince the listeners, as well as to show

the lecturer dissent to the planned reforms.

But can we say that all the protesters were intervening in “the dialectic relation between a human being and the world” (Miller 1981, 122)? In order to answer this question, we need to find what the “world” means in the context of the lecture. On the one hand, the lecture hall is a sort of isolated lab for creating new ideas and since they do not necessarily need to be useful, the lecture hall can be perceived as a “world” in itself (“world” meaning here a system of created things and a sphere of human activity). In this small world people have some expectations about certain roles of individual human beings in that place, but still, during the lecture they can establish new relations between each other and the matter of their concern. On the other hand, an intervention usually ruins the relative isolation of the lecture hall. The place turns into a theatre and the play – if recorded – will be viewed and commented long after the actual event. Thus, the very act of intervention brings back the suspended relationship between individual actors and the outside world. Moreover, because of external viewers, every aspect of the event can be assessed from the perspective of benefits for the development of the society.

The IiL, thus, changes the way lectures are seen – they become a part of a broader political struggle. The IiL changes also the audience from being mere listeners to becoming actors – they may support the lecturer with their voices and actions (clapping, fighting with protesters), or may support the protesters. They also take a role of reporters and record the event. Thus, their dialectic relation with the lecture and the world changes – they are both changed by the actions of others (they get to know something about the object of the protest, find out that it is controversial, make their opinion about the protest and the actions of the protesters, the lecturer, the authorities and other members of the audience), but also they become active participants in the lecture, who may change the course of action, as in the case of IiLPC.

Still, this type of intervention into the relation between humans and the world may not be what protesters had hoped for. Those who intervened in the four lectures described did not do it in order to activate the audience, and probably hoped that the audience would stay passive or support their protest. They might have thought that they would be able to teach the audience something and change their opinion. Instead, they found that the audience supported the lecturer, since they had come to see her/him. It is difficult to force the audience to support the protest, especially when the intervention seems violent.

Adult learning theorists, such as Stephen Brookfield claim that adults learn most effectively when they want to learn and are motivated to do it (1986). This could suggest that the audience who do not want to learn what the movements want to teach them will not do it. They will resist learning the content prepared by the movement (e.g. the critics of Zygmunt Bauman), but may learn something contrary – for instance, that right-wing movements are too strong in Poland and need to be stopped. Yet, Brookfield claims that real transformational learning cannot happen through self-directed learning and comes only if imposed on the learner – e.g., learning through life-crises or traumatic experiences. This way,

even if the events themselves were appalling to the audience, they may have forced them to reconsider their positions. Finding out if they actually did so, would however need a different methodology, as we were not able to conclude it from seeing the protests or reading comments to articles about them.

The IiLs' effectiveness

If it is, however, so difficult to find out what people would learn from the intervention, is this method worth using? Why are IiLs chosen over other tactics, especially when the public might be concerned with the use of violent or disruptive methods? Many studies show the efficacy of disruption or even strongly support such tactics (Larson 2013). The main arguments for this are:

- ◆ low costs of intervention – as in all described IiLs, a relatively small number of protesters were involved and financial costs were much lower than needed for a bigger campaign (fewer posters, leaflets, flags and other props);
- ◆ big publicity – even the smallest intervention (IiLPC) received a fair share of publicity also in mainstream media.

These advantages are especially important for small social movements and protest groups or for expanding movements which want to mobilise new members. The same may concern movements or protest groups that have problems mobilising their supporters and inactive members for large scale actions. On the other hand, IiLs also have a few risks. Disadvantages include:

- ◆ The costs might actually be substantial. The IiLPC is an example of such a situation. It was organised without support from a broader social movement (although the protesters were members of the LGBT activist community) and, therefore, the financial cost were borne by the protesters, as each of them received a fine (300 PLN).
- ◆ Negative response of the activist and supporters' community – some perceive disruptive methods as unsuitable or unacceptable and may criticise the tactic choice. However, this disadvantage did not seem to affect IiLZB and IiLMS protesters as much as IiLPC ones (possibly because of differences in both movements in their willingness to be associated with force and violence).
- ◆ Losing possible new members and supporters if they do not accept violent or disruptive methods of protest.
- ◆ Larson (2013), after Titarenko et al., lists other possible risks of disruptive methods including injuries and arrest, which also require high levels of commitment.

As we have shown, the four interventions had various consequences – from personal ones (fines for protesters, detention in police custody) to those involving the audience and the public. We have argued that the learning of the audience may not, however, be the same, as the protesters had assumed. Consequences for the lecturer are also that the public learns more about them, not only by hearing about them in the media, but also by looking more closely into their biography or watching their lectures online, as we did. Moreover, organisers of future lectures may change their willingness to invite them again. Other consequences were related to increasing police order and control, e.g. controlling who enters the lecture hall or giving more money to police in order to fight the nationalist movement.

If we recall the difference we described between activists who demand less immune lectures and those who demand more immune ones, then this difference is often blurred, because the actual results of a protest can be mistaken for its demands – e.g. if the activists demand a “real discussion” on the issue and that the lecturer actually listens to the discussants and takes conflicting ideas into consideration – it can result in resigning from the lecture form and organising rigidly structured panels with people with radically different ideas. This is because the “profanation” of rigid knowledge is difficult to preordain, so the only answer that can be expected from authorities is always changing the police order, which means further immunisation.

Looking at the effects of different protest techniques, we can say that IiLMSHE was treated as a serious and acceptable protest (the academic audience clapped), since it did not stop the flow of the lecture and it did not really transgress the culture of the academia, or the cultural norms of the audience. Still, it was not very controversial, so the media coverage was little. In the three other interventions the lecture could not continue because of the shouting, the protests were considered aggressive (using vulgar language at IiLPC or threat of violence at IiLZB) and they transgressed the norms of the audience. Protesters at IiLMS and IiLZB were criticised as barbarian and unacceptable, while protesters at IiLPC were considered to be aggressive and indecent (kissing publicly).

Thus, the audience turned against the protesters, even to the extent that the audience became violent (IiLPC). The high resistance from the audience indicates that they had not learned what the protesters wanted to teach them, so the pedagogical value of the protest was low in terms of educating the audience. On the other hand, the protests were controversial and, therefore, gained a lot of media attention, so there was more chance to educate the watching subjects, the public, about the issues that protesters found important, even to the extent that debates were organised in order to discuss the condition of the university – who should or should not be given voice there, and in which way.

It is interesting in this context to see that protesters rarely identified themselves with the exact institution in which the lecture took place. Apart from IiLMSHE, they did not identify themselves as students of the exact university. Still, the protesters started a debate about limits that should or should not be set at universities. Such discussions were mostly normative – many people wanted to

comment and say what they feel about the role of the university and about what and who should be excluded from lectures. One of these debates showed that something has been learnt, and it influenced the shape of IiL as a tactic. During the debate which was a response to the IiLMS, representatives of far-right organisations behaved in a more toned down manner (sitting at the lecture hall, clapping and showing marks on pieces of paper) (CIA 09.03.2013).

Finally, if we were to speculate about the future use of IiLs in Poland, then the contemporary increase in numbers and publicity of IiLs may suggest ignoring the official channels of communication and action. As long as interventions in lectures are seen by protesters as rewarding in any sense, there is little chance that the protesters will enter regular forms of communication (such as taking part in discussions during lectures) – as the analysis of heckling shows – “no matter what accommodations are made or attention given to the issues raised” (Nandi 1980, 18). If the main aim of protesters is reaching out to existing and prospective members or simply becoming more visible in preparation for intensive political activity requiring broader mobilisation, then we can expect IiLs popularity. Leftist movements in Poland may, however, resign from the method that has been associated with nationalism, unless they try to change its image.

Epilogue

In November 2013, after we submitted this article, a visit of Zygmunt Bauman was announced at our university. Actually, there were two lectures on one day – in the morning and in the afternoon – which made us expect the right-wing's protest. We were tempted to transform the results of our analyses into meaningful practice, which could save us from being put into a position of passive audience. We discussed this online with other former OKUPÉ activists and decided to be active during the IiLs and shout back, although there was no unanimity as to what should be shouted. In the end, when Bauman was presented in the lecture hall, and several men stood up with anti-communist banners, shouting anti-communist aggressive slogans, activists from the University of Gdańsk stood up as well, and shouted “Fascists go home!” as a response. The slogan had been rather spontaneous, copied from other left-wing protests.

This clearly confused the protesters, but after a short moment of hesitation, they continued shouting. Then, they were ridiculed by the meeting's moderator, which stopped the shouting for some time. The men were, however, still shouting some remarks about Bauman's past from time to time, until they left the hall in the middle of the lecture. Their intervention caused strong emotions among the audience. One of us stood outside the lecture hall and observed those who were leaving. Some were clearly very disturbed, such as one woman who told us she was not able to stay until the end of the lecture, as her hands were shaking, she was all jittery and in shock. Later, we heard from other members of the audience, mostly women, that they, too, were very disturbed and unable to

understand what had happened in front of them. They had deep respect for the lecturer and were shocked by the protest. At the same time, some students leaving the lecture hall expressed their bewilderment in a less emotional way, saying “What a show!”, in line with the analyses of heckling as a performance (Nandi 1980).

The analysis we had made helped us reflect on the IiLs and choose the way to act during such events. It brought our attention to the active role that the audience can play, rather than being a passive object of activists’ and lecturer’s pedagogical actions. We had not, however, included in our analysis the role of a moderator, as it had not come out as important in the four cases we had described. After the IiL in November 2013, we think, however, that this role should be looked closer into in future analyses of this method.

References

Brookfield, Stephen D. 1991. *Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning: A Comprehensive Analysis of Principles and Effective Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruner, Jerome 1997. *On Knowing: An Essay for a Left Hand*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, Shelagh 2010. “Comparative Case Study.” pp. 174-175 in *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*, edited by Albert J. Mills, Gabrielle Eurepos, Elden Wiebe. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.

CIA 16.02.2013. "Jak prawica próbowała zagościć na UW (wspomnienie z lat 90-tych)". *Centrum Informacji Anarchistycznej*
http://cia.media.pl/jak_prawica_probowala_zagoscic_na_uw_wspomnienie_z_lat_90_tych#comment (accessed 08.04.2014).

CIA 09.03.2013. "Warszawa: Debata “Ksenofobia, Przemoc, Uniwersytet?” na UW." *Centrum Informacji Anarchistycznej*.
http://cia.media.pl/warszawa_debata_ksenofobia_przemoc_uniwersytet_na_uw (accessed 29.10.2013).

Clover, Darlene E. and Budd L. Hall 2000. "In search of social movement learning. The growing jobs for living project." *WALL Working Paper No. 18*.
<https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/retrieve/4478/18insearchof.pdf> (accessed 09.03.2012).

Colectivo Situaciones 2007. “Something More on Research Militancy: Footnotes on Procedures and (In)Decisions.” Pp. 73-93 in *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations//Collective Theorization*, edited by Stevphen Shukaitis, David Graeber, Erika Biddle. Oakland: AK Press.

CrimethInc n.d. "The Ukrainian Revolution & the Future of Social Movements." *CrimethInc*. <http://www.crimethinc.com/texts/ux/ukraine.html> (accessed 03.04.2014).

Cunningham, Phyllis and Curry, Regina 1997. "Learning within a social movement: The Chicago African-American experiences." *Adult Education Research Conference Proceedings*.

<http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/1997/97cunningham.htm> (accessed 15.10.2013).

Dehaas, Josh 08.03.2013. "A men's rights advocate spoke at the University of Toronto." *Mclean's On Campus*.

<http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/2013/03/08/a-mens-rights-advocate-spoke-at-the-university-of-toronto/> (accessed 20.10.2013).

Dekeyser, Luc 2000. "Lessons about adult learning to be drawn from different types of social movement." Paper presented at International Conference about Education and Social Action, Sidney, December 2000.

<http://www.cpe.uts.edu.au/pdfs/ConfHdbk2000.PDF> (accessed 27.09.2012).

Horowitz, Adam 17.10.2009. "Ehud Olmert struggles to give Univ. of Chicago lecture amid protests." *Mondoweiss*.

<http://mondoweiss.net/2009/10/ehud-olmert-struggles-to-give-univ-of-chicago-lecture-amid-protests.html> (accessed 26.10.2013).

Husk, Kasey 14.04.2012. "Protest at talk by evangelical pastor leads to arrest at IU." *Herald-Times*,

http://www.heraldtimesonline.com/news/local/protest-at-talk-by-evangelical-pastor-leads-to-arrest-at/article_53cc9b13-bda4-58df-80bf-60805dc28952.html (accessed 26.10.2013).

inter.blog TV 23.10.2013. "Spodkanie z doktorem Paulem Cameronem na Uniwersytecie Opolskim nt.rewolucji obyczajowej."

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-5r9gQYrKjs> [Video file] (accessed 28.10.2013).

Jałoszewski, Mariusz 24.06.2013. "Wrocław nie dał się zastraszyć narodowcom." *MetroMSN*

http://metromsn.gazeta.pl/Wydarzenia/1,126477,14155233,Wroclaw_nie_dal_sie_zastraszyc_narodowcom.html (accessed 09.10.2013).

Krajewski, Andrzej 04.11.2009. "Wykłady z opozycji." *Polityka.pl*

<http://www.polityka.pl/historia/285129,1,wyklady-z-opozycji.read> (accessed 29.10.2013).

Larson, Jeff A. 2013. "Social Movements and Tactical Choice." *Sociology Compass* 7: 866–879.

Latour, Bruno 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lesslie, Callum 26.10.2012. "Protests derail Israeli ambassador's university visit." *The Journal*

<http://www.journal-online.co.uk/article/9489-protests-derail-israeli-ambassadors-university-visit> (accessed 29.10.2013).

Lipski, Jan Józef 1985. *KOR: a history of the Workers' Defense Committee in*

Poland, 1976–1981. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Masschelein, Jan and Maarten Simons 2002. "An Adequate Education in a Globalised World? A Note on Immunisation Against Being-Together." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36(4): 565–584.

Masschelein, Jan and Maarten Simons 2012. "The University: A public issue." Pp. 165–177 in *The Future University: Ideas and Possibilities*, edited by R. Barnett. New York: Routledge.

Masschelein, Jan and Maarten Simons 2013. "The Politics of the University: Movements of (de-)Identification and the Invention of Public Pedagogic Forms." Pp. 107–120 in *Education and the Political: New Theoretical Articulations*, edited by Tomasz Szkuclarek. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

McFarlane, Colin 2011. *Learning the City: Knowledge and Translocal Assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Miller, Romana 1981. *Socjalizacja, wychowanie, psychoterapia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Myśl24.pl 22.02.2013. Winnicki: Protest przeciwko skrajnej ideologizacji uczelni był co do zasady słuszny. Myśl24.pl.

<http://www.myśl24.pl/polityka/484-winnicki-protest-przeciwko-skrajnej-ideologizacji-uczelni-był-co-do-zasady-słuszny.html> (accessed 10.04.2014).

Nandi, Proshanta K. 1980. "The Sociology of Heckling." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 21 (1): 14–33.

NOP 22.06.2013. "Wrocław: Nacjonalisci kontra antyterrorysty." Narodowe Odrodzenie Polski.

<http://www.nop.org.pl/2013/06/22/wroclaw-nacjonalisci-kontra-antyterrorysty/> (accessed 10.04.2014)

NOP 24.06.2013. "Konserwatyści solidarni z NOP." Narodowe Odrodzenie Polski. <http://www.nop.org.pl/2013/06/24/konserwatysci-solidarni-z-nop/> (accessed 10.04.2014)

NOP 24.06.2013a. "Rafał Dutkiewicz wzywa do wyeliminowania." Narodowe Odrodzenie Polski.

<http://www.nop.org.pl/2013/06/24/rafal-dutkiewicz-wzywa-do-wyeliminowania-nop> (accessed 10.04.2014)

NOP n.d.. Wrocław NIE dla czerwonych! Facebook.

<https://www.facebook.com/events/461486437286729/?ref=22> (accessed 10.04.2014).

NSA n.d. "Informacje". Facebook.

<https://www.facebook.com/nsawarszawa/info> (accessed 10.04.2014).

NSA 19.02.2013. Niezależne Stronnictwo Akademickie – NSA. Facebook.

https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=534180959938506&set=a.169777423045530.32362.158879207468685&type=1&stream_ref=10 (accessed

11.04.2014)

NSA 20.02.2013. Niezależne Stronnictwo Akademickie – NSA. Facebook.
https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=534502236573045&set=a.169777423045530.32362.158879207468685&type=1&relevant_count=1 (accessed 11.04.2014)

NSA 26.02.2013. Niezależne Stronnictwo Akademickie – NSA. Facebook.
https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=536786866344582&set=a.169777423045530.32362.158879207468685&type=1&relevant_count=1 (accessed 11.04.2014)

Olick, Jeffrey K., Robbins, Joyce 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 24, pp. 105-140.

Ozdoba, Paweł 23.10.2013. "Wulgarne zakłócenie przez homoaktywistów wykładu dr. Camerona w Warszawie." *Pch24.pl*
<http://www.pch24.pl/wulgarne-zaklocenie-przez-homoaktywistow-wykladu-dr-camerona-w-warszawie.18629.i.html#ixzz2jtodvJbF> (accessed 24.10.2013).

Paquette, Danielle 01.10.2011. "IU warns Occupy protesters against disrupting classes again." *Herald-Times*, (Bloomington, IN).

Pezda, Aleksandra 24.06.2013. "Po skandalu we Wrocławiu ministra nauki pisze do Baumana: Przepraszam, Panie Profesorze." *Gazeta Wyborcza*
http://wyborcza.pl/1,76842,14157731,Po_skandalu_we_Wroclawiu_ministra_nauki_pisze_do_Baumana_.html#ixzz2j2uovTM1 (accessed 10.10.2013).

Prusinowska, Magdalena, Kowzan, Piotr, Zielińska, Małgorzata 2012. "Struggling to unite. The rise and fall of one university movement in Poland", *Interface: a Journal for and about Social Movements* 4, no.1: 327 – 359.

Rudolf Steiner 29.10.2013. In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*.
http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Rudolf_Steiner&oldid=579319340 (accessed 02.11.2013).

Rutkowiak, Joanna 2011. "Duchowość jednostki a neoliberalne upolitycznienie edukacji." Pp. 113-130 in *Neoliberalne uwikłania edukacji*, edited by Eugenia Potulicka and Joanna Rutkowiak. Krakow: Oficyna Wydawnicza 'Impuls'.

Schaffer, Michael 22.10.2009. "Pervez Dispenser." *The New Republic*
<http://www.newrepublic.com/article/pervez-dispenser> (accessed 11.10.2013).

Smolík, Josef, Vejvodová, Petra 2013. "Nové trendy české krajní pravice", *REXTER: Politicko-Sociologický Casopis* 11, no. 1: 91-116.

Tudoreanu, Mike 08.12.2011. "Capitalism lecture interrupted to present facts." *Daily Collegian*
<http://dailycollegian.com/2011/12/08/capitalism-lecture-interrupted-to-present-facts/> (accessed 02.10.2013).

TVN24 25.02.2013. "Panel o związkach partnerskich odwołany. 'Baliśmy się demonstracji Młodzieży Wszechpolskiej'." *TVN24*

<http://www.tvn24.pl/pomorze.42/panel-o-zwiazkach-partnerskich-odwolany-balismy-sie-demonstracji-mlodziezy-wszechpolskiej.308273.html> (accessed 18.10.2013).

Wieviorka, Michel 2014. "Sociology's interventions: Engaging the media and politics while remaining a social scientist", *Current Sociology Monograph*, 62(2): 243-252.

Winnicki 13.02.2013. "Musimy odbić szkolnictwo wyższe z rąk lewaków." *Myśl24.pl*

<http://www.mysl24.pl/spoleczenstwo/463-winnicki-musimy-odbic-szkolnictwo-wyzsze-z-rak-lewakow.html> (accessed 17.10.2013).

Wodecka, Dorota 24.06.2013. "Po przerwaniu wykładzie Baumana: Pałka zamiast argumentów." *Gazeta.pl Wrocław*

http://wroclaw.gazeta.pl/wroclaw/1,35771,14155147,Po_przerwaniu_wykladzie_Baumana_Palka_zamiast_argumentow.html (accessed 08.10.2013).

Zielińska, Małgorzata, Kowzan, Piotr, Prusinowska, Magdalena 2011. "Social Movement Learning: from radical imagination to disempowerment", *Studies in the Education of Adults* 43(2): 251-267.

About the authors

Piotr Kowzan, Małgorzata Zielińska and **Magdalena Prusinowska** are PhD students at the Institute of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Gdańsk, Poland. They have also been members of OKUPÉ movement at the University of Gdańsk. Małgorzata and Magdalena have background in Scandinavian Studies, as well as in Educational Studies, while Piotr has background in Management Studies and in Social Pedagogy.

Emails: Małgorzata Zielińska: [m.zielinska AT ug.edu.pl](mailto:m.zielinska@ug.edu.pl), Piotr Kowzan: [dokpko AT ug.edu.pl](mailto:dokpko@ug.edu.pl) and Magdalena Prusinowska: [m.prusinowska AT ug.edu.pl](mailto:m.prusinowska@ug.edu.pl)