

Decolonial Subversions

2023

Unleashing Abolitionist Logic
on International Aid

Nora Lester Murad

Unleashing Abolitionist Logic on International Aid

Nora Lester Murad¹

Abstract

The abolitionist thinking, proliferated particularly by U.S. Black feminist radicals in the wake of the police murder of George Floyd in 2020, exposed police reformism as liberal subterfuge facilitating the expansion of the carceral state. This article utilizes the relationship between police reform and abolition as a prism through which to look at international development aid. If international aid is thought of as a reform effort serving the interests of colonialism, what is the abolitionist approach to international development? This commentary suggests that abolitionist logic grounded in the US-based movement for Black lives can expose international aid reform as a neoliberal tool and simultaneously unmask the potential for a radical vision of development based in a commitment to liberation rather than white/western/northern supremacy.

Keywords: abolition, police reform, international development, international aid, colonialism, decolonization, mutual aid, redistribution, reparations.

Introduction

The logic of today's abolitionism, as theorized by some U.S. Black feminist radical activists and others, suggests that we cannot build a safe and secure world by controlling people with surveillance, policing, punishment, and incarceration. Further, theorists argue that carceral institutions were never intended to promote universal safety and security but rather to protect capitalist interests at the expense of everyone else. For this reason, abolitionism argues that these institutions cannot be fixed or reformed. Instead, safety and security must be fundamentally reimagined in the context of liberation, equality, rights, and justice for all.² Although I have always been an antiracist, the murder of George Floyd in 2020 brought me to the Defund the Police group in my city. Some of the group's abolitionist language was

¹ I acknowledge the problem of taking US experiences/frameworks/theorizing and applying them to contexts outside the US, as well as the inadequacy and distortion of all the terminology used in this article; and my positionality as a white, native English-speaking US citizen who is financially secure.

² See, for example, Angela Y. Davis, *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016), 21–26.

new to me, although the paradigm was very familiar. Previously, I lived in Palestine where I raised my family and worked as an international aid accountability activist. Through Dalia Association and Aid Watch Palestine, we challenged the global humanitarian and development systems—industries built around the idea of helping—to respect Palestinians’ right to self-determination in development.

This commentary is a thought exercise of sorts. I use abolitionist logic inferred from the Defund the Police movement, of which I am a participant, to question hegemonic beliefs about the seemingly unrelated sphere of what is called international development. Using abolitionism as a lens, the relationship between the rich and powerful countries of the so-called global north and the poor, aid-receiving countries that constitute the global majority is reimagined. Employed as a tool, analogy can dislodge international development discourse from its self-contained and self-referential tendencies. Below, I explore this question: If abolitionism, not police reform, is the only way to achieve real safety and security, is decolonization, not international aid, the only way to achieve real development?

Terminology as Framing

International development is traditionally defined as consumption and measured by gross domestic product (GDP), thus growth is considered synonymous with progress.³ In this worldview, countries that are not rich can develop with the help of international aid. International aid is integral to the concepts of development and progress in the same way that policing is integral to our unquestioned concept of public safety. The notion of ‘help’ is common to both sets of ideas. Policing is said to help achieve public safety and international aid is said to help achieve development.

In my experience as an aid activist, the defenders of aid as it is and those who propose that aid needs to be reformed both default to using the capitalist definition of development as consumption. This definition is so obviously correct to professionals within the field that it need not be acknowledged, and the fact that there are other ways of looking at development is liable to be outside of some professionals’ awareness. In this way, both the defenders and reformers work together to normalize international development aid as a thing so obviously good, either in practice or in terms of its potential, that it need not be explicitly justified. Critics of international aid are deemed credible if they operate within the field and call for reforms that strengthen, not challenge, the existing system.⁴ The only exception is when contrary ideas are presented as so-called alternatives to development. For example, worldviews like *buen vivir* (an Andean notion of living in harmony) or *sumak kawsay* (a Kichwa notion of a “good life”) do not buy into the dominant idea of development

³ Jason Hickel, *The Divide: Global Inequality from Conquest to Free Markets* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2015).

⁴ See, for example, the use of the term transforming in the reformist article by David Beckmann, George Ingram, and Jim Kolbe, “Transforming Foreign Assistance,” *Brookings Institute*, April 15, 2013, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/transforming-foreign-assistance>.

and instead promote collectivist well-being and non-extractive ways of living and sharing according to need, rather than wealth accumulation,⁵ and these are, to some extent, discussed within development and aid circles. However, their very presentation as alternatives leads to the strengthening of the dominant concept of development as the standard against which others are compared. Presenting these ideas as alternatives to development, even though some of them predate and continue to exist alongside capitalism, keeps them marginal and ensures that they do not threaten the mainstream understanding of development.

How can international aid actors step out of the groupthink that defines aid as development—and development as categorically good—and instead look critically upon the concept of development itself? By analyzing the dynamics of discourse about what appears to be a completely different issue—policing in the United States—we can begin to unleash what I am calling abolitionist logic onto the international aid reform discourse. This requires alternating between the unpacking of policing discourse and the deploying of that new frame on the international development context. In this way, the provocative potential of two social movements—abolitionism and decolonization—is catalyzed.

The Hegemony of Good

In the US mainstream, public safety is a hegemonic value. Public safety is generally defined narrowly as protection from private violence.⁶ No one suggests that public safety is not legitimate and worthwhile. Tied to the belief that public safety is inherently good is a dominant (and almost completely unquestioned) belief that public safety is threatened by people who are bad or act bad. In other words, there is “a common-sense understanding of social crisis as a problem of dangerous individuals doing bad things.”⁷ Following this logic, public safety is pursued by distinguishing good people and bad people, criminalizing bad people or bad ways of being, enforcing laws/rules/policies against the so-called criminals, and using surveillance, punishment, and incarceration to control them. In this way, it becomes commonsense to consider carceral institutions as “catch-all solutions to social problems.”⁸

Within this paradigm, surveillance, policing, and incarceration are integral to a stable and safe society, and police are seen as guardians of public safety who serve the public interest. Take note of this logic as I will reference it below: Policing is therefore upheld as objectively righteous regardless of its actual history as a weapon wielded by white property owners against people of color and poor people. Both the history of policing and current evidence of

⁵ Eduardo Gudynas, “*Buen Vivir*: Today’s Tomorrow,” *Development* 54 (2011): 441–47. doi:10.1057/dev.2011.86

⁶ Brandon Hasbrouck, “Reimagining Public Safety,” *Northwestern University Law Review*, 117, no. 3 (2022): 685–730.

⁷ Kay Gabriel, “Abolition as Method: Ruth Wilson Gilmore’s *Abolition Geography* is written to be used,” Review of *Abolition Geography: Essays towards Liberation* by Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Dissent*, Fall 2022, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/abolition-as-method>.

⁸ Gabriel, Review of *Abolition Geography*.

police violence are sidelined as unfortunate deviations from the standard of goodness. Abuses of policing are explained with the “bad apples” argument, not used as proof of policing’s inherent harm.

Pitting supposedly law-abiding members of society against supposed criminals accomplishes many objectives. It relieves unjust systems from critical scrutiny and simultaneously legitimizes the methods those systems use to perpetuate inequality. Fear is used to normalize the right of powerholders to control populations and as justification, Ruth Wilson Gilmore suggests, for divesting from social programs that “break the force of redistributive political agendas.”⁹ An equivalent argument in the international development context is that poor governance is endemic to countries that are poor and in conflict. The bad behavior (e.g., corruption, incompetence, authoritarianism) of leaders in the global south is framed as personal failing, not a result of historic or systemic factors. Therefore, it is necessary for donor countries to control the global economy through all means (e.g., austerity measures, trade agreements, migration controls, interventions in governance), including how resources are used in aid-dependent contexts, “for their own good.” That is, when donor countries in the global north control the people of the global south, either through direct colonization or via global economic and political relationships, the donor countries claim to be aiding the populations in the global south.

Default Reformism

Since policing is integral to the dominant concept of public safety, we are led to believe that problems with policing (including surveillance and incarceration) should be dealt with by reforming/improving it, not by abolishing/eliminating it. This reformism is the default approach to concerns about policing when policing is associated with public safety.

We can see that the exact same default reformism predominates in discussions in the field of international aid. Rewrite the paragraph I noted above to change “policing” and related phrases to “international aid” and similar phrases:

International aid is therefore upheld as objectively righteous regardless of its actual history as a weapon wielded by white property owners against people of color and poor people. Both the history of international aid and current evidence of aid misconduct are sidelined as unfortunate deviations from the standard of goodness. Abuses of international aid are explained with the “bad apples” argument, not used as proof of international aid’s inherent harm.

⁹ Gabriel, Review of *Abolition Geography*.

Returning to public safety discourse, reformists see policing as valuable to society but recognize the need for systemic improvement.¹⁰ They call for better training, more hiring of officers of color, and better police–community engagement; they believe that corrective action will reset the police to their natural and legitimate course. To see how this functions, rewrite the first sentence in the paragraph immediately above, substituting “development” for “public safety” and “international aid” for “policing”: “Development reformists see international aid as valuable to society but recognize the need for systemic improvement.” Replace the list of police reforms with a list of international aid reforms (e.g., more harmonization with recipient governments, increased funding through national organizations, and stronger mutual accountability), substitute “international aid” for “the police.” The paragraph would then close with “they believe that corrective action will reset international aid to its natural and legitimate course.” In the same way that international aid reform calls for an increased investment of money and effort to fix international aid so that it fulfills its role to advance development, police reform calls for an increased investment of money and effort to fix policing so that it fulfills its role to advance public safety¹¹. In other words, reformist demands not only fail to transform the systems being critiqued, they also invariably lead to their expansion.

While critics of aid cannot (yet) be characterized as a social movement, an increasing number of voices, especially from the global south, point out aid’s shortcomings, including politicized donor agendas, internal hierarchies/inequality, distortion of local agency, among others.¹² Like police reform, international aid reform has developed into an industry of its own, replete with lingo, conferences, publications, theorists, Facebook groups, and its own funding streams, which, notably, almost completely come from within the development/humanitarian industry. Reformism is using the language of challenge to protect mainstream practices (of policing or international aid) from actual challenges.

Reforming aid involves investments to fix it, to strip away its distortions, and to uncover an objectively pure humanitarianism that is driven by our most basic instinct to help others. Aid reformists acknowledge colonial history and the perpetuation of colonial thinking in the practice of international development aid and humanitarian assistance, but they consider this colonial history to be an aberration or something of the past. They idealize an essential humanitarianism that precedes and exists outside of the actual practice of aid, and they call for changes in the system to enable this genuine practice of helping.

¹⁰ See, for example, US Conference of Mayors, “Resolution: In Support of Principles to Achieve Police Reform and Racial Justice,” Adopted at the 88th Annual Meeting, 2020, <https://www.usmayors.org/the-conference/resolutions/?category=a0F4N0000PdGreUAF&meeting=88th%20Annual%20Meeting>.

¹¹ Aaron Ross Coleman, “Police Reform, Defunding, and Abolition, Explained,” *Vox*, July 16, 2020, <https://www.vox.com/21312191/police-reform-defunding-abolition-black-lives-matter-protests>.

¹² Mary B. Anderson, Dayna Brown, and Isabella Jean, *Time to Listen: Hearing People on the Receiving End of International Aid* (Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2012).

Abolitionist Perspectives

In the discourse about policing, there are some groups standing/working/fighting outside of the hegemonic policing-equals-public-safety circle. These abolitionists, grounded in the movement for Black lives, expose the reformist narrative by challenging the very purpose of policing. They highlight how policing has never been, is not now, and can never be part of equitable public safety. The Defund the Police group I have been organizing with argued that policing actually undermines public safety—first by targeting Black, indigenous, and other people of color, and second by pulling resources away from housing, health care, education, and other services that are essential to genuine public safety. Terminology, including terms like *white supremacy*¹³ and *anti-Blackness*,¹⁴ which are completely absent from the reformist lexicon, is used to make visible systemic and cultural inequalities that are denied by the dominant discourse. By evoking these terms, abolitionists claim that racist violence is inherent to policing, not an exception to it.

Therefore, the abolitionist vision is not one of a dangerous society made safe by policing, but of a society that is so safe, affirming, abundant, supportive, and equitable that carceral institutions become nonsensical. In other words—and this is important—abolitionists do not merely challenge the value of policing to public safety, they fundamentally redefine what constitutes public safety to include housing, jobs, health care, education, and other rights. The abolitionist goal is not only a negative one—to eliminate carceral systems—but, as Ruth Wilson Gilmore says, it is also “to change how we interact with each other and the planet by putting people before profits, welfare before warfare, and life over death.”¹⁵

Activists, including Black Lives Matter cofounder Patrisse Cullors, note that abolitionist strategy is also a means to repair. Cullors defines reparations as financial restitution, land redistribution, political self-determination, culturally relevant education programs, language recuperation, and the right to return (or repatriation). Cullors adds that reparations also include

restoring a balance from within our communities and carrying our autonomous healing and reparatory work through the arts, culture, language, and emotional and mental health services. Reparations must also include pressure on state accountability as well as community-driven and -centered responses.¹⁶

In discourse about international aid, is abolitionist logic. To get there, we may ask a series of questions:

¹³ Tracey Corder and Ramah Kudaimi, “After the Insurrection: An Abolitionist Response to White Supremacy,” *The Forge*, February 23, 2021, <https://forgeorganizing.org/article/abolitionist-response-white-supremacy>.

¹⁴ Kathy Hytten and Kurt Stemhagen, “Abolishing, Renarrativizing, and Revaluing: Dismantling Antiblack Racism in Education,” *Educational Researcher*, published ahead of print, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X221143092>.

¹⁵ Ruth Wilson Gilmore quoted in Gabriel, review of *Abolition Geography*.

¹⁶ Patrisse Cullors, “Abolition and Reparations: Histories of Resistance, Transformative Justice, and Accountability,” *Harvard Law Review* 136, no. 2 (April 2019): 1678.

What happens if we separate policing from the discussion of public safety? In fact, what if we stipulate that policing, which is currently considered almost synonymous with public safety, is not integral to public safety at all?

What if we go further and acknowledge that the dominant conceptualization of public safety as a well-policed society is one that promotes the value of white property owners at the expense of everyone else? In other words, what happens if we consider the possibility that policing is not only *not* synonymous with public safety, but is intrinsically antithetical to equitable public safety?

Next, we may take these questions as a frame and look through it at the question of international aid, arriving at a parallel set of questions:

What if international aid is not integral to genuine development?

What if the dominant conceptualization of development values northern/western/white/capitalists at the expense of everyone else?

What if international aid is not synonymous with development but intrinsically antithetical to equitable progress?

Decolonization and Reparations

While Tuck and Yang insist that *decolonization* refers to the actual rematriation of land and is not a metaphor for efforts to decrease inequality,¹⁷ advocates do regularly use the term to call for a more egalitarian partnership between donor and recipient. The analogical method used in this paper, however, suggests that international aid can be considered like policing, as a means of control that is intended to maintain inequality between donor and recipient countries for the benefit of donor countries. If international aid is itself a neocolonial mechanism, what would it mean to decolonize it anyway?

A more fruitful question might be: What would an abolitionist approach to development look like? There is no way to answer or even explore this question without intentionally decentering the dominant (white/western/northern/capitalist) worldview. When we step out of the hegemonic circle, we encounter fundamentally different worldviews of people who are marginalized and nondominant, expressed in languages grounded in their lived experiences. They can teach those of us who are white/western/northern/rich—if we are willing to learn from them.

For an example, let us reflect again on policing in the US context:

The movement for Black lives has called upon white people to respect the leadership of Black, brown, and Indigenous people of color (BIPOC) because they are most negatively affected by racism. The centering of the experiences of BIPOC people has the effect of decentering whiteness, exposing the fact that white people are, in fact, less qualified and less

¹⁷ Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1.

credible as leaders in the fight for equity and justice. As a result, white antiracists are called into *allyship*,¹⁸ a position that is unfamiliar to many white people and often quite uncomfortable. Allyship does not mean passively following people of color. It means actively following their lead and playing their/our part, including and especially working with white people to understand and resist structural racism and white privilege.¹⁹

This understanding of allyship reflects a recognition that the relationship between white and BIPOC people is, primarily, a collective, cultural, and historical one and, only secondarily, an interpersonal one. The understanding contradicts the commonly held assumption in white supremacy culture that we act as individuals and are responsible only for our individual actions.²⁰ Thinking about white and BIPOC people in terms of collective relationships brings to the forefront the realization that white people, as the beneficiaries of systemic racism, are implicated in the harm being experienced by BIPOC people. Even when whites engage in antiracist actions, they do so in the context of an existing relationship of ongoing harm. In this context, reparations make sense.

Clearly the international development/humanitarian field does not see itself through the same lens of historic, structural inequality. The closest thing to recognition of global south leadership is the *localization* agenda, which many critics have exposed as an effort to impose constructs and priorities of the global north on their own communities. This and related conversations fall short because they do not include the corollary understanding that the global north should be followers of and allies in the global south's own struggle for liberation, not necessarily development.²¹

Without any recognition that the global north perpetrates ongoing harm on the global south, the problems of the global south appear without context, likely the result of some kind of deficit (in other words, "it's their own fault"). Actors from the global north claim to engage with the global south as neutral outside parties in order to "help" those in "need," entrenching their power over poor people while simultaneously appearing benevolent in doing so. Identifying themselves as helpers perpetuates a focus on the needy as those who must change, and robs them of dignity and agency. Allyship, in contrast, is an ongoing process of unlearning, learning, listening, analyzing, acting, building relationships, and taking risks. *Solidarity*, a similar concept, means taking a stand on the side of those in struggle; solidarity is in opposition to the principle of neutrality that remains an aspiration in the field of international aid, especially among humanitarians.

¹⁸ Anti-Oppression Network, "Allyship," <https://theantioppressionnetwork.com/allyship>.

¹⁹ Maia Niquel Hoskin, "We Don't Need Allies, We Need Abolitionists: Enough with Playing It Nice and Safe in the Fight against Anti-Blackness," *Medium*, May 6, 2021, <https://zora.medium.com/we-dont-need-allies-we-need-abolitionists-4eec702a6ccf>.

²⁰ See Tema Okun, "(divorcing) White Supremacy Culture: Coming Home to Who We Really Are," White Supremacy Culture, www.whitesupremacyculture.info.

²¹ Nora Lester Murad, "Aiding Liberation," in *Our Vision for Liberation: Engaged Palestinian Leaders and Intellectuals Speak Out*, eds. Ilan Pappé and Ramzy Baroud (Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press, 2022), 397–409.

At this point, I anticipate that aid actors are pushing back. Some will defend their motives, despite knowing that impact matters regardless of intentions. Some will cling to the pragmatic view that there must be something of value that can be salvaged from the aid system given all the resources that are invested in it. Discounting how the system promotes the well-being of some at the expense of others, they will point out that some have benefitted. They will argue that even if aid as a tool is infected with coloniality, rich actors cannot use that fact to shirk responsibility to promote the right to development for others. This is internally logical, but it does not hold up when juxtaposed to abolitionist logic.

What is needed is a complete reframing. Imagine a finger gently stroking the face of an injured person. The act appears compassionate, better than nothing and worth continuing. But pull back the camera to recognize the violent bigger picture and the finger stroking the face belongs to a body that, with the other hand, is strangling the person lying on the ground. Aid is not separate from the totality of the relationship between the global north and the global south that adheres to a violent system. As Jason Hickel et al. have pointed out, developing countries transfer trillions of dollars more *to* the global north than they receive *from* the global north.²² Does that gentle finger look different in the bigger picture? Does aid look different when we see that the global south is actually propping up the global north? There is a net flow of resources from the global south to the global north.

Using abolitionist logic, if police reform is a smoke-and-mirrors way of increasing the power and footprint of carcerality, is it not also true that international aid is a reformist way of entrenching colonial control? If we really want to stop doing harm and start doing good, how do we get from the hegemonic, capitalist idea of development, one that requires structural inequality, to a new kind of world that we cannot even imagine from within the world that we have created?

Abolitionists do offer visions of a better world.²³ They offer transformative justice, mutual aid,²⁴ radical love, and much more. Their visions sound a lot like *buen vivir*²⁵ and other Indigenous systems of living based on collective well-being among humans and the earth. There is an abundance of reinforcing constructs and examples of life-affirming practices from non-capitalist and non-Eurocentric communities that we can see only if we question what many of us have come to think of as the truth. What remains unclear, though, is how do we go from here to there if not through reform?

Again, abolitionists can help. They distinguish between *reformist reforms* and *abolitionist reforms*. Reformist reforms are ones grounded in a belief that while the system is broken, it is

²² Jason Hickel, Christian Dorninger, Hanspeter Wieland, and Intan Suwandi, "Imperialist Appropriation in the World Economy: Drain from the Global South through Unequal Exchange, 1990–2015," *Global Environmental Change* 73 (2022): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102467>.

²³ Hasbrouck, "Reimagining Public Safety."

²⁴ Simone Weil Davis and Rachel Fayter, "Mutual Aid as Abolitionist Praxis," *Citizenship Studies* (2020): 1–4, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2020.1859190>.

²⁵ Gudynas, "Buen Vivir."

not inherently bad or wrong. In the police context, reformist reforms include more training for police so they can better respond to people experiencing mental health crises or anti-bias training so police will no longer discriminate based on race. These reformist reforms invariably cost money, leading to increases in police budgets and also to the expansion of the policing's footprint, at the expense of other forms of public safety. Moreover, reformist reforms do not address the systemic injustices that result in racialized patterns of involvement with the US criminal justice system in the first place.

In the international aid context, reformist reforms include those advocated by the Grand Bargain²⁶ negotiated at the World Humanitarian Summit. The global agreement included promoting transparency, increasing the percentage of funding that goes to local actors, coordinating aid more effectively, and similar tweaks. Like police reforms, these international aid reforms do not address the systemic injustices that cause people to need international assistance in the first place, nor do these reforms acknowledge how the current system entrenches rather than resists inequality.

Fortunately, abolitionists also talk about abolitionist reforms. These are reforms that achieve incremental steps toward the abolition of carceral systems and that immediately reduce harm. Abolitionist reforms include removing barriers that protect police from accountability for misconduct and halting the police's militarization through acquisition of military-grade equipment and training. Abolitionist reforms also include incremental defunding of policing and investment in community-based safety, which includes realizing the right to safe and secure housing, healthy food, dignified and fair wage jobs, quality and equitable education, accessible health care, including support for mental health. In other words, abolitionists say we must build up a culture and system for community care while we dismantle our current harmful system.

With this commentary, I propose the analogous relationship between police reform vis-à-vis abolition and international aid reform vis-à-vis systemic liberation as a tool to help create new options in thinking about development. I suggest that international aid is itself a reformist reform that increases the budget for and footprint of coloniality—at the expense of justice. What is needed in the international context is an abolitionist strategy. Abolitionist reforms in the international context refer to the incremental steps toward dismantling systemic injustice internationally and eliminating the suffering that is used as the justification for intervention by aid actors in the first place.

In the same way that police abolitionists can lead us along the incremental steps of abolitionist reforms, so too can the freedom fighters of the global majority lead the rest of us to a process of reckoning from which we may all emerge liberated. For decades, these leaders of the global majority have called for abolishing 'third world' debt, fundamentally redesigning the international finance system, democratizing global governance, among other tangible steps. And yes, there does need to be a massive redistribution of wealth from the

²⁶See Interagency Standing Committee, "The Grand Bargain (official website)," OCHA Services, <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/content/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc>.

center to the periphery, but this should not be a discretionary transaction from a benevolent giver to a needy receiver, but the embracing of obligations in the context of reparations and the imperative of collective well-being.

Bringing abolitionist logic into the context of international relations not only helps us focus our efforts on abolitionist reforms, including defunding systems that promote compliance with systems of inequality like education, mental health care and policing, and instead investing in fulfilling people's needs. It also helps expose the illogic inherent in international aid reform discourse and in the unsustainable concept of development as consumption. Perhaps, as the degrowth movement advocates, progress requires dialing back the ever-increasing consumption that we have come to define as development²⁷ and recognizing how, as abolitionists assert, we are all harmed by the inequality, injustice, and violence that come of it. Perhaps abolitionist logic can help replace mainstream ambition for capitalist development with radical imagination of a truly liberated world.

Bibliography

Anderson, Mary B., Dayna Brown, and Isabella Jean. *Time to Listen: Hearing People on the Receiving End of International Aid*. Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2012.

Anti-Oppression Network. "Allyship." <https://theantioppressionnetwork.com/allyship>.

Beckmann, David, George Ingram, and Jim Kolbe. "Transforming Foreign Assistance." *Brookings Institute*, April 15, 2013. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/transforming-foreign-assistance>.

Coleman, Aaron Ross. "Police Reform, Defunding, and Abolition, Explained." *Vox*, July 16, 2020. <https://www.vox.com/21312191/police-reform-defunding-abolition-black-lives-matter-protests>.

Corder, Tracey, and Ramah Kudaimi. "After the Insurrection: An Abolitionist Response to White Supremacy." *The Forge*, February 23, 2021. <https://forgeorganizing.org/article/abolitionist-response-white-supremacy>.

Cullors, Patrisse. "Abolition and Reparations: Histories of Resistance, Transformative Justice, and Accountability." *Harvard Law Review* 136, no. 2 (April 2019): 1684–94.

²⁷ Jason Hickel, "The Anti-Colonial Politics of Degrowth," *Political Geography* 88 (2021): 1–3, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102404>.

Davis, Angela Y. *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016.

Gabriel, Kay. "Abolition as Method: Ruth Wilson Gilmore's *Abolition Geography* is written to be used." Review of *Abolition Geography: Essays towards Liberation* by Ruth Wilson Gilmore. *Dissent* (Fall 2022).
<https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/abolition-as-method>.

Gudynas, Eduardo. "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow." *Development* 54 (2011): 441–47.
doi:10.1057/dev.2011.86

Hasbrouck, Brandon. "Reimagining Public Safety." *Northwestern University Law Review* 117, no. 3 (2022): 685–730.

Hickel, Jason. "The Anti-Colonial Politics of Degrowth." *Political Geography* 88 (2021): 1–3.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102404>.

Hickel, Jason. *The Divide: Global Inequality from Conquest to Free Markets*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2018.

Hickel, Jason, Christian Dorninger, Hanspeter Wieland, and Intan Suwandi. "Imperialist Appropriation in the World Economy: Drain from the Global South through Unequal Exchange, 1990–2015." *Global Environmental Change* 73 (2022): 1–13,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102467>.

Hoskin, Maia Niquel. "We Don't Need Allies, We Need Abolitionists: Enough with Playing It Nice and Safe in the Fight against Anti-Blackness." *Medium*, May 6, 2021.
<https://zora.medium.com/we-dont-need-allies-we-need-abolitionists-4eec702a6ccf>.

Hyttén, Kathy, and Kurt Stenmagen. "Abolishing, Renarrativizing, and Revaluing: Dismantling Antiracist Racism in Education." *Educational Researcher*, 2023.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X221143092>.

Interagency Standing Committee. "The Grand Bargain (official website)." OCHA Services.
<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/content/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc>.

Murad, Nora Lester. "Aiding Liberation." In *Our Vision for Liberation: Engaged Palestinian Leaders and Intellectuals Speak Out*. Edited by Ilan Pappé and Ramzy Baroud. Atlanta: Clarity Press, 2022.

See Tema Okun. "(divorcing) White Supremacy Culture: Coming Home to Who We Really Are." White Supremacy Culture. www.whitesupremacyculture.info.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.

US Conference of Mayors. "Resolution: In Support of Principles to Achieve Police Reform and Racial Justice." Adopted at the 88th Annual Meeting, 2020.

<https://www.usmayors.org/the-conference/resolutions/?category=a0F4N00000PdGreUAF&meeting=88th%20Annual%20Meeting>.

Weil Davis, Simone, and Rachel Fayer. "Mutual Aid as Abolitionist Praxis." *Citizenship Studies* (2020): 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2020.1859190>