Introduction:
Learning Disobedience from the Heart of Empire

(UN)LEARNING AND LEARNING DISOBEDIENCE TO ABOLISH DEVELOPMENT

We take as our starting point the imperative for collective projects to abolish international development. Part of this struggle means abolishing development studies and a set of disciplinary specialisms, among them development geographies. We invite scholar-activists, students, organisers and practitioners to divest themselves and their institutions from the practices, ideologies and spaces of international development. For us, cultivating and learning disobedience is at the heart of the struggle for futures beyond development. The apparatus of international development is so thoroughly implicated within ongoing colonial and capitalist formulations of extraction, marginalization and exploitation that we cannot continue to even passively take part. Beginning with our refusal to take 'development' for granted as a feature of contemporary life, being-in-the-world and academic knowledge-making, we embolden ourselves to the tasks of repair, re-imagining and transformation beyond it.

As scholar-activists working within a sub-field entangled in colonial legacies, namely 'African development geographies' (Mercer, Mohan and Power 2003; Daley and Murrey 2022a), we strive to imagine and cultivate a new paradigm that addresses global inequalities, disrupts power relations, attends to ecological repair and emphasizes our common humanity – all starting from the ground-up. In so doing, we extend a rich and radical body of literature that critiques development (in its many iterations) as deeply embedded within the 'colonial matrix of power' (Quijano 2000): as Eurocentric, heteronormative, embedded within racializing thought and rooted in colonial logics. As consenting to capitalism and, often, as promoting neoliberal capitalism. In our pursuit of epistemic and political ruptures with development, we bring together a capacious and important intellectual work on critique and struggle. We find solace in the more emergent projects to decolonize development thought and practice, particularly through meaningful and enduring solidarities. This book is our effort to open up the ways in which we have knowingly engaged in the unfinished project of abolishing development in our teaching praxis.

The project of abolishing development entails a double movement: undoing and dismantling international development, while simultaneously building solidarities and contributing to movements for reparative justice and healing that address and redress intergenerational harms perpetrated in the name of 'development'. In spaces and places impacted by coloniality, struggles to decolonize necessarily involve movements to repair colonial wounds and nurture forms of anti-imperial responsibility for harm by those situated in the Global North (e.g. Raghuram, Madge and Noxolo 2009), alongside creative and joyful political practice. We have come to understand decolonization as the collective and ongoing move to break with colonial systems (including, for example, racist and anthropocentric norms, institutions, values, built environments, technological dimensions, etc.) in ways

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 6/6/2024 3:32 AM via NTNU UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
AN: 3441958 ; Amber Murrey, Prof. Patricia Daley.; Learning Disobedience : Decolonizing Development Studies
Account: ntnu.main.ehost

9

that work towards realizing decolonial, anti-racist and queer futures. Abolishing international development is therefore an essential movement within the wider project of abolishing racial capitalism (Bhattacharyya 2018).

We are inspired by the prison-abolition movement and Ruth Wilson Gilmore's (2007) work on abolition geographies, which assert the need for the negation of the confinements, borders, structures and relations of carceral geographies to end the Prison Industrial Complex (see also Davis 2003; Vitale 2018; Elliott-Cooper 2021). Abolitionist perspectives can be directed generatively towards development. As our comprehensive engagement with international development here shows, we have had enough with superficial and cyclical reforms. For us, upending the elaborate systems of international development begins with the dismantling of our disciplinary and sub-disciplinary areas of focus. As activists, after all, we begin where we are already situated. This project begins with our active divestment in the hegemonies of knowing and practice fostered by international development actors, sectors, funding and epistemes. This freeing up of our labour, energy and political resources allows us to direct more attention to repair, reparations, justice and decolonial options.

DISMANTLING DEVELOPMENT, DISMANTLING COLONIALITY

To dismantle development, we work from decolonial thought. We situate our present world order as one of 'global coloniality' (sometimes referred to as the 'colonial matrix of power'). In the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano's (2000a) seminal article outlining this concept, he works from the earlier intellectual traditions of dependency theory (Amin 1972) and world systems analysis (Wallerstein 1974) to assert the continuation of colonial relations of power and being beyond and in spite of formal (or 'flag') decolonization on a global scale. Reading Quijano's (2000a, 2000b) work, we understand that the colonial matrix of power has four interrelated domains:

1. control of the economy (land appropriation, exploitation of labour, control of natural resources);
2. control of authority (institutions, army);
3. control of gender and sexuality (family, education);
4. control of subjectivity and knowledge (epistemology, education and the formation of subjectivity).

For Quijano (2000a), race is the 'mental category of modernity', and coloniality is maintained through the establishment of racial difference. The decolonial feminist Maria Lugones (2008, 2010) amends Quijano's articulation so that it attends more fully to the centrality of sex and gender difference within the coloniality of power (see Chapter 6). The colonial matrix of power operates as a hegemonic ordering logic that configures economies, relations and epistemes but in ways that go unsaid, unacknowledged and unrecognized by most people. For this reason, decolonial scholars have been interested in understanding the epistemological functions of global coloniality and racialization, as it is through ideas, and the structuring of reality effected by those ideas, that coloniality is concealed. Decolonial thinker and sociologist Rolando Vázquez (2012) calls the effacement of coloniality by modernity 'the denial of the denial'. Coloniality operates rhetorically through a double negative that dispossesses and excludes the 'Other' and then invalidates, negates and disavows that very dispossession and exclusion.

Coloniality is what is erased by the classification and representation of 'modernity' – *plus the denial of that erasure* (Vázquez 2012). Working within anthropology, Francis Nyamnjoh (2017a, 2017b) has argued that the perpetuation of epistemic Eurocentrism (namely the inability to

acknowledge the different ways of knowing by which people in the margins and beyond Europe and North America give meaning to their lives) has sometimes involved 'epistemicide' or the active killing of knowledge forms. There is a deep relationship between knowledge of the world, knowledge in the world and political and social justice. Motivated to push the conversation *beyond critique*, scholars like the Zimbabwean decolonial philosopher Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni and decolonial feminist Rosalba Icaza have argued that decolonial options offer pluriversal and alternative epistemes for understanding and engaging with Euro-normative units of analysis and ways of thinking about our social and natural worlds.

In this way, 'decolonial options' (Mignolo and Escobar 2010) seek to move beyond critique (of the coloniality of power) to politically and ethically oriented action (see also Icaza and Vázquez 2017, 50). Mignolo (2010) and other decolonial thinkers have written of the sets of *possible pathways* beyond coloniality as 'decolonial *options*' as they are necessarily multiple and our engagement with them (within our communities of struggle) is influenced by our situatedness, and our body- and geo-politics. The work of decolonial scholars is therefore to imagine presents and futurities beyond the colonization of the future effected by colonial logics (which would deem the present state of affairs absolute and inescapable) – this is an imaginative work called 'gesturing'. Given our shared context of coloniality, we seek to craft generative courses of action that neither presume to escape our entanglement within the coloniality of power, nor to render us innocent (e.g. Tuck and Yang 2012).

Indigenous-inspired approaches emphasize an ability to work and be collectively without claims to either expertise or mastery. Decolonial notions of the pluriverse posit possibilities of co-existence and co-entanglement of multiple worlds and ways of being in the world. Calls for convivial, alternative and decolonial knowledge demand that intellectuals, and people more broadly, move away from binary imaginaries (Icaza and Vázquez 2017; Boidin, Cohen, Grosfoguel 2012, 2–3). These efforts seek to imagine *other ways* of expressing knowledge, shared and collective thinking, and creative processes.

Beginning from the perspective of decolonial options means that those scholarly lexicons taken-for-granted in the social sciences – gender, the nation-state, territory, the normative individual, culture and more – are unsettled as analytical frames of reference (Kothari et al. 2019). Decolonial options are more than supplementary components to be merely added upon pre-existing terms and frames: to take the project of decolonizing development and reworlding seriously, a new vocabulary, a decolonial language, is indispensable. Projects of re-founding the university demand attention to forms of epistemic injustice and violence; thus, necessitating forms of disobedience in our learning, unlearning and knowledge practices. For us, this entails active disobedience in turning away from the illusions of universal knowledge towards pluriversal knowledge.

'WHITESTREAMING' AND THE (MIS)APPROPRIATION OF DECOLONIZATION

As we write this book, international development has not yet been abolished. We are at (yet another) colonial impasse (Schuurman 1993; Booth 1985) in which long-established and prevailing formulas of development have been exposed as enacting forms of subjection, exclusion and dispossession. In the last decade, we have witnessed a proliferation of publications, workshops and conferences on themes related to decolonization. So much so that some have argued that the current tenor of the university has taken on the form of a 'decolonization industry' (Táíwò 2022) – so named to critique the ways in which a discourse of 'decolonization' has been mainstreamed (as well as appropriated and emptied of concrete political meaning) within academic business-as-usual. The drumbeat of inclusion and equity has not, however, led to structural change within our institutions; we know from the work of feminist scholars such as Sara Ahmed, Patricia Noxolo, Farhana Sultana and others that these provisional

projects of diversification have in fact amounted to ongoing forms of alienation for scholars of colour. 'Inclusion and equity' would resign our political projects as merely additive to the existing system. Decolonization, rather, calls for a radical transformation of knowing, being, relating and praxis (Bhambra, Gebrial, Nişancıoğlu 2018).

The mainstreaming or, we might more appropriately say, the 'white-streaming'[1] of decolonization, has done a disservice to the political project of decolonization. In the context of international development, Themrise Khan (2021) notes that not only does decolonization often fail to translate across and between languages ('in many other languages, from Arabic to Spanish, only a loanword exists'), but that this lack demonstrates how Anglocentric such contemporary discussions are.

Writing and speaking in 2016, we predicted that 'decolonization' would be appropriated by hegemonic financial and developmental institutions (we specifically named the World Bank) to sabotage and curtail radical projects (Murrey 2016, 2019). Tuck and Yang (2012) give a name for the phenomenon of well-intentioned 'decolonizing' scholars who impede Indigenous struggle for land, sovereignty and dignity through their claims of decolonization: these are 'moves to innocence' that would absolve settler guilt and reify white saviour paradigms. The permanent misappropriation of defiant language by colonial forces remains a shameful practice of corporate and colonial actors (see also Daley, in Hughes and Murrey 2022). As such, it is a wicked problem that we must constantly address in our journey of disobedient learning (Murrey 2019). This feature of ongoing coloniality enacts fresh epistemic violence against communities of intergenerational struggle.

Here, *coloniality* is a name for the enduring forms of colonial relations, logics and structures beyond the moment of official (juridical or 'flag') decolonization (Quijano 2000). Colonial logics mystify the continued practices of political and economic violence, often by labelling them with the language of emancipation (Escobar 1995). These logics undermine existent and emergent solidarities by casting doubt, fostering scepticism and hesitation, and dismissing genuine attempts at decolonization as dangerous facsimiles. For a variety of reasons, the relative explosion in projects of decolonization in the present are summarily dismissed as another 'fad' and 'fashionable' project. For scholar-activists and activists – particularly queer and women of colour scholar-activists – who have struggled and worked for decades in these areas, more emergent moves to decolonize from and by hegemonic institutions and people signal yet another form of appropriation, glossing over and consuming the time, labour and love of intergenerational struggles (in long, protracted and historically patterned ways). The institutionalization of 'decolonization' – the rendering of a project into an industry both in academia and development – permits yet another false narrative, yet another misguided kind of white 'help' and 'aid'.

Within academia, there is a tendency to superficially apply and dangerously misappropriate critical concepts that emerge from the labour and energy of Indigenous, Black and marginalized scholars (Tuck and Yang 2012; Roy et al. 2020). The appropriation without citation of women of colour scholars has been an endemic feature of the coloniality of knowledge within the operations of the university (Rivera Cusicanqui 2012; Tilley 2017). Feminists have long asserted that our words are life – that our words, our terms and our concepts carry political, social, economic and geographical significance (Brand 1990). The theft and misappropriation of ideas occurs within and brings attention to the concurrent and permanent orders of racialized and gendered violence that are simultaneously standardized within racial capitalism (Smith 2022), with each violence building upon and also only occurring within and because of the multiplicity of colonial racialized violence. Roy (2020) writes powerfully of the ways in which the work of postcolonial, queer and feminist scholars in the discipline of geography are held up as

evidence that the discipline is diversifying – thus providing forms of 'citational alibis' – even as they simultaneously remain decentred, seen as 'specialized fields of inquiry' and as actively depoliticized (Roy 2020).2

For some bad faith actors (including openly fascist and racist public intellectuals as well as more 'moderate' neoliberals), recent movements for decolonization have been dismissed as shallow posturing. Through this, we see that bad faith actors modify and exaggerate the purposeful critique of decolonization first crafted by Indigenous scholars (Tuck and Yang 2012) in ways that would discredit anti-racist and anti-colonial movement-making. Other bad faith actors argue that decolonization is entirely misguided: based on either 'bad science' or overburdened with 'identity politics' that presume forms of racial purity that are inherently divisive and essentializing.

Given this milieu, you might wonder why we *knowingly* persist in using the concept to describe the project within which we collaborate. This is because, for us, decolonization continues to have an active traction; it is valuable particularly in teaching and recognizing the ongoing contours of the settler–slave-Indigenous relationship within development studies/geographies (Curley et al. 2022). Decolonization speaks to our aspirations in teaching pedagogies and praxis (Sultana 2019), and it provides a useful emboldening agenda for us, our students and our readers as we consider the possibilities and potentials of teaching against our own institution, and therefore unlearning dominant frames of being and knowledge. Our usage of the term is done in the ugly context of its systematic sabotage and appropriation by institutional actors, with an awareness of our liminality and our weaknesses (including our mindfulness that we have weaknesses that we are not yet aware of).

PEDAGOGICAL DISOBEDIENCE

Drawing from a transdisciplinary body of thought on decolonizing the university and decolonizing pedagogy though grounded, pluralistic and holistic praxes, we think through our practice of 'pedagogical disobedience' as one through which educators, students and activists can work to unlearn – with lucidity and humility – the colonial logics within international development, while supporting decolonial options for futures both beyond and outside mainstream development models. Our use of disobedience draws from Mignolo's (2009, 2011) arguments on the importance of 'epistemic disobedience' in dismantling coloniality (we trace the longer legacies of this thought elsewhere; see Murrey 2019 on 'disobedient pedagogies'; Daley and Murrey 2022a, 2022b on 'defiant scholarship'). Learning how to be intellectually disobedient to the multi-headed hydra of racialized capitalism is an active, collective and ongoing ambition. Dismantling and divesting our selves, our labour, our communities and our institutions from development fictions and structures – through practices of epistemic and pedagogical disobedience – is fundamental to our yearning for flourishing and joyful collective lives.

While this is a co-authored book that draws from our experiences creating, co-teaching and learning over the past five years, at Oxford University's School of Geography and the Environment, our reflections cull from our multiple decades of wider and richer experience of teaching and learning in and against 'international development' in the social sciences, including at institutions in the UK, US, Cameroon, Egypt and Ethiopia. To do so, we build from a powerful existing scholarship to demystify the fluctuating colonial logics undergirding international development for the last 75 years, including Euro-normativity, heteronormativity and white supremacy in development studies and development practice. As anti-racist educators, we seek to learn *with* and to build important relations, connections and curriculums in the watershed moment of projects to decolonize knowledge to nurture flourishing and thriving worlds. Inspired by the promises of Pan-African, decolonial and pluriversal options, it is

not sufficient to work against the doxa of Eurocentric 'canons' of thought – we must imagine new, liveable and dignified futures.

Whose knowledges and perspectives have, do and should inform and shape international development policy and programming? How do we actively set out about a praxis of (un)learning as educators, as students, and as activists? In our responses to these questions, we build from the scholarship on decolonizing pedagogies, which (a) centres Indigenous and decolonial ontologies and epistemologies; (b) is purposefully oriented to abolition; (c) critiques the role of coloniality in informing human/nature relations; and (d) is place- and land-based (McCoy, Tuck and McKenzie 2017). Working from Eve Tuck's (2019) challenge, 'to work purposively to create healthy decolonized academic spaces', we aim to be thoughtful in seeking a holistic consideration of decolonizing praxes and curricula (Murrey 2019; Sultana 2019). Tuck and Yang (2012: 21) explain that 'the colonial apparatus is assembled to order the relationships between particular peoples, lands, the 'natural world', and 'civilization'. Colonialism is marked by its specializations. While we are both working within the sub-fields of decolonial political geography and feminist political ecologies within a British university, in our teaching we intentionally pull from an eclectic and wide range of materials, including music, video, social media posts and popular sources like blogs and interviews. Our purpose in writing this book is to carve out the space to sincerely sit with our own co-teaching and (un)learning practice, so as to enrich it and to trace generative connective tissues (including contributing helpful examples) for activists, students and educators committed to the project of decolonizing development.

Within the tradition of decolonial geographies, 'liminality' is a particularly important concept as it admits the modesty and transience of our scholar-teacher selves. We are always in transition, always becoming, always unlearning and learning. Something that remains a particularly instructive prompt for us, especially while we are at the University of Oxford, is to think about how we, as educators, have been inculcated and socialized by and through colonial thought. The project of colonial unlearning requires cultivating a critical awareness of how our own knowing, training, teaching and research practices reinforce systems of oppression (Jackson 2017). How do we set about un-thinking the boundaries of our knowledge projects? Part of this includes deliberately upsetting taken-for-granted parameters regarding the world, interspecies and interhuman relations, and more – the project to decolonize international development entails decolonizing the nation-state, queering our thought (see Alqaisiya 2018), engaging in decolonial praxis, rethinking transnational solidarity, and more.

The project of unlearning and rebuilding is a useful counterpoint to the focus on critique within the Western university, which often takes the form of critique-as-destruction or critique-as-disengagement/dismissal. One thing we remind our students and readers – and one thing we see in ourselves and our own disciplinary training – is that deconstruction can be quick and relatively easy. It is much easier to read a paper and 'identify the weaknesses' (as we are often trained in the Western university) than it is to imagine, write and create. Creation and imagination are challenging, painstaking and sometimes dangerous work. This phenomenon presents challenges for decolonial scholarship, centred as it is in reimagining and creating beyond the ideas of modernity and coloniality. Not only will our task be time- and labour-intensive, but within the university we oftentimes default to critique *even in projects that centre upon reimagining*. We have seen this in our classrooms, for example, when we ask particularly imaginative questions for which there will be no quick response (and no solution-oriented answers). Our students will sometimes defer to, unpacking, the question, identifying its framing implications or critiquing the specific terminologies and linguistic patterns. The work of critique is important! As Carlos Rivera Santana and Graham Akhurst (2019: 2) explain,

'decolonial work has simultaneously been diagnostic – to expose and discredit coloniality – as well as imaginative-futurities – to expose and realize decolonial options within the pluriverse'. Yet, disobedience in the colonial university requires both anti-colonial critique and decolonial imaginaries.

This book is intentionally provocative in articulating disobedience as central to decolonizing development studies. We embrace the objective of learning disobedience in refusing to abandon the project on the basis of uncertainty – that is, we know that we do not yet know *how* what we name 'decolonizing development' will come to fruition (Sultana 2019; Daley and Murrey 2022b). But we remain disobedient in the face of capitalist, extractivist and colonial paradigms by insisting that *it is possible*. In the face of intellectual projects that would shore up and dismiss decolonial work and decolonizing projects as unconvincing or improbable because they are unfinished (Nyamnjoh 2017a, 2017b), we propose a knowing defiance, a knowing disobedience. We draw from a transdisciplinary body of decolonial work to historicise coloniality and situate it alongside activist and scholarly projects to imagine new and more dignified post-capitalist, post-extractive and post-heteropatriarchal futures.

OUR CODES OF BEHAVIOUR IN THE ARTICULATION AND PRACTICE OF DISOBEDIENT PEDAGOGIES

Refusing to seek legitimation by colonial epistemologies, defiance can be a tool for dismantling coloniality in African development geographies. Working towards pedagogical disobedience is a relational and constant project, one which requires a thoughtfulness and labour that is often not allotted within neoliberal universities. For us, there are several dynamics central to our articulation and practice of disobedient pedagogies:

(1) humility;
(2) unlearning;
(3) learning in-place;
(4) a decolonial ethic; and
(5) attention to power.

Humility is a starting component of disobedient pedagogies. It enables critical reflection on our positionalities and the epistemic violence that informs how and what we were taught in the academy and how those pedagogies may continue to shape the ways in which we approach the teaching of development. Having first questioned these hegemonic pedagogies, we then embark on a process of unlearning.

Through **unlearning**, we highlight the importance of recognizing the violence(s) of development projects and its epistemological branch through development studies and focus on teaching radically alternative approaches, including post-development, anti-imperialism, dependency theory, indigenous studies, decolonial futures and pluriversals.

Through **learning in-place**, we encourage teachers, students and activists to engage with their local spaces, communities and institutions. Learning *in-place* and *with-place* is a fundamental practice of any disobedient pedagogy. We therefore reflect upon the particular role of our institution, the University of Oxford, within colonial and capitalist development. Pedagogic disobediences are vital at hegemonic institutions like Oxford, which continue to operate as nuclei for global economic and political hubris. We remain vigilant to these **power asymmetries**. Working within a **decolonial ethic**, we frame our teaching and coursework so that students think critically about what it means to learn and study Africa from Oxford, what it means to aspire to 'do' development 'work', what it means to read, study and observe places elsewhere. Within a disobedient pedagogy, the way to learn 'development' is to

fundamentally unlearn it; to interrogate the imperial arrogance in the premise of cyclical historical intervention; to decolonize development by working to end it and engaging in other sets of relations with the human and non-human worlds, engaging in decolonial solidarities and horizontal political projects.

(UN)LEARNING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

We remain alert to the colonial ground upon which we stand at Oxford, even as we seek to gesture towards decolonial futures of ecological co-existence. We situate our starting point from Oxford, a city with outsized policy importance in terms of setting the tone for international development policy and for the university's role in condoning colonial knowledges and patrimonial relations with the Global South. Oxford has a long tradition of educating the British ruling elite and providing a space for the development of colonial ideas and strategies, including the legal premises for enslavement and the expropriation of native land and property (John Locke, etc.) and the acquisition of knowledge and artefacts through conquest and coercion. Sarah Stockwell (2018: 93) describes the roles of Oxford and Cambridge during the late colonial and early postcolonial era as aiming to 'teach what "the Natives need to know"'.

The civil rights lawyer and legal scholar Michelle Alexander (2010) writes powerfully about the roles of 'race-making institutions' within systematic anti-black racism. Racial and gendered representations, formal legal policies and taxonomies of power shift over time, yet dominant 'race-making institutions' operate in ways that continue racial hierarchization and violence. While Alexander writes in the context of the US prison-industrial-complex and what she terms the 'new Jim Crow' (or the ways in which contemporary organizations perpetuate racial segregations similar to those more formalized during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Jim Crow period), her elucidation of certain hegemonic institutions as 'race-making', or systemically (re)materializing forms of racial violence, is an important starting point for our consideration of co-teaching and (un)learning from the University of Oxford.

The imperial underbelly of British geography implicates all of us that work at Oxford, including those of us who wish to work against it. The British colonialist and founder of the De Beers diamond firm, Cecil Rhodes, described colonialism in the former colonial territory of Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe and Zambia) in Southern Africa in the following terms: 'imperialism was philanthropy plus a 5 percent dividend on investment' (Rhodes, quoted in Lawlor 2000: 63). In eighteenth-century England, plantation owners in the so-called 'New World' of the Americas and the West Indies amassed the money that enabled the financing of institutions of higher education, factories and industry in the imperial core. The Cameroonian political philosopher Achille Mbembe argues that the colonial system and the slave system 'represent modernity's and democracy's bitter sediment . . . driving it towards decomposition' (2017, 20). Meanwhile, one of our colleagues at the School of Geography and the Environment, Professor Danny Dorling (2020) argues that the

> [p]urpose of geography originally [was] as a subject of Empire: to know about the empire before going out and serving in it . . . Geography has its origins with people like Halford Mackinder who cared deeply about the British Empire: the purpose of geography was to produce colonial officers.

At the behest of the Vice President of the Royal Geographical Society, who appealed to the Vice Chancellors of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in 1886, Halford John Mackinder was appointed Reader in Geography at the University of Oxford (in 1887) and became the School of

Geography's first director (in 1899). The school was established in 1899, with a lineage directly traced to Mackinder's ascent up Mount Kenya. Mackinder would maintain the post of Reader in Geography from 1887 to 1905.

It was in 1899 that Mackinder led an expedition to Mount Kenya in an attempt to become the first white man to scale Africa's second highest peak. The members of the expedition consisted of 99 Kikuyu, 66 Swahili and two Maasai porters and guides, alongside six Europeans. The journey was marked by violence from the beginning. Mackinder used enslaved Swahili labourers as porters, who he compared to animals in his diaries (calling them, for example, his 'faithful dogs'). East African labourers were disciplined and intimidated with the whip and the firearm, including by Mackinder himself. Mistreated and facing possible starvation, a group of labourers sought to escape. Eight porters were 'shot by orders'. The historical records remain debated, in part because of Mackinder's own silence about the killings. Yet, most scholars are confident that these executions were for 'insubordination' or desertion, following deplorable treatment and conditions. As the geographer Gerry Kearns (2009) explains, 'Mackinder and indeed empire remains part of the historical and epistemological legacy of British geography . . . Mackinder's geography was not only a science of empire, it was also a way of promoting the cause of Empire'. Nowhere is this truer than in the halls of the Oxford's School of Geography and the Environment.

When Mackinder departed Kenya, he is said to have returned to Oxford with a rock that constituted the uppermost piece of the summit of Mt. Kenya. This small rock remained on display on his desk throughout his tenure and remained somewhere in the School of Geography and the Environment as recently as 2009. In 2021, we began a sustained search for the object, reaching out to colleagues, administrators and maintenance personnel. In the course of teaching on a collaborative postgraduate course entitled 'UNISA-Oxford Decolonising Research Methodologies' in 2020, with students from universities across the African continent, we sought to locate the rock and ultimately repatriate it to the University of Dar es Salaam as a means of speaking to and acting against the colonial legacies of our subject at Oxford. The removal of the rock at the summit of Mount Kenya and its blasé display in our department fits within the wider paradigm of colonial dispossession and theft, often in the name of universal 'knowledge' and 'human betterment' (see Smith 1999).

We corresponded with Benezet Rwelengera, a PhD student in the Department of Geography at the University of Dar es Salaam. Our task was rendered more difficult insofar as we did not know quite what the rock looked like. One of our former colleagues, the economic geographer Gordon Clark, told us that he was aware of its (supposed) provenance and had seen the rock about fifteen years ago, sometime between 2008 and 2009. Gordon described it as small ('approximately two thumbs in size') and 'blue-brown in colour'. To his recollection, it was 'kept in a little box' with 'no tag or label'.

In our search for the rock, Oxford maintenance staff pulled boxes out from storage containing Mackinder's loot. We uncovered and analysed several of Mackinder's various 'trophies'; the animal skulls, furs and remains which were being stored, without labels or identifying tags, in the basement of our building on South Parks Road. Yet nowhere did we locate the elusive rock. We perused the electronic files and scans of Mackinder's work in Oxford's Bodleian Library and learned that Mackinder's original trunk had been 'disposed of' when his objects were transferred from the Mansfield Road building to the library for digitization and permanent archiving.

What began as a project to repatriate the rock from the summit of East Africa's second highest peak to the University of Dar es Salaam, ended anti-climactically, without event and, significantly, without the rock. Things had been put in the bin, others left to collect dust and fragment in dark basements, and others basically vanished. The disordered handling of the objects taken by Mackinder from East Africa reflects some of the strange modifications over time between empire and our university: from the

height of colonial removal to the quieter colonial apprehensions and hegemonic effacements of the post-colonial₃ moment. The main lecture theatre, for example, in Oxford's School of Geography and the Environment had been named the 'Halford Mackinder Lecture Theatre' in the early years of the twenty-first century, as each of our rooms was named after a geographer of note. (Significantly, only one room was named in honour of a woman geographer at the time: the staff coffee and break room was named after the geomorphologist Dr Marjorie Sweeting. We often remarked that the only 'kitchen' space in the building was named for a woman). Then, in May 2020, after some internal debate, the school's teaching and research staff voted to remove Mackinder's name from our main lecture theatre. Subsequently, in the early months of the Covid lockdown, every room in the building was quietly renamed to reflect seemingly apolitical and noncontroversial geographical themes: we now teach in awkwardly named rooms like the Atmosphere Room, the Village Room, the Space Suite, the Diversity Room and so on.

That our department, as far as we can tell, lost this rock is in keeping with the imperial debris and colonial hauntings of the university. One of our students, for example, recently shared a rumour that the foundation of the building housing the Department of Physiology, Anatomy and Genetics (DPAG) contains the bones and remains of indigenous peoples, illicitly removed and stolen for medical research. In 1945, the university established the Institute of Colonial Studies (ICS) to educate colonial officers and administrators – today, this institute has been renamed the Department of International Development.₄ In the post-colonial period, 'courses [initially] created for British [Colonial Administrative Service] probationers developed into training programmes aimed wholly at overseas civil servants in independent countries . . . [these appointments were seen] as "key" because they were aimed at high fliers likely to become department heads . . . [and thus would] advis[e] their governments on policy' (Stockwell 2018: 94). The earlier colonial names of buildings and knowledge programmes have slowly been painted over, but the legacies of empire remain embedded within the materials, practices and discourses of our 'race-making institution'. Within present-day coloniality, colonialism has been transformed rather than eliminated. Even as critical notions are increasingly taken up within a geographical tradition influenced by postcolonial, decolonial and anti-racist thought, most scholarship is still written and published by white academics from the Global North, working in Western universities and institutions. The anti-racist geographers James Esson and Angela Last (2020) explain that whiteness (as a location of structural advantage and an unacknowledged normative positionality) remains standard in British geography departments. Decolonial pedagogical praxis thus necessarily and defiantly takes on the structures and institutions of contemporary geography (Esson et al. 2017: 385; Daley and Murrey 2022a).

The age-old idea of the university as an 'ivory tower' removed from the world and messy geopolitics is not only incorrect, but dangerous. Part of our purpose in writing this book is to embrace a teaching praxis that refuses to sequester ideas behind 'ivory towers'. The classroom is a battleground in the struggle to decolonize development. Inspired by Alyshia Gálvez (2020) and other critical pedagogists, we ask, 'How is [our] understanding of what is necessary to read, write and know in this course shaped by white supremacist ideas about whose work matters?' The university and our intellectual practices within and beyond it contribute to public debate and action. The university is a site for the socialization, formation and training of countless public figures and leaders. Those who do not attend formalized post-secondary education are nonetheless influenced by the primary school teachers, journalists, pundits, authors and researchers trained within their walls. Some 75 per cent of all British Prime Ministers (57 in total) have been educated at the University of Oxford and the University

of Cambridge alone (Dorling and Tomlinson 2019). The university where we teach and research holds a significant position for configuring conversations around (and conceptualizations of) colonial violence, economic (in)justice, racial repair, ecological restoration and dignified futurities.

We therefore ask our students and readers to think about why a consideration of our situatedness at Oxford is important and how it does (or should) structure our conversation, our study and our unlearning differently. What are our unique responsibilities as differentially positioned and differently racialized scholars in the United Kingdom and in Oxford? The Liberian scholar of public policy, Robtel Neajai Pailey (2020), speaks of the need for holistic approaches to decolonization which centre upon rethinking knowledge itself – demanding that we rethink our very imaginaries.5 How do we take up Pailey's (2020) urgent demand, in the classroom and beyond, to de-centre the colonial and white gaze of development? In our defiant and disobedient teaching praxis, we seek to remain aware of how students and educators at Oxford encounter particular responsibilities and challenges in the study and (un)learning of international development within the 'colonial matrix of power'.

TEACHING FROM THE INTELLECTUAL CENTRE OF EMPIRE

It is important to understand Oxford's simultaneously prominent and concealed position and function within the British colonization of, and extractive corporate practices within, Africa, Asia and the Americas; and to supplement this understanding with self-reflection and decolonial ethics. We have intellectual and activist networks across the African continent and, throughout this book, will often draw from our experiences teaching and learning in Ethiopia, Egypt, Tanzania and Cameroon. Our collective teaching practice is motivated and imbued with a decolonial ethics, in which we are in the university but not *of* the university (Harney and Moten 2013), and in which our accountability and responsibilities are to the people in the communities where we work. We make a case for researchers to practice an ethic of responsibility that involves adopting the stance of 'guerrilla intellectuals' as articulated by Walter Rodney (1990), where we recognize that the legitimacies of modern universities are too often derived from Eurocentrism, elitism, capitalism and white supremacy. Our aim is to enact a struggle against those ideas, rather than to legitimize them.

The institutional setting that is Oxford fosters all sorts of colonial illusions in the present-day. We are endlessly pressed within certain moulds of coloniality, including the discriminatory and hidden demands to present in specific ways and formulas (for example, to assert the title of 'recognized knower' or 'expert') (see González and Harris 2012). We seek to unthink and reject the title of 'expert' from within. Both of us, for different reasons, are not automatically recognized as expert 'scholars' who merit respect in our immediate institutional setting (unlike many of our older white female-presenting colleagues or our male-presenting colleagues of most any age). We teach with and through these differences. We have been frequently overlooked and dismissed by colleagues, students and maintenance and security staff, although for different reasons. We situate our (un)learning from the imperial remains of Oxford, and we situate our teaching from our bodies.

One of us (Patricia), was appointed as the first Black permanent member of teaching staff in the University of Oxford's some thousand-year history in 1991. Patricia, coming from rural Jamaica and a London working class background, faced classism, racism and sexism simultaneously. But equally important were the challenges she encountered as a diaspora African studying and researching on Africa amongst white Africanist colleagues who sought to delegitimize her contributions by labelling them 'Afrocentric' and to marginalize her in the spaces of the university to avert competition for funding and status. One of us (Amber) is a white, first-generation and immigrant scholar, also from a rural background in the mountains of the US Pacific Northwest. Amber is neurodivergent and teaches

as a dyslexic scholar, a reality that is at once enriching and marginalizing. Dyslexia can foster numerical confusion and anomic aphasia or an inability to recall names, but it can also allow scholars to see connections, contours and big picture phenomenon with incredible clarity of vision.

Our co-teaching has been focused on interrupting the colonial and capitalist logics embedded within development scholarships and development geographies. Our co-teaching is grounded on our relationship and mutual accountability, our relations with our students (who propel us with vigorous insights and robust questions) and our excitement regarding decolonial work and how we might *gesture* towards anti-racist, anti-imperial and Pan-African pathways.

Thus, we are simultaneously keenly privileged for being within the 'belly of the beast' (Oxford) and relegated within this colonial space in everyday and mundane ways. This dual-being structures our teaching. More than one reviewer of our work has asked if we 'can ever even say that we do anything akin to decolonization while employed by the University of Oxford'. To this, we respond firstly with comprehension: making unfounded claims of collaboration would be tantamount to the worst forms of moves to innocence (see Tuck and Yang 2012); for both of us, our political commitments to Pan-African, collaborative and solidarity work is as long as our intellectual trajectories. These are not new or careerist endeavours for us, but lifelong commitments that began much earlier than our employment at Oxford. Secondly, the institution of Oxford is too important within British imperial politics to leave either unchallenged or unchanged. We refuse to be debilitated or demobilized by the numerous, real imitations that we encounter (daily and via structural means to contain and limit the work of decolonizing). As activists and political intellectuals, we work where we are and where we are shapes our work. In the context of international development, Oxford continues to play an important role as an institution that contributes to setting the parameters of dominant thought and practice, including through naming and analysing people and places in publications, teaching and seminars. These intellectual practices are transformed into policy-making and grounded action (see Escobar 1995: 41) by students and intellectuals who graduate and continue on to become corporate 'flexians'[6] and officials, Prime Ministers and planners.

We have no illusions of scholarly or political purity, and our situatedness within this imperial institution marks our knowledge projects differently. As Burman (2012: 117) rightly notes, 'there is no way we are going to intellectually reason our way out of coloniality, in any conventional academic sense. There is no way we are going to publish our way out of modernity. There is no way we are going to read our way out of epistemological hegemony'.

At times, the topics of our research and teaching have subjected us to forms of institutional ostracization and isolation. We have organized talks on 'defiant scholarship in Africa' at the University of Oxford. We know that some of our work has been received with confusion or condescension. Within geographical circles, work in decolonial African political geographies has often been oddly situated outside conversations in Black geographies, an important sub-field of heterogeneous Afrodiasporic thought within the powerful Black Atlantic traditions, focused on the spatial, place-based and embodied experiences of blackness as multiple, creative and resurgent (McKittrick and Woods 2007; Noxolo 2022); and yet also often separate from decolonial geographies (which has focused more centrally on epistemic and political communities of Latin America). Our teaching is thus an enactment against geographical segmentation. As the powerful scholarship within the remit of epistemologies of the South has made clear, knowledges in and of Africa are not confined to 'area studies' (Zeleza 1997) – or forms of knowing 'merely' interesting or applicable within their particular areas or regions (see also Sidaway et al. 2016 on thinking against the geographies of 'areas') – but have global significance. Thinking with and from African geographies is an element of our disobedient pedagogy, pushing against wider trends to separate and hyper-marginalize African epistemologies within the Westernized

university (i.e. the Euro-Anglocentric colonial university system; see Grosfoguel 2013). Centring African societies within our decolonial teaching praxis is a facet of working against forms of intellectual and 'academic imperialism' (Ake 1996; Alatas 2003), which continues to foster 'epistemic exclusion, cultural mismatch and epistemic extractivism' (Readsura Decolonial Editorial Collective 2022). It is an act of solidarity with global African peoples. Critical geographical scholarship has much to contribute to the project of decolonizing development. Yet, as the title of the book connotes, the social science of development we engage with is broader and wider than African development geographies and, in elevating decolonial transdisciplinary praxis, we are not fixedly loyal to geography as a discipline of thought (see also Daley and Murrey 2022a, 2022b).

At other times, our anti-racist and anti-imperial work has been heralded and arrogated by institutional actors in ways that would 'take credit' for labour often done against and in spite of institutional structures (we are aware of this risk with the publication of this book, for example). This public-facing appropriation of small-scale decolonizing projects within the university can disguise the ongoing injustices of our institution, as it simultaneously defers the radical or militant energies of students, staff and educators to press for substantive change. The fracturing of dissent has been particularly pernicious in the formation of committees (and subcommittees) to address targeted tasks in response to student-led pressures to decolonize the university (see also Ahmed 2008). At Oxford, we are not (yet) working within holistically anti-imperial collaboratives. This inevitably marks our teaching in the minds and experiences of our students and for our capacities to move against coloniality. Part of our job has been to reveal the inner workings of institutional power with and alongside our students, not as uniform or omnipotent aligned forces, but as ever-evolving sets of seizures, dismissals and seductions by hegemonic actors (see also Murrey 2019). We have often responded in real-time to the (anticipated, sometimes random and capricious) enclosures and misappropriations of radical scholarship in the service of colonial stabilization and capitalist reproduction. Defiant scholars like Sara Ahmed, Patricia McFadden, Stella Nyanzi, Olivia U. Rutazibwa, Sara Salem, Lisa Tilley and Farhana Sultana (there are too many to list!) steadily cultivate scholarly praxes that refuse the university's misuse and commodification of their knowledge. As we seek to 'learn how to live with difference in damaged heterogeneous worlds' (*Common Worlds Research Collective*), our work has sometimes felt fragmented and piecemeal. Indeed, elsewhere we have likened our decolonial praxis to a form of 'hustling' (see Daley and Murrey 2022b); it is a state of continuous manoeuvring and relation-making, guided by a decolonial ethic grounded in the commitment to collaboratively work for dignified futures. In the spirit of Nyamnjoh's (2017a) 'case for conviviality', we ask what it means for our scholarship to be decolonial and 'disobedient' to colonial and capitalist epistemes (Daley and Murrey 2022a).

Colonial legacies and colonial logics continue to shape the ways in which land, wellbeing, progress and development are conceived of and practiced. How do we, through our classroom and activist practices, work collaboratively to create the radical imaginaries and practical scaffolding we need for decolonizing development? Given the centrality of forms of expertise in fostering and legitimizing histories of Eurocentric development practice, we argue that the classroom is a key domain in the larger struggle to decolonize development. Employing a practice that we call 'pedagogical disobedience', we chart a critical interdisciplinary approach to unthinking, unlearning and decolonizing international development studies. Through pedagogical disobedience, we develop a critique of the longstanding colonial practice of 'incorporating' marginalized people within dominant development paradigms (like projects to 'diversify' that do not alter structural relations of racialized empire and coloniality nor the material conditions of domination); these forms of 'diversification' can condone or even exacerbate capitalist exploitation. Rather, epistemic, racial and ecological justice are praxis-oriented: we actively

imagine and construct liveable futures, foster dignified obligations as part of our reworlding (Spivak 1988; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2023). Our teaching is part of our wider web of relations. What is meaningful in the classroom is meaningful beyond it.

In developing our teaching praxis throughout this course and over time, we have sought sustenance and gained momentum from Pan-African, anti-racist and decolonial collectives and forms of resurgence. In our citational and elevational practices, we seek to cultivate forms of reciprocity for the scholars who have both formed and informed us. We have learned from many different decolonial teaching collectives, who importantly have a rich plethora of open-source materials available online. We are accompanied in this project to unthink and unlearn development geographies with pluriversal possibilities. So much important work has set the stage for our intervention.

The digital commons nurtured by Convivial Thinking has done important work gathering materials on decolonial and anti-colonial rejoinders to development and publishes thoughtful, experimental blog posts, poems, songs and podcasts. The Earth Unbound Collective meanwhile prioritizes forms of 'unbuilding' ongoing colonial violence; 'undoing' frameworks that 'celebrate, exoticize or extract "minor" knowledges' and 'address . . . fear, guilt and anxiety'. For their 'commoning pedagogies', the Common Worlds Research Collective finds inspiration in Donna Haraway's interspecies notion of 'worlding' to name the co-making of 'common worlds [as] an inclusive, more than human notion'. Commoning pedagogies begin with the awareness that 'we inherit worlds already damaged in the name of human progress and development, e.g. by colonisation and extractive capitalism'; therefore, communing pedagogies entail 'shifting from the current focus upon individual human learners learning facts about the world (out there), to following and enabling collective, productive and pedagogically worldly relations'.

The Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures collective are a powerful source of provocative projects and activities for those committed to turning away from coloniality and the coloniality of being. They describe their decolonial practice as

> multi-layered and rather difficult to explain . . . it is about composting our individual and collective shit with humility, joy, generosity and compassion . . . it is about facing our complicity in violence . . . and its implications with the courage of really seeking to connect with the collective pain, past, present and future . . . it is about recognizing and taking responsibility for harmful modern-colonial habits of being . . . that cannot be stopped by intellect, by good intentions and by spiritual, artistic or embodied practices alone (Gesturing Toward Decolonial Futures n.d.)

Their exposure of the pretences and illusions of academic practice is both thorough and deeply humbling. A decolonial praxis demands that we recognize and deliberately destabilize our desires for self-aggrandisement, recognition and authority, instead fostering spaces for 'accountabilities, for response-abilities, for exiled capacities and for deeper intimacies'. (Ibid) This is a collective state of being-in-the-world with the capacity to learn with difference so as to mourn, grieve, heal, digest and metabolize, so as to see ourselves as 'cute and pathetic, so that the wider metabolism can breathe and move more easily within and around us'. (Ibid) The Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures collective has a deck of playing cards which raises questions and topics for people compelled by 'decolonial options'. Many of their questions burn in our minds as we write this book, and as we have taught and engaged with complex colonial, capitalist and racial questions.

PAN-AFRICAN DEFIANCE, JOY, HOPE AND SONG

Patricia's defiance owes much to her maternal grandmother and aunts – phenomenal women who worked as housewives, nursing assistants, care workers, peasant farmers and domestic workers. At a breakfast in her honour organized by black female students from Oxford's Africa Society7, she spoke of how the women in her family survived where they were not meant to even thrive, created citizenship in marginal spaces, ensured a sense of belonging that transcended generations – how they made family life, laughed, clapped, sang and danced. Her intellectual flourishing occurred outside the academy and from reading Pan-Africanist women writers, poets and artists such as Maya Angelou (1969), Dionne Brand (1990), Grace Nichols (1984), Loretta Ngcobo (1990), bell hooks (1986, 1994) and Ifi Amadiume (2007), all of whom possessed heightened awareness of injustices and intersecting oppressions. These theoreticians were unafraid of disrupting, constantly creating new concepts and vocabularies to express the specificities of their condition, to articulate their resistance, and to communicate their imaginations of a better future.

Together, we draw inspiration from and are motivated by the student-led Rhodes Must Fall (@RMF_Oxford) campaign in our city; this is a struggle that both of us have joined in the classroom and on the streets (see Daley 2018). One of us (Amber) gave the inaugural talk at the Rhodes Must Fall Freedom Summer Teach-in in the streets of Oxford in 2020, on 'Pedagogies of Disobedience and the "Dangerous" Ideas of Thomas Sankara'. With hundreds of students and activists gathered at Oriel Square, Amber spoke about the significance of unrelenting pressures on the university and its associated colleges. She described how the Pan-Africanist revolutionary Thomas Sankara galvanized and embodied a militant decolonial praxis in the 1980s, before we even had a label for 'decoloniality' (see Biney 2018). His people-centred practices provide a powerful illustration of the political possibilities for community flourishing, and yet also expose the endangerments of neo-imperial racialized violence (see Chapter 2).

To provoke and incite you (our readers), we have integrated critical materials from a wide range of sources, built in possible activities and offered questions for further thought as you continue to ruminate on your journey to untangle the colonial matrix of power, nurture anti-colonial solidarities and co-create life-affirming relations. In our invitation to take up the project of fundamentally breaking away from the promise and illusion of development imaginaries, violence and practice, we acknowledge that theorization does not occur exclusively in the spaces of the academy. The theorization of power, the critique of coloniality, heteropatriarchy and racism, and the fostering of other ways of being, knowing and acting has long been best championed amongst activists, songwriters, musicians, poets, writers, visual artists and storytellers, who, in whatever medium they use, provide incisive analysis of the conditions of life in the Global South and articulate visions of alternative lifeworlds.

Thus, at the beginning of each chapter in this book, we seek to provoke and move you with short decolonial and anti-colonial musical playlists. Songs are a powerful force for transformative socio-political change. We have selected these songs because they have moved our own work, they have challenged us and they provide moving and insightful artistic and musical commentaries on the subjects and themes about which we write. Students and readers might listen to one or two (and watch the accompanying music videos) before immersing themselves in the reading materials. We hope educators reading our book will, in their teaching practice, add to these playlists music from their own communities of struggle, imagination and being. We hope they will encourage readers to appreciate knowledge creation beyond Euro-America, including cultural forms that 'speak back' to the empire, in the tradition of bell hooks (1986). As hooks (1986: 123) explains, 'to speak when one [is] not spoken to [is] a courageous act – an act of risk and daring'. As with all cultural artefacts, songs are not unproblematic. We invite readers to sit with – rather than turn away from – discomforts provoked by

these playlists and by our words. Discomfort is one important component of anti-racist and decolonial unlearning, just as 'there is much to learn from joy and pleasure' (Eaves et al. 2023: 3). Within feminist political geographies, an

> intentional . . . engage[ment with discomfort plants] "a seed that provokes questions" about power, difference, and authority . . . [it is important to think about] what occurs when you feel discomfort, revulsion, abjection, or a sense of unbelonging – [sometimes] at the very instant you are told you are being cared for? (Eaves et al. 2023: 3).

A critical and knowing engagement with discomfort is part of a wider project of refusing the imperial fostering of comfort within the university, which is too often at the expense of marginalized people and communities of colour (Ahmed 2017).

TEACHING, (UN)LEARNING AND BECOMING TOGETHER

Our book begins with the emergence of imperial claims to benign humanitarianism within colonial projects and engages in a broad survey of the diverse and complex ways in which (multiple) ideologies of race are foundational to various forms of development through the cultivation of a particular (victimized, disposable, criminal, rights-deficient) 'Other' (Chapter 1). A critical interdisciplinary approach to development does not mean uniformly tracing failures or problems within development, rather we consider development as a collection of ideas that emerge from specific social, historical and geographical contexts, with often unintended outcomes that reflect complexities on the ground. We consider critical development studies and post-development literatures alongside examinations of the political, social and ecological contexts of development in order to address critical global issues: political ecologies of aid; the relations between humanitarianism, violence and militarism; the corporatization of NGOs and the NGO-ization of the corporation; digital media and social justice movements; 'decolonizing development' (Sultana 2019) and indigenous struggle outside of official or mainstream development frequencies. Through context-specific analyses of development we are attentive to dissimilar people and communities too frequently marginalized bydevelopment practice: women, non-binary, LGBTQI, Indigenous and differently-abled people from across the Global South, especially Africa. We hope that our book contributes to the collective labour and energy of engaged and critical learners who are interested in (un)learning together to abolish development as a set of material and ideological practices . . . this is a struggle that continues.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER THOUGHT

We invite you to sit with the argument that the project of decolonizing geographical knowledge could do 'more harm than good' (Esson et al., 2017, p. 384). Why is this so and how might it guide your reading of this book, and the wider projects with which you collaborate?

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2008) *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2017) *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ake, C. (1996) *Democracy and development in Africa*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Alatas, S. F. (2003) 'Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences', *Current Sociology*, 51(6), pp. 599–613.

Alexander, M. (2010) *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: New Press.

Alqaisiya, W. (2018) 'Decolonial queering: The politics of being queer in Palestine', *Journal* of *Palestine Studies*, 47(3), pp. 29–44. DOI: 10.1525/jps.2018.47.3.29.

Amadiume, I. (2007) *Voices draped in black: Poems*. Trenton, N.J: Africa World Press.

Andreotti, V. (2021) *Hospicing modernity: Facing humanity's wrongs and the implications for social activism*. Berkeley, Calif.: North Atlantic Books.

Angelou, M. (1969) *I know why the caged bird sings*. New York: Random House.

Biney, A. (2018) 'Madmen, Thomas Sankara and decoloniality in Africa' in *A certain amount of Madness: The life, politics and legacies of Thomas Sankara*. Murrey, A. ed., pp. 127–46. London: Pluto Press.

Boidin, C. and Cohen, J., Grosfoguel, R. (2012) 'Introduction: From university to pluriversity: A decolonial approach to the present crisis of Western Universities', *Human Architecture*, 10(1), pp. 1–6.

Booth, D. (1985) 'Marxism and development sociology: Interpreting the impasse', *World Development* 13(7), pp. 761–87.

Brand, D. (1990) *No language is neutral*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Burman, A. (2012) 'Places to think with, books to think about: Words, experience and the decolonization of knowledge in the Bolivian Andes', *Human Architecture* 10(1), pp. 101–19.

Curley, A. and Gupta, P., Lookabaugh, L., Neubert, C., Smith, S. (2022) 'Decolonisation is a political project: Overcoming impasses between Indigenous sovereignty and abolition', *Antipode* 54(4), pp. 1043–62.

Daley P., Murrey A. (2022a) 'Response to commentaries on Patricia Daley and Amber Murrey's "Defiant Scholarship: Dismantling Coloniality in Contemporary African Geographies"', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 43, pp. 194–200.

Daley P., Murrey A. (2022b) 'Defiant scholarship: Dismantling coloniality in contemporary African geographies', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 43, pp. 159–76.

Daley, P. (2022) 'Linguistic defiance: Language mobilization and new spaces of resistance' in Hughes S., Murrey A., et. Al. Interventions on the political geographies of resistances: The contributions of Cindi Katz. *Political Geography*, 97(1). DOI:10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102666

Daley, P. (2018) 'Reparations in the space of the university in the wake of Rhodes Must Fall' in Chantiluke, R., Kwoba, B. and Nkopo, A. (eds.) *Rhodes Must Fall: The struggle to decolonise the racist heart of empire*. London: Zed Books, pp. 74–89.

Davis, Angela Y. (2003) *Are prisons obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.

De Sousa Santos, B. (ed.) (2007) *Cognitive justice in a global world: Prudent knowledges for a decent life*. New York: Lexington Books.

Dorling, D. (2020) 'Empire with Danny Dorling, an interview on Greenbelt Volunteer Talks'. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=83BfemZxqyg.

Dorling, D. and Tomlinson, S. (2019) *Rule Britannia: Brexit and the end of empire*. London: Biteback Publishing.

Eaves, L. and Gökariksel, B., Hawkins, M., Neubert, C. and Smith, S. (2023) 'Political geographies of discomfort feminism: Introduction to the themed intervention', *Gender, Place & Culture*, [online first].

Elliott-Cooper, A. (2021) *Black resistance to British policing*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Esson, J. and Noxolo, P., Baxter, R., Daley, P., Byron, M. (2017) 'The 2017 RGS-IBG chair's theme: Decolonising geographical knowledges, or reproducing coloniality?, *Area*, 49(3), pp. 384–88.

Gálvez, A. (2020) 'How I've implemented an anti-racist approach in my teaching'. Blog post. www.alyshiagalvez.com/post/how-i-ve-implemented-ananti-racist-approach-in-my-teaching.

Gilmore, R. W. (2007) *Golden gulag: Prisons, surplus, crisis and opposition in globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grosfoguel, R. (2013) 'The structure of knowledge in Westernized Universities: Epistemic racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th century', *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 11(1), pp. 73–90.

Harney, S. and Moten, F. (2013) *The undercommons: Fugitive planning and black study*. New York: Autonomedia/Minor Compositions.

hooks, b. (1986) 'Talking Back', *Discourse*, 8, pp. 123–28.

hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York and London: Routledge.

Icaza, R. and Vázquez, R. (2017) 'Notes on Decolonizing Development' in Estermann, J. (ed.)., *Das Unbehagen an der Entwicklung: Eine andere Entwicklung oder anders als Entwicklung?* Aachen, Germany: CoMundo, pp. 47–62.

Kearns, G. (1997) 'The imperial subject: Geography and travel in the work of Mary Kingsley and Halford Mackinder', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 22(4), pp. 450–72.

Kearns, G. (2009) *Geopolitics and empire: The legacy of Halford Mackinder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khan, T. (2021) 'Decolonisation is a comfortable buzzword in the aid sector', *Open Democracy*, 15 January. Available: www.opendemocracy.net/en/decolonisation-comfortable-buzzword-aid-sector/.

Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., Demaria, F., Acosta, A. (eds.) (2019) *Pluriverse: A post-development dictionary*. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Jackson, N. A. (2017) '"Social Movement Theory" as a baseline legitimizing narrative: Corporate exploitation, anti-hegemonic opposition and the contested academy', *Human Geography*, 10(1), pp. 36–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/194277861701000104.

Lugones, M. (2008) 'The coloniality of gender', *Worlds & Knowledges Otherwise*, 2(2), pp. 1–17.

Lugones, M. (2010) 'Toward a decolonial feminism', *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 25(4), pp. 742–59.

Mbembe, A. (2017) *Critique of black reason*. Translated by L. Dubois. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mercer, C. and G. Mohan, M. Power (2003) 'Towards a critical political geography of African development', *Geoforum*, 34, pp. 419–36.

McCoy, K., Tuck, E. and McKenzie, M., eds. (2018) *Land education: Rethinking pedagogies of place from Indigenous postcolonial, and decolonizing perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Mignolo, W. (2009) 'Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), pp. 159–81.

Mignolo, W. (2011) 'Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto', *Transmodernity*, 1(2), pp. 44–66.

Mignolo, W. and Escobar, A., ed. (2010) *Globalization and the decolonial option*. London: Routledge.

Muhs, G. G. and Harris, A. P., González, C. G., Niemann, Y. F. (2012) *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Salt Lake City: Utah State University Press.

Murrey A. (2016) 'The emotional geographies of slow resistance', *Singapore Journal for Tropical Geography*, 37(2), pp. 224–48.

Murrey A. (2020) 'Between assassination and appropriation: Pedagogical disobedience in an era of unfinished decolonisation', *International Journal of Social Economics*, 46(11), pp. 131934.

Ngcobo, L. (1990) *And they didn't die*. London: Virago Press.

Nichols, G. (1984) *The fat black woman's poems*. London: Virago.

Nyamnjoh, N. (2017a) 'Incompleteness: Frontier Africa and the currency of conviviality', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 52(3), pp. 253–70.

Nyamnjoh, N. (2017b) *Drinking from the cosmic gourd: How Asmos Tutuola can change our minds*. Buea, Cameroon: Laanga Press.

Pailey, R. (2020) 'De-centring the 'white gaze' of development', *Development and Change*, 51(3), pp. 729–45.

Quijano, A. (2000a) 'Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), pp. 533–80.

Quijano, A. (2000b) 'Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social', *Journal of World Systems Research*, 6 (2), pp. 342–86.

Raghuram, P. and Madge, C., Noxolo, P. (2009) 'Rethinking responsibility and care for a postcolonial world', *Geoforum*, 40, pp. 5–13.

Rivera Cusicanqui, R. (2012) '*Ch'ixinakax utxiwa*: A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111(1), pp. 95–109.

Rivera Santana, C. R. and Akhurst, G. (2019) 'Critical creative pedagogies: A decolonial and indigenous approach using visual arts and creative writing', *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 50(1), pp. 47–54.

Rodney, W. (1990) *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Roy, A., Wright, W. J., Al-Bulushi, Y. and Bledsoe, A. (2020) '"A world of many Souths": (anti)Blackness and historical difference in conversation with Ananya Roy', *Urban Geography*, 41(6), https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1807 164.

Schuurman, F.J. ed. (1993) *Beyond the impasse: New directions in development theory*. London: Zed Books.

Sidaway, J. D. and Ho, E., Rigg, J. D. Woon, C. Y. (2016) 'Area studies and geography: Trajectories and manifesto', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(5), pp. 777–90.

Smith, L. T. (1999) *Decolonizing methodologies*. London: Zed Books.

Spivak, G. (1988) 'Can the subaltern speak?', *Die Philosophin*, 14(27), pp. 42–58.

Stockwell, S. (2018) *The British end of the British empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sultana, F. (2019) 'Decolonizing development education and the pursuit of social justice', *Human Geography*, 12(3), pp. 31–46.

Táíwò, O. (2022) *Against decolonisation: Taking African agency seriously*. London: Hurst.

Tilley, L. (2017) 'Resisting piratic method by doing research otherwise', *Sociology*, 51(1), pp. 27–42.

Tuck, E. and Yang, W. (2012) 'Decolonization is not a metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Edcuation & Society*, 1(1), pp. 1–40.

Zeleza, P. T. (1997) 'The perpetual solitudes and crises of African studies in the United States', *Africa Today*, 44(2), pp. 193–210.

Zhao, W. and Popkewitz, T. S. (2022) 'Introduction: Critiquing the onto-epistemic coloniality of modernity in/beyond education', *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 43(3), pp. 335–46. DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2022.2041327.

Vitale, A. (2018) *The end of policing*. London: Verso Books.

1. Here we work alongside Grande's (2003) criticism of hegemonic forces within academic feminism as 'whitestream', a phenomenon they describe as 'a feminist discourse that is not only dominated by white women but also principally structured on the basis of white, middle-class experience; a discourse that services their ethnopolitical interests and capital investments… whitestream feminism [also] include[s] a heavy dependence on postmodern/poststructuralist theories, a privileging of "academic feminism" over the feminist political project, and an undertheorizing of patriarchy as the universal oppression of all women' (Grande 2003, 330).

2. Against this kind of gesturing 'respectability politics' within academia, Roy (2009, 2011) argues for the need of 'new geographies of theory' that compels a 'reworlding' of the discipline.

3. We employ the hyphenated term 'post-colonial' to refer to the historical period following formal decolonization in the second half of the twentieth century; 'postcolonial' is used in reference to the body of critical scholarship critiquing colonialism (that is, postcolonial studies). Postcolonial scholarship has revealed the lack of an absolute break or rupture between the colonial and post-colonial periods (see Chapter 1).

4. For more on the colonial history of International Development at Oxford, readers may wish to consult the 2016 Oxford and Colonialism project and webpages, for example https://oxfordandcolonialism.web.ox.ac.uk/department-internationaldevelopment.

5. We recommend listening to Pailey's comments on decolonizing international development in an episode of "ODI Bites" from October 2020, available here: www.youtube.com/watch?v=liyeK8wnsI0.

6. Flexians is a term coined by Anthropologist Janine Wedel to refer to groups of educated, affiliated and connected people within the 21st Century who maintain multiple roles and positions of influence in global capitalism. These people move in and out of institutions – for example, holding visiting fellowships at the world's leading universities, while sitting on corporate advisory boards, and authoring government policy. The multiple affiliations are frequently changing, often opaque and render responsibility difficult to determine (see also Jackson 2019). For people interested in working together against capitalist exploitation and extraction, understanding the manoeuvrings of these actors can be essential to exposing motivations and entrenched networks of power.

7. 'The Daley Breakfasts' were three interrelated events organized between 2018 and 2019 to celebrate the contribution of Black women in Oxford. The first event focused on the career and activism of Patricia Daley; the second event was on non-conformity, space-making and the politics of Black hair, with Amber Starks of 'Conscious Coils'; the final event celebrated the work of the Zimbaabwean journalist and author Panashe Chigumadzi and was titled, 'Black as I am, Black as we are'.