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Does class still matter?
Conversations about power, privilege and persistent inequalities in Higher Education

Louise Morley* (Guest Editor of Special Issue)
Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research (CHEER), University of Sussex, UK

CHEER’s 10th anniversary seminar

This Special Issue of Discourse emerged from the 10th Anniversary Seminar of the Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research (CHEER): Does Class Still Matter? Conversations about Power, Privilege and Persistent Inequalities in Higher Education at the University of Sussex on 15 November 2017.

CHEER came into being in 2007 and 10 years earlier, in 1997 a seminal book was created by Pat Mahony and Chris Zmroczek – Class Matters: ‘Working Class’ Women’s Perspectives on Social Class. Two of CHEER’s founding members contributed chapters to this collection: Valerie Hey and Louise Morley, and our late-career conversants in the Anniversary Seminar (Meg McGuire, Diane Reay), also had the privilege of contributing to this collection. When planning the 10th Anniversary celebration, CHEER members stressed the discursive entanglements between these two events. The 1997 edited collection theorised the contradictions, ambivalences and affects around classed identities and experiences – especially in higher education – a domain that traditionally has excluded working-class people from participation, knowledge production and leadership. To mark CHEER’s 10th anniversary, we decided to focus intellectually on one of higher education’s seemingly intractable issues – the assemblage of social class, higher education opportunities, policy and practice imaginaries, and the affective economy.

From its outset, CHEER declared itself a discursive and disruptive space for thinking otherwise about higher education policy and practices nationally and globally. Our aim has always been to interrogate the material, structural, discursive and affective consequences of exclusion and inclusion. Equity, for us, is more than a series of demographic variables. The higher education sector not only reflects and reinforces social stratification, but, via its production and circulation of narratives and quotidian micropolitical practices, it does difference. It goes without saying that power relations infuse organisational and disciplinary cultures, epistemic and pedagogic traditions, student access, achievement and employability, research priorities, the elitist prestige economy, funding and employment regimes, opportunity structures, academic identities, mobilities and subjectivities. We recognise that we
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inhabit the hegemonic space of the knowledge economy, but we attempt to go beyond quantitative success measures. For example, by troubling epistemic exclusions and raising questions about whose knowledge is circulating in the global academy. We strive to animate debates by demonstrating how difference is done by applying counter-hegemonic theories, and critique to the seemingly monolithic neoliberal global academy.

We believe that we need to extend the lexicon, find new vocabularies for thinking about higher education that are not restricted to the clichéd crisis discourses of avalanches and tsunamis (Barber, Donnelly, & Rizvi, 2013), that enable and justify global market dominance and cognitive capitalism. We challenge the reductiveness and anti-intellectualism of financialisation, commodification and instrumentalisation, and the banal binaries of the higher education as public/private good debates. Via our scholarship and publications, we aim for generative entanglements between, for example, feminist, poststructuralist and postcolonial theories and a range of contested and richly rewarding sites for higher research. Our sheer material presence and ‘irritant’ power are indeed consequential. A consequence or penalty is that we are not always included in the Mainstream/Malestream, but that is one of our strengths as not being incorporated offers opportunities for radical otherness, re-voicing and recuperation. We are aware that we are working in a policy context of intense competition and rampant individualism, rather than collaboration and co-operation, but we have links and coalitions around the globe – working on five continents with cognate and cosmopolitan scholars of higher education who, like us, desire alternative futures. We have an open access website, a free seminar series, a Facebook page, and a Twitter account in which we share ideas, materials and intellectual property.

Does class still matter?

Despite decades of policy interventions in diverse national locations to encourage more people from working-class backgrounds to enter higher education as students, the socioeconomics and geo-demographics of the global academy remain a site of class privilege and a vehicle for social differentiation (Hoskins, 2010; Jin & Ball, 2019; Liu, Green, & Pensiero, 2016; Michell, Wilson, & Archer, 2015; Morley, 2012). In relation to students, Boliver (2011) claims that notwithstanding expansion in access, ‘social class inequalities in British higher education have been both maximally and effectively maintained’ (p. 240). When one intersects social class with gender and the putative ‘feminisation’ of higher education, a range of complexities arise about women’s inclusion and working-class men’s exclusion from new opportunity structures. Yet questions remain about who is valued, affirmed and supported in higher education systems, and who has to struggle to be allowed to enter, survive, and thrive (Lee, 2017; Muzzatti & Samarco, 2006; Taylor, 2010). It is this struggle that produces the potent affective economy and critical dialogues that are explored by authors in this Special Issue. As Blackman (2014) argues, ‘affect acts as an attractor for and pick up on more longstanding debates surrounding power, agency, subjectivity and biopolitics’ (p. 364). Despite the affective turn in the humanities and social sciences, it seems like a fairly high-risk strategy to create discursive space for articulations and intellectual formations of the inner conversations of lack, deficit, shame, and desire associated with working-class academic identities in the contemporary social context of fluid and shifting identities and unboundaried opportunities.
Rosemary Hennessy (2000) notes that: ‘the retreat from class analysis … in the eighties and nineties [seems] one of neoliberalism’s most effective ideological weapons’ (p. 12). As capital’s current regime of accumulation, the political economy of neoliberalism emphasises market society where nearly all aspects of life privilege individualism, privatisation, and competition. In neoliberal discourse, there is an individualisation of responsibility for social risks, e.g. poverty, social exclusion, unemployment, sickness, which means that it is all now about entrepreneurship of the self, self-care and making the right investments and choices. Reductively constructed, this means that there is an identifiable pathway to social mobility via accessing higher education, and that all working-class communities need is intentionality, or aspiration, e.g. to focus on getting in and getting on (Friedman, 2016). There are also multiple readings of the drivers behind widening participation policy initiatives in higher education, including the emphasis on human capital theory, normative ideals of the good citizen, incorporation and neoliberal notions of enterprising, competitive and self-maximising individuals rather than analysing social structures and collective identities (Walkerdine, 2011). Current rises of populism in some regions have also been linked to particular formations of ‘problematic’ collective classed identities. The rise of ‘post-truth’ narratives has challenged the assumption that forms of classed, gendered and racialised identity discrimination no longer pose a significant social problem. This prompted the CHEER seminar to consider:

- In what way(s) does social class come to matter for those bodies and practices included/excluded by Higher Education?
- How have theorisations of class by sociologists of education developed since the book’s publication?
- What are the on-going challenges in thinking about social class in Higher Education?

This was back in 2017, and class-based inequalities seem to have been painfully reinforced in the following years.

**Pandemic people**

The 2020 global COVID-19 pandemic highlighted how class and racialised hierarchies are pervasive in deciding whose lives matter (Butler, 2015). As Braidotti (2013) suggests, ‘we are all humans, but some of us are just more mortal than others’ (p. 15). Black and white working-class communities across the globe have been positioned as a type of Morlock sub-species (Wells, 1895) who emerged from the fear-laden shadows to provide all the services for the protected, privileged classes including healthcare, transport, and grocery deliveries, with resulting high mortality rates. The assemblage of poverty, vulnerability and provision of services has catalysed a collision of crises, with higher mortality rates for black and minority ethnic (BAME) communities exacerbated by institutionalised police violence and murder – in the USA, for example. Social disadvantage was recast as an essentialised predisposition to disease, thus reinforcing BAME identity as contaminated/contaminating others. The notion of disposable bodies has been an example of necropolitics in action (Mbembe, 2011). As Davis (2020) argues, twenty-first-century capitalism points to ‘a permanent triage of humanity … dooming part of the human race to eventual extinction’ (n.p). The magnifications and intensities of social disadvantage and the
resulting coalition of tensions produced a ‘Snapping Point’ (Ahmed, 2017a; Antonakaki, French, & Guner, 2018), and globalised resistance in the form of a re-emerged and strengthened Black Lives Matter movement (Black Lives Matter, 2020). As Ahmed (2017a) suggests ‘a snap is not a starting point, but a snap can be the start of something’ (p. 194). A snap is a rearrangement of in/visibility and embodied perception. ‘If you have to shout to be heard you are heard as shouting. If you have to shout to be heard you are not heard’ (Ahmed, 2017b, n.p.). In the context of biopower and the politics of vulnerability, breathing matters (Gorska, 2016) in so far as who has the right to breathe, or breathing space – in the midst of a global respiratory pandemic and police brutality which has led to black citizens such as George Floyd being asphyxiated? (BBC, 2020). It is unsurprising then that the cry ‘I can’t breathe’ has become a leitmotiv of social movements of resistance. The ‘age of contagion’ (Sampson, 2012) relates both to the pandemic and the network society that means that both the virus and social resistance movements are transmitted rapidly across borders.

A further ‘Snapping Point’ arose when class-based educational opportunities were painfully exposed in the pandemic, e.g. in the debacle over the UK’s A-Level results in August 2020 in which a humanly constructed algorithm (that was represented as an autonomous, objective, non-human entity) institutionally advantaged independent over state-funded schools in view of their past examination records. Almost 40% of A-Level grades were downgraded from the teacher-assessed grades, with the largest differences seen among students from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds (TES, 2020). While this catastrophic formula was materially reversed and results returned to teachers’ predicted grades, the sense of injustice circulated in the nation’s affective economy. This was exacerbated by further revelations including a list of 21 UK universities at financial risk as a result of the pandemic suggests that 17 of these institutions have a disproportionally high number of undergraduate students from state schools (Frontier Economics, 2020). Many also offer access to a disproportionate number of students from low participation areas. Across the UK, fewer than 12% of higher education students come from such areas, but several of the vulnerable institutions educate a much higher proportion from this group. Disposable bodies and disposable institutions that include the dispossessed are simply collateral crisis damage and injustice.

Social class in a post-binary world

I often experience a frustrated sense of bleakness and despair when I read of the entrapment, reification, injuries, and injustice of the intractable inequalities and classifications of social class. Having struggled myself with social mobility (Morley, 1997), I am conscious that vast areas of my past and quotidian experiences and receipt of repetitive micro-aggressions are often absent from what has frequently been heteromasculine analyses of socio-economic difference. I believe that the debate on social class in higher education needs broadening, or queering, to move beyond often archaic binaries of working-class (abject, excluded, exploited) and middle-class (secure, strategic, smug) identities. It also needs to be racialised and theoretically intersected with a range of strands of difference that resonate with questions of nomadism, border-crossing, passing, reveal/disclosure, belonging, self-appellation, and in-betweeness, e.g. postcolonial, and queer and transgender studies (Skeggs, 2019; Tudor, 2017). Intersectionality is not just about bodies and materialities, or creating an oppression Olympics or hierarchy, but needs to incorporate a capacity for enabling
diverse theories to speak creatively and illuminatively to each other. The exploration of working-class identities is often laced with a sense of nostalgic attachment to community that relies on heteronormative kinship that can exclude LGBTQAI+ identities, for example. Social class in relation to sexuality is woefully under-researched (Attitude, 2018). Additionally, the middle classes can dominate research on social class. Whereas Savage’s (2015) research asked important questions about whether we can identify distinctive social classes who share common lifestyles, identities, social networks and political orientations as well as levels of income and wealth? The researchers in his study acknowledged that the BBC survey on which the research was based was mainly completed by middle-class participants. They concluded that there are now at least seven social classes in the UK: Elite (6% of the population), Established Middle Class (25%), Technical Middle Class (6%), New Affluent Workers (15%), Traditional Working Class (14%), Emergent Service Workers (19%), and Precariat (15%). Underpinning this analysis is a preoccupation with inequality and social mobility and the vast and growing disparity in wealth and power between the ‘elite’ and the ‘precariat’. A range of new intermediate groups has emerged that reflect the process of social mobility, or ‘climbing the mountain’ for an enlarged lower-to-upper-middle class. Savage estimates that a super-wealthy class now represents about 6% of the population, with an average household income of £89,000 – boosted, he suggests, by attendance at Oxbridge or a handful of other super-elite universities, e.g. Imperial, King’s College, London. But social class, as we all know, is about more than the reification of income and occupation, postcodes and housing stock. While classifications can provide a helpful form of socio-political and narrative power and critical analysis, they imply borders, boundaries and identificatory regimes which exclude or problematise subjects that are rendered unintelligible or beyond classification. Identity classifications often fail when there is complexity.

For working-class academics, there is a sense of being forever in transit – caught between identities in the friction and ambiguities of disadvantage and privilege. Identity can be situated in opposition to original class identity and indeed to the middle-class (naturalised academic) terrain which one enters. Coming out as working-class involves the denaturalisation of hegemonic assumptions about what constitutes an authentic academic identity. The constriction and expansion of social mobility can produce a liquidation of the past, and uncertainty for the present and future. An ontological position can be dialectically forged in otherness, and indeed, excess. Reliance on higher education to effect class equality requires working-class individuals to accommodate and assimilate into the very structures that oppress them in order to achieve social mobility (Waterfield, Beagan, & Mohamed, 2019). Yet this can also involve resistance, defiance, and rage – much of which is generative and energetic. Working-class academic identity involves intrapsychic states, relational processes, and power-sensitive performativity. This can propel a potent affective economy that simultaneously drives, impedes, repels, and distorts social mobility. Academic winners can experience themselves as losers in the politics of verticality and social precarity – imposters, frauds, tricksters, and interlopers – misrecognised and marginalised but also catalysed by the rage of injustice to create alternative futurities (Johansson & Jones, 2019).

This Special Issue of Discourse contains narratives from academics who have ‘climbed the mountain’ from their working-class backgrounds to working not only in an elite profession, but also in a pivotal system in elite formation. It attempts to move beyond the misery or triumphalist Cinderella stories of individual transcendence
It broadens assessment of economic inequalities beyond income to include consideration of the affective ecology of class including the psychic life of power, the micropolitics of class-based power relations in the workplace, and the residual feelings of shame, pride, and anxiety about concealment and passing that structure and straddle popular and scholarly discourse (Loveday, 2015). Sara Ahmed (1999) and Judith Butler (1993) criticise assumptions that passing references a ‘real’ identity. If working-class academics feel like fraudulent imposters, what constitutes an authentic, legitimate, or essentialised academic? Does every performance of academic excellence involve a ‘passing’ as middle-class? While the materialities of class inequalities continue to shock and outrage (Piketty, 2013; Savage, 2016: Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009), there is a quixotic aspect to class that is often abstract and difficult to subject to logical analysis, e.g. once socially mobile, why do people from working-class backgrounds continue to be dogged by so many ugly feelings (Ngai, 2005)? Why are we subjected to so many mis-readings of our intellectual and professional abilities? Why can’t we simply celebrate our ‘successes’ and just get on with it? Why is it so painful to be an academic when one’s destiny was to be otherwise? Armed with multiple capitals, why is there an omnipresent and quotidian fear of leakage, revelation, or accusation of evidence of lack?

Politics of critical hope

In the CHEER Anniversary Seminar, we wished to continue to develop class analysis and share collective imaginaries by moving beyond the stimulus/response model of many academic seminars and create opportunities for conversations and connectivity between late- and early-career researchers of social class. The seminar drew together the generative forces of some of the original writers and invited newer researchers to speak back to the papers ‘in conversation’. In so doing, we hoped to generate creative, regenerative and productive inter-generational dialogue and reparative readings around social class, feminisms and identities in (and about) the academy. In a coagulation of the personal and the political, we attempted to provide discursive space for the autobiography of the question, internal and collective narratives, and multiple readings and analyses of the complex micropolitics of class privilege in the academy. Moving beyond an aesthetic of victimhood and vulnerability, heroic narratives of overcoming adversity, and linear narratives of mobility, speakers deconstructed the many discomforts, discords and frictions involved in a subject position of being working-class in socio-cultural organisations that were never designed to include them. The relationality, and feminist analysis of otherness, are not simply based on shared injury or the negativities of social ascription, but are affirmative, capacious, and creative. As such, the powerfully destabilising narratives serve as a corrective to the epistemic injustice that excludes the working classes as knowledge producers.

We were also delighted to welcome a range of eminent scholars of social class as participants in the seminar including Valerie Walkerdine, Carole Leathwood, and Jo Stanley, as well as past and current CHEER members, associates and Visiting Professors, including Miriam David, Heather Eggins, Terri Kim, Charlotte Morris, Gaby Weiner, and feminist scholars from around the globe, including Gloria Bonder, Rosemary Deem, and Janet Boddy. As always, our doctoral scholars were central to the event and exchanged new and emerging ideas with mid- and late-career colleagues.

We were also delighted to welcome the two editors of Class Matters: ‘Working Class’
Women's Perspectives on Social Class – Pat Mahony and Chris Zmroczek – who introduced the seminar, making links to their 1997 work.¹

**Conversation 1** (The Un/methodology of ‘Theoretical Intuitions’: Resources of Generations Gone Before, Thinking and Feeling Class) was between Valerie Hey, Emerita Professor and former Co-Director, CHEER, University of Sussex, UK, Dr Sarah Leaney, and Dr Daniel Leyton. Sarah and Daniel were both doctoral researchers in CHEER who are now early-career academics in the University of Brighton, UK, and Alberto Hurtado University, Chile respectively. They spoke to Valerie’s chapter in *Class Matters* (Hey, 1997) *Northern Accent and Southern Comfort: Subjectivity and Social Class*, noting how it reflected its author’s material circumstances, including her preferred conceptual interests as well as her un(self)conscious knowledge. In revisiting the way class ‘mattered’, and continues to matter, and is so often read via accent and vocabulary, they devised and enacted an exploratory dialogical methodology to open up the original text to new meanings and interpretations influenced by generationally and geographically specific intellectual/theoretical vocabularies. Their paper in this special issue enacts this multivocality with reflections from each author, connected by a co-authored exploration of affect and the power and problematic of the ‘autobiography of the question’.

**Conversation 2** (‘The Still-Moving Position’ of the ‘Working Class’ Feminist Academic: Dealing with Disloyalty, Dislocation and Discomfort) involved Emerita Professor Diane Reay, University of Cambridge, UK, discussing with Dr Kirsty Morrin, then at the University of Manchester, now at the University of Liverpool, UK, Dr Jessie Abrahams, then at University of Surrey, now at the University of Bristol, and Annabel Wilson, University of Cardiff, UK. They examined the relationship of working-class feminist academics to the Academy, and interrogated the tension between resistance and submission from the perspective of four educationally successful working-class women who have become academics. Building on Reay’s (1997) chapter in *Class Matters*, they developed and reflected on four central themes: the dilemmas of belonging within higher education, the challenge of continuing class exclusions, the oppressive and exploitative class relations that remain and are rarely recognized or addressed, and finally the difficulties around sustaining ‘authentic’ and meaningful relationships with the still working-class.

**Conversation 3** (Invoking Ourselves: The Role of Space and Place in Being a Working-Class Female Academic) involved Professor Meg Maguire, King’s College, London, UK, and Dr Lisa Jones, University of Hull, UK, examining the constructions of their own identities with a particular focus on both what unites and differentiates working-class women. They focused on the way in which their lives have been similarly shaped by structuring forces such as class, whiteness, and gender, but they also explored how their lives and experiences have been shaped by space and place as a complex set of time-sensitive inter-relationships involving domination and subordination (Massey, 1994). In this paper for the special issue, their different stories of *where*, *when* and *how* they grew up are discussed as they attempt to make sense of these in relation to constructions of class and its intersectionality with diverse aspects of their lives. A key part of their discussion was the sense of belonging/not belonging in the academy, a non-neutral space where white, male middle-class privilege remains unchecked and ‘invisible’.
CHEER was delighted that other seminar participants and scholars of social class accepted our invitations to contribute to this special issue. Professor Valerie Walkerdine, Cardiff University (What’s Class Got to Do With It?) argues that with social class not being a protected characteristic in the UK’s 2010 equity legislation, issues of classism tend to be ignored and relegated to the Widening Participation agenda in universities, where the serious issues tend not to be engaged with at all. She suggests that we need to understand how this situation has arisen and what needs to be done to confront it. Valerie makes a plea for an understanding of class as transversal and global in new ways following the demise of heavy industry in much of Europe and North America. She asks how a different understanding of how class is currently lived might help us in engaging with working-class students in higher education today.

Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, UK (Social Class and Mobility: Student Narratives of Class Location in English Higher Education) explores mobility as a defining feature of higher education and what this means for working-class students, drawing on data from a UK study of Higher Education and Social Mobility (the Paired Peers Project). The notion of mobility is central to efforts to increase participation in higher education for working-class students, associated with the possibilities of upward social and economic mobility. Higher education is also organised around expectations of ‘mobile’ individuals, who are at ease moving through and across space and place, and who expect to move to locations where the high-skilled work is situated. For middle-class students in the Paired Peers project, it appeared much easier to maintain and enrich earlier place-based identities, whilst working-class students had to consider leaving behind their classed and place-based identities. Moreover, mobility represented a form of capital, differently available to students from different backgrounds. It could be cultivated and invested in, for example through travel, high-status internships in distant locations, and fieldwork placements in exotic places, and then mobilised to ensure continued advantage both within and beyond university.

Bridgette Rickett and Anna Morris, Leeds Beckett University, UK (‘Mopping up tears in the academy’ – Working-Class Academics, Belonging and the Necessity for Emotional Labour in Contemporary UK Academia for Working-Class Women) examine the ways in which 12 working-class female lecturers in UK-based universities talk about their experience of belonging, and the contemporary requirement for emotional labour in their work. Drawing on feminist Discourse Analysis of the transcribed interview data the authors identified two overarching discourses that constructed the deployment of emotional labour and emotional work as presenting opportunities for belonging in an otherwise exclusive terrain. Classed and gendered identities were presented as being key determinants of why some people were required to deploy emotional labour more than others. Contemporary lecturing work is also located within a ‘marketised’, ‘work-intensified’ space which is inhabited with discourse around ‘student mental health crisis’ and where the deployment of emotional labour appears to be both understood as a vehicle to enable feelings of belonging and value yet also as something that is (de)valued and divisive according to intersecting classed and gendered power differentials.

We were keen to include discussions on social class from beyond the UK, and were thrilled when Dr Ana Luisa Muñoz García, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile – a former visiting academic to CHEER, and partner in the research network Chilean Higher Education: Interrogating Knowledge, Internationalisation and Gender accepted our invitation to write about the ways in which international students from Chile narrate their experiences in the USA, and the extent to which mobility
across national borders reshapes class understandings and privilege. Ana Luisa argues that through a process of international mobility, upper class students from Chile lose class privilege, which in turn influences them to denaturalise their class constructions and to reshape their class consciousness.

Staying with the international, my research on women leaders in higher education in Finland with Dr Rebecca Lund, from Oslo University, Norway, when I was a Visiting Professor in Tampere University, has also been included. We argue that women leaders are frequently treated as one class – a homogenised group with essentialised skills and competencies in binary relationship to male leaders. We explore how feminist ways of knowing gender and leadership, and circulated a plethora of affects, shape women’s diverse leadership practices and identities within the neoliberal, and neuroliberale academy in Finland – a Nordic country with a sophisticated gender equality policy architecture. We conclude that the politics of representation - counting more women into neoliberal universities, as one class, is not a counter-normative force, and that we need to consider how to apply feminist knowledge for leading post-gender universities and imagining alternative futurities.

Sally Munt, Professor Emerita at the University of Sussex is an eminent feminist, queer scholar of cultural studies, and also a qualified psychotherapist. We were honoured that she agreed to be interviewed about her life-history as an academic from a working-class background, and the intellectual and affective complexities of social mobility via higher education. As well as theorising the micropolitics of her quotidian experiences, Sally argues that universities should consider how to widen the doors, and resist restricting access to higher education to only those with existing symbolic, economic and social capital.

Paul Roberts examines how social class is frequently dismissed in international mobility, and ethnicity can serve as a proxy for social class especially with and stigmatised and socio-economically disadvantaged groups such as the Roma. Drawing on data from the CHEER study on Higher Education Internationalisation and Mobility (HEIM) funded by the European Commission, he explores how social class is made visible or rendered invisible in relation to short-term international placements for doctoral researchers. The article contributes to a small, but growing critical, as opposed to descriptive, approach to academic mobilities research.

In engaging with these papers, and the entangled power relations of social class in the contemporary global academy, CHEER invites us all to imagine and reflect on the future of higher education that we want to see. Contemporary crises in higher education as a result of the global pandemic have reinforced class privilege and have exposed the naked elitism that is omnipresent despite performative policies of widening participation and social mobility. Rather than providing a static definition of social class, and its ontologies, we suggest a need to intersect class-based analysis with theoretical developments in gender including the post binary fluidity that problematises the demarcation and reification of identity. We call for power-sensitive epistemic inclusion, and a collective off-switch, or politics of refusal, for the deep-seated internalised and externalised narratives of lack and deficit. Ultimately, a question is what part can the global academy play in queering and disrupting class politics and hierarchies of value, rather than hegemonic co-optation or simply lifting the class-controlled barrier to allow more individual members of marginalised groups to enter the sacred grove.

Note
1 For recordings and photos of the seminar, please see 
http://www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/events/doesclassmatter
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