

Te[a]chnolog[able]y: A Move/me[a]nt to Counter the Neoliberal Global Pandemic

Tejwant K. Mohabeer Chana

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3724-7117>

Abstract

COVID-19 prompted most educators across the globe to actively deploy technology during confinement to ensure the continuity of teaching in a time period marked by the world-wide pandemic of neoliberal globalisation and active anti-systemic decolonial movements both within the North and South. Neoliberal globalisation is a multi-centric, world-wide, global governance system designed and executed by a few for a few in pursuit of economic wealth and power. Neoliberalism champions capitalism and regards nations as borderless business units and generates related societal ills (i.e. warfare, poverty, land dispossession) rooted in the coloniality of power. Technology and technological pursuits have fuelled the rise and expansion of neoliberal globalisation, with the more recent ‘developments’ in microelectronics and information and communication technology (ICT). This world-wide system of global governance deploys education as a tool to serve its global agenda by contouring and controlling educational reforms and policies; promoting Education for All (EFA) for a ‘better’ neoliberal world through initiatives such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); imbibing the values of global competition; mandating life-long learning for the knowledge economy and the deployment of technology. This paper argues that the readily available use of technology is not serendipitous but rather linked to the wider neoliberal global agenda advocating technological use in education to prepare learners to function within the neoliberal capitalist system. I propose that we te[a]chnolog[able]ly (*teach knowledgeably*) about our current historical moment beyond the lens/knowledge rooted in/for the knowledge economy, given that there are no neoliberal global solutions for neoliberal global problems.

Keywords: neoliberal globalisation, coloniality and decoloniality, international educational reforms, knowledge, [higher] education

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 epidemic has entered an historical moment marked by the world-wide pandemic of neoliberal globalization, alongside active anti-systemic decolonial movements and processes both within the North and South contexts (de Sousa Santos 2008; Bello 2019; Sethi 2011). Within formal educational spaces, prolonged societal confinement during COVID-19 [has] activated institutions world-wide to deploy technology, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to anchor and attend to the timely completion of pending teaching, assessments, and semester. This convenient availability of remote online technology is not a serendipitous savior but rather, accurately reflects the current neoliberal reforms of the 1990s, emphasising educational expansion, decentralisation, privatisation, and the deployment of technology (Carnoy 2012). While technology has been availed in most higher education spaces, perhaps emergent engagements have been delimited to its practical, operational, and pedagogical applications more so than its worldwide consequences. The well-intended deployment of technology prompted by COVID-19, has now accelerated and escalated the trajectory of technological use in higher education possibly without concurrent critical consideration of the neoliberal global project design (Mignolo 2000). This chapter discusses the ways in which the deployment of technology at the micro-level spaces within education actively breeds and feeds neoliberal globalisation. It argues for critical understanding of neoliberal globalisation, acknowledging its propensity for world-wide structural violence, and the illusion of democratic education (formal, informal, and non-formal) for a fair and unequal society. The ‘knowledge’ neoliberalism espouses across the globe is critically countered.

A baseline analysis of globalisation can be characterised as the growing interdependence of societies across the world increasingly sharing similar consumer goods, mode of economics, political influences, and culture. It is characterised by capital, trade, transactions, investments, multi-national corporations, technological advancement, dissemination of knowledge, and the movement of people all within a global context that slots and categorises countries as ‘developed’ (former colonial countries), ‘developing’ (Brazil, Russia,

India, China, and South Africa), and ‘underdeveloped’ (African continent, small islands, parts of Asia), on the basis of their gross domestic product (GDP) (Arrighi 2005; Scholte 2005). Globalisation is a worldwide hegemonic politico-economic system of governance, rooted in coloniality, created by a few élite, for a few élite, in pursuit of global economic power, wealth, and profit (Escobar 2004; Mignolo 2000). While globalisation has been praised for many positive outcomes within a short period of time such as increased life expectancy, GDP, and a decrease in population growth and poverty rates (Bhagwati 2004), this analysis fails to acknowledge the interrelated juxtaposed societal ills of war, inter-state conflicts, poverty, unemployment, pollution, food scarcity, land dispossession, human trafficking, genocide, and the inequality they generate (Escobar 2004; Kapoor & Jordan 2019; McMichael 2017). More recent data indicates that 82% of the money generated on a global level in 2017 went to the richest 1% (BBC 2018). At present, the world’s eight richest individuals possess wealth equivalent to half of the world’s poorest individuals (Oxfam 2018). These realities indicate a dysfunctional, failing global economic system that is abyssing the economic gap worldwide. The underlying purpose of this paper is to pause and take cognisance of our current historical moment marked by non/evident societal ills, and to deliberate the politics, policy, planning, praxis, and pedagogy of the deployment of technology within the space of education.

This chapter is not written specifically for the North/’developed’/’west or the South/’developing’/’rest’, but rather for all, given the omnipresence of neoliberal globalisation, epistemic imperialism, coloniality of power, and the trickle-down effects of neoliberal globalisation (Escobar 2004; Quijano 2000). Within the context of this paper, the terms ‘globalisation’ and ‘neoliberalism’ are used interchangeably, given that neoliberalism is globalisation’s latest brand. The term ‘technology’ envelopes all modes and modalities of hard and soft applications, information and communications technology (ICT), software, telecommunications, computers, and any other machinery which advances the global market for world-wide effectiveness and competition. Within the space of education (formal, informal, and non-formal), technology refers to the hard/soft pedagogical moves and modes of educational software(s), application(s), e-books, digital curriculums, tablets, online remote teaching, and MOOCs (massive open online courses), for example, that prepare learners for competitive economic global growth (Carnoy 2014). It is understood and acknowledged that the praxis of technology varies from country to country,

and context to context. I acknowledge my own surface level deployment of technology as necessitated by my profession and the reluctant complicity of this with my axiological positionality.

Given that ‘another world[s] is possible’ (McNally 2008) with ‘Other[s]’ knowledge[s] (de Santos Sousa 2008), I am proposing that we te[a]chnolog[able]y (pronounced *teach knowledgeably*) about the current neoliberal world system to prepare learners to dismantle it and activate contextually-based alternatives. This is a term I have coined to unveil the neoliberal global project within all educational (formal, informal and non-formal) spaces inclusive of schooling, media, industry and society as a whole, to counter and dismantle neoliberal globalisation, capitalism, global competition, and ‘over-development’. To te[a]chnolog[able]y is a praxiological move/ment that moves beyond the knowledge of the ‘knowledge-economy’ to reinstate democracy and human agency, given that economics presently governs societies as opposed to societies governing their respective economies (Polanyi 1944). Through a socio-historical vantage point, this paper contours the origins of neoliberal globalisation and the underpinning ‘western-like development’ agenda (Peet & Hartwick 2015), followed by an examination of the re/colonising role of education in sustaining neoliberalism/ globalisation. This paper then discusses te[a]chnolog[able]y as a move/me[a]nt to counter the knowledge-hegemony of neoliberal globalisation that is observed within societal/educational spaces (i.e. schools, media, workplace). I argue that we should not let technology-based remote learning alienate us *from* learning, irrespective of COVID-19, but rather we should te[a]chnolog[able]y to galvanise teaching/learning.

2 Neoliberal Globalisation, ‘Development’, and the Role of Technology

Neoliberal globalisation is a world-wide economic, political and socio-cultural system of global governance designed and executed by a few for a few. It regards nations as borderless ‘business units’ as evidenced by the establishment of multinational corporations (MNCs) in multiple countries, and mandates no interference from national governments in its endless pursuit of production, accumulation, and profit (Held & McGrew 2007). It is disconnected from social realities and values the capitalist logic of commercialism, individualism and fiscal achievement. A neoliberalist

perspective can be further understood by Fukuyama's (1992) assertion of 'the end of history' at the end of the Cold War, in which he proclaimed the universalisation of western liberal democracy and neoliberal globalisation as the final human regime with no existing alternative[s] to capitalism. Neoliberalists believe that 'those states that fail to make this [economic, political, and cultural] adaptation will fall behind and stagnate, eroding the opportunities of their people' (Peet & Hartwick 2015: 189).

Neoliberal globalisation is both ahistorical and distorted. It argues that colonialism and neocolonialism are obsolete and meritocracy rules in an economically interdependent world governed by MNCs (Burgis 2015). It is a system that '... confuse[s] the things of logic with the logic of things' (Bourdieu 1998: np). What is key to understanding neoliberal globalisation is that the economic, political, and socio-cultural decisions that govern the billions of us on the globe are designed, created, and decided largely by corporate élites who comprise 1% of the world's population (Burgis 2015; McMichael 2017). Deglobalists such as Mignolo (2000: 124), argue that neoliberalism is nothing more than 'a new civilising project driven by the market and transnational corporations'.

Neoliberal globalisation's principles, policies, and structures predate to the 15th century with the Puritan movement which observed the expansion of Europe's mercantile trade, colonialism, and empire building across Africa, Americas, Asia, and Oceania (Amin 2007; Mignolo 2000). This moment in history unleashed unprecedented physical, structural, and onto-epistemic violence in its annexation and exploitation of both material and human resources. After 'in-dependence', the former colonial countries developed the three global international financial institutions (IFIs) in 1944, namely, the World Bank (WB), originally called the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), referred to as the World Trade Organisation (WTO) since 1995. Instituting the IFIs provided 'former' colonial countries (re)access to colonised countries to sustain their multi-centric politico-economic control of the global market through the classical liberalist ideologies of private enterprise, market supremacy, and free trade (Peet & Hartwick 2015). Colonised countries were pressed to keep their national borders open for export and take high-rate long-term loans from the IFIs to 'develop' and accelerate modern industrial growth.

The 1991 neoliberal economic reforms of the Washington Consensus

emerged due to the South's inability to repay the high interest rate loans (Peet & Hartwick 2015). Neoliberalists then professed that the 'free market logic' emphasising export-based economies, increased foreign trade, investment, and deregulated government control, would 'develop' local economies, eliminate the accrued debt, and reduce poverty levels (Amin 2007; Arrighi 2005). In reality, the debt has exacerbated resulting in reduced government expenditures and investment in education and other key social services (Amin 2007; Peet & Hartwick 2015). Not only are the IFIs continuing to loot colonised countries, they have forced them to lower their standard of living to ensure repayment. From a Marxists/Neo-Marxists lens, one can see the ways in which geopolitics and the history of colonisation have shaped current global economic relations, in which the accumulation and reproduction of wealth observed in the North has come at the expense of those in the South (Amin 2007; Arrighi 2005; Kapoor & Jordan 2019).

Technology has instrumentally foregrounded globalisation's emergence throughout its three 'development' phases (industrial, technological, and electrical) (Arrighi 2005; Scholte 2005). What demarcates globalisation from previous world economies, is the accelerated pace in which global markets were captured due to technological advances in transportation and industry. The nineteenth century observed 'developments' of modern technologies, information and communication technologies (ICT), computers, and telecommunications. More recent advances and economic expenditures centre around the development of artificial intelligence, robotics, and genetic engineering, or what is referred to as the Fourth and Fifth Industrial Revolution. The active pursuit of microelectronics and ICT has revolutionised digital communication (i.e. Internet, mobile phones). This, in turn, has radically altered the global flow of capital goods and services. Multinational corporations (MNCs) now conduct their work digitally in real time anywhere across the globe without necessarily needing to be in close proximity of their targeted markets. They continue to own and control a large percent of the material resources, and production of goods and services in one or more countries other than their home country (Burgis 2015). Despite generating annual profits that exceed billions of US dollars, MNCs continue to set up their companies, plants, and/or factories where cheapest, typically near the vulnerable (Statista 2020; see also Amin 2007; Kapoor & Jordan 2019). Technology has, and is, accelerating and intensifying MNCs' (the 1% of billionaires) traction on the globe.

In addition to annexing politico-economic global control, MNCs monopolise access to cultures across the globe (North and South) by ‘manufacturing consent’ in the space of public pedagogy through the digital technologies of the internet and media (Giroux 2005). Herman and Chomsky (1988) explain the ways in which corporate media(s) ‘manufactures [public] consent’ by creating the necessary illusions through propaganda to detract, distort, and distract the public from reality and accepting certain events and practices as absolutely essential with a view to prevent actual democracy. However, technology has provided a steady stream of access to information about the world in real time which might have remained unknown. While digital access to the world’s destruction, disparity, and inequality has provided a platform for mass communication and a public pedagogical space for participatory change, it has been criticised for facilitating ‘armchair activism’, in which dissent can be expressed in a single click or tweet instead of substantive action to achieve actual change.

3 Technology in Education: Accidental or Occidental?

Just as technology foregrounded globalisation’s emergence, so did education. During the colonial period, education, educational policies, and schooling served as an onto-epistemic deculturation project of imbibing the coloniser’s ‘knowledge’ and culture onto the colonised (Abdi 2006; Altbach & Kelly 1978; Nyerere 1968). Underlying this mass socio-cultural engineering was the coloniser’s need to permanently secure access to the colonised’s resources (human and material). Education was delimited to the four Rs of reading, writing, arithmetic and religion, as opposed to academic subjects such as science and economics to prevent the emergence of a qualified ‘local’ ruling class. The residual effects of this remain today as many nations, North (i.e. ‘New World’) and South, remain in dependence on foreign knowledge, policy, and governance due to the inherited colonial system of education and related cognitive imperialism.

An additional factor explaining the continued foreign ‘dependence’ centres around the World Bank’s active role in educational planning and ‘development’. As contoured in the previous section, colonised countries were pressed to take high interest rate loans from the IFIs to ‘develop’ and accelerate modern industrial growth. It was argued that heavy investment in the expansion of education would produce the required human capital necessary for national

reconstruction and modern ‘development’. Today, the World Bank remains ‘the leading global investor in education’ (Spring 2009: 29) and believes ‘education is central to development...and reducing poverty...for sustained western-like economic growth’ (Spring 2009: 30). The World Bank’s education policy seeks to consolidate its own role at the heart of the world economy with reduced government involvement to depict its view of the ideal world-wide economy. Given the accrued debt, nations are left with no alternative other than to adhere and adapt to these enforced policies hence preventing local governments from executing the necessary autonomy to ‘develop’ contextually relevant educational systems and practices. To address the world’s ‘development’ challenges, the World Bank initiated the ‘World Declaration on Education for All’ (EFA) in 1990. Originally referred to as Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and now the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), this action framework advocates ‘for all’ to participate in the global economy, and the SDGs recent response to the COVID-19 epidemic reflects this given its emphasis on economic recovery. It states: ‘COVID-19 is spreading human suffering, destabilising the global economy and upending the lives of billions of people around the globe This is the time for change, for a profound systemic shift to a more sustainable economy that works for both people and the planet’ (Sustainable Development Goals 2020). The SDGs are a neoliberal hegemonic force disguised under the rubric of educational equality and access for all.

The World Bank’s policy mandate of Education for the Knowledge Economy (EKE) ‘is aimed at helping countries adapt their entire education systems to the new challenges of the learning economy’ by producing an educated workforce equipped with the latest knowledge, information, ideas, and skills to increase economic productivity and growth (Spring 2009: 38). The prescribed curriculum emphasises ‘literacy, foreign languages, science, math, and civic participation ... [not] ... geography, history, and any form of cultural studies’ for all (Spring 2009: 45). It is believed that the former subjects will attend to the worldwide techno-industrial demand for the 21-century skills required that centre around reasoning, problem solving, innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship, to name a few. Most governments now have an established educational policy supporting the active use of technology; some have signed UNESCO’s Qingdao Declaration which promotes ICT use to achieve the SDGs targets. Multinational corporations have marketed and set-up their technologies and educational materials/resources banking on the

dependency of its usage (Spring 2009; Selwyn 2013). Education is now transiting towards heavier computer reliance in lieu of face-to-face classroom-based teaching, making learning portable through tablets, and certain ‘knowledge’ accessible through the ‘worldwide’ web. The underlying force of ICT in education is to competitively prepare learners for participation in the global economy and economic growth as it is perceived that nations with high performing learners (as ‘measured’ by technological performance measures) will generate stronger economies (Carnoy 2014). While the current research surrounding the learning effectiveness of technological deployment is conflicting, it is clear that education is a lucrative market for MNCs who are teaching for the global knowledge economy.

Within higher education specifically, an international analysis indicates a paradigmatic shift from a socially oriented system to an economically oriented system in which massification is underway. The pressure for nation-states to increase the quantity and quality of their education system has been activated by neoliberal globalisation’s demand for graduates with higher skills and credentials for the knowledge-economy. For those already employed, the push for ‘up-to-date’ knowledge and skills has made lifelong learning ‘essential for individuals to keep pace with the constantly changing global job market and [advances in] technology’ (Spring 2009: 49). The promotion of science and technology has pushed countries to heavily promote research, teaching, and program designs within science, technology, engineering, and maths (STEM). As local governments anticipate attracting foreign direct investment for the building up of local high-tech industries to boost their respective economy, they are increasingly relying on higher education institutions to become collaborative leaders in their national innovation systems. Higher education institutions are now working with industries in the production of knowledge; universities produce STEM- based knowledge and industries provide the ‘know-how’.

4 Knowledge: The Struggle over the Meaning and Value/s of It

The previous sections explored the multi-centric interconnected histories of colonialisation, globalisation, and neoliberalisation. The culmination of physical, material, human, economic, political, socio-cultural, financial, and educational exploitation has maintained the world-wide division of labour, which

‘apartheids’ the world into core countries (‘[over]developed’, high skill, knowledge-intensive production), and semi-periphery/periphery countries (‘developing’/ ‘underdeveloped’, low-skill, labor-intensive) (Arrighi 2005; Wallerstein 2004). Educational decisions are issued by the ‘global designers’ and global financial planners (IFIs) who have tasked educational institutions, irrespective of geopolitical location, to develop learners with the necessary skills and dispositions of positivistic scientific and technological knowledge amidst the lived realities of ‘Other’ concurrent knowledge systems (e.g. see, Escobar 2004; Kapoor & Jordan 2019; Mignolo 2000; Neerjaj 2007). The dangers of this mono-centric, decultural, neoliberal educational design, is that it is used to ‘control the “real” and what is “truth”’ in our daily lives (Apple 2000: 45).

Counter-hegemonic anti-neoliberal/globalisation movements have emerged in the North and the South at unprecedented rates, by anti/deglobalists, who seek an alternative[s] counter-hegemonic system[s] of economic governance (Escobar 2004; Kapoor & Jordan 2019). Conscientisation and agency rooted in anti-globalisation movements among the masses across the globe in re/action to the accumulated violence of MNCs/neoliberalism have been successfully observed. For example, in Chiapas, Mexico, citizens actively protested the land grabbing and contaminated drinking water produced by MNCs; and in New York, the *Occupy-Wall-Street* movement declared its anti-neoliberal global stance in response to the financial bailouts provided to corporate élites from public funds (Sethi 2011). These movements, and many others across the globe, are collectively questioning: ‘...who has the right to “name the world”?’ (Apple 2000:45) and ‘whose knowledge is of most worth?’ (Apple 2000: 46), and are seeking alternatives to the neoliberal global agenda. The following section introduces ‘te[a]chnolog[able]y’, which is a term that I have coined to dismantle the knowledge and values of the neoliberal world system, with a view to engender an ‘another world[s]’ with ‘[O]ther’ knowledge[s] and contextually-based systems.

5 Te[a]chnolog[able]y: From Cogs to Cognitives

Te[a]chnolog[able]y draws heavily from the work of anti/deglobalists (see for example, Bello 2005; de Sousa Santos 2008; Escobar 2004; Kapoor & Jordan 2019; Mignolo 2000 and Quijano 2000), who are calling for decolonial alternatives to the current hierarchical world-system dominated by ongoing colonisation, so that societies are self-reliant (Nyere 1968), governing their

respective economies and not the economy governing them (Polyani 1944) by dismantling the hegemonic structures of the WTO and IFIs, and reorienting local economies from export to local production guided by localised knowledge[s] (Bello 2005). To te[a]chnolog[able]y then is to not teach (formally, informally, and non-formally) the knowledge manufactured by neoliberalism, but rather unpack and teach knowledgeably about the catastrophic realities and disorders of neoliberal globalisation, with a view to develop and prepare societal/ educational spaces (i.e. schools, media, workplace, communities, governance) with tangible alternatives to capitalism inclusive of ‘Other[s]’ knowledge[s] and ways of knowing and being. This anti-systemic decolonial move/ment foregrounds the multi-centric history of colonialisation, globalisation, and neoliberalism as the core unit of analyses to paradigmatically understand how the world works, how it is divided (inclusive of physical and ideological), and why it is the way it is, given that ‘... one cannot act otherwise unless one can think otherwise’ (Giroux 2005: 16).

To te[a]chnolog[able]y requires an architectural understanding of coloniality, neoliberalism/globalisation and its complexity, along with *acknowledging* the coloniality of power and epistemic imperialism. To te[a]chnolog[able]y is not restricted to the classroom but rather is hinged to all spaces of life as education (formally, informally, and non-formally) given neoliberalism’s/globalisation’s hegemony. Therefore, this enabling praxiological move/ment applies to all, North and South, irrespective of ‘race,’ class, gender, caste, sexual orientation, dis/abilities, citizenship, urban/rural and profession, to name but a few categorisations. It is explicitly understood that the intersectionalities of these diverse identity markers will facilitate in influencing and shaping the diverse ways in which individuals will engage with te[a]chnolog[able]y. To prevent the engendering of another set of hierarchical dominations, what must remain central in this move/ment and its practices, is the active decolonisation of the current apartheid world-system without feeding or breeding further, or new[s], hegemony between and within nations, and valuing the human worth of all. Te[a]chnolog[able]y is an enabling move/me[a]nt to move individuals into collective tangible action towards countering neoliberalism/globalisation, while simultaneously cultivating ‘another world[s]’ which *acknowledges* ‘Other[s]’ knowledge[s] praxiologically.

Within [higher] education spaces, te[a]chnolog[able]y lends itself to all faculties and institutional spaces (i.e. teaching, research, administrative, curricular, publishing, policy, planning, leading, and managing), given that

institutional alignment is key. To te[a]chnolog[able]y is to restore the space of higher education as an institution of thought with diverse thinkers that serve to understand the world/s we live/in, and *how to* serve the world/s we live/in beyond the neoliberal agenda. Institutionally, this requires the decision-making around research, teaching, administrative designs, and institutional politics be in collective accord with one another and not influenced or dominated by neoliberal policies and mandates. A shift to research and funding that assists in remedying our current historical moment as opposed to a disproportionate concentration on technological and capitalist advancement is required, given the role of research in informing policy and practice, and the teaching-research nexus. Pedagogically and institutionally, te[a]chnolog[able]y moves beyond creating cogs of neoliberalism to cognitive learners who are equipped to generate sovereign self-reliant practices as well as dismantle and debilitate neoliberalism and coloniality at its root.

To counter-neoliberalism and achieve alternatives, spaces of/for engagement must be created. In addition to embedding critical/multiple perspectives within a discipline, interdisciplinary engagement alongside existing research and scholarship within the fields of international ‘development’, ‘critical’ global education, or citizenship education, for example, can be imbibed in any subject area. What is essential is a foundational understanding of neoliberal globalisation’s hegemony and worldwide destruction, and dialogical deliberations and active practices that focus on ‘how to’ create alternatives in the absence of neoliberal ideologies and epistemes. These are [some of] the core practices I deploy within the context of my own teaching (undergraduate and graduate), research, and supervision. It is not a seamless process. The ideological and conceptual disruptions that emerge for students during discussions for example, are valued and attended to with care both in the moment and then through subsequent pedagogy. The use of tangible ‘real’ examples and contextual/local examples and activities are deployed for relevancy purposes to reinforce the realities of neoliberalism as opposed to a phenomenon occurring elsewhere. Te[a]chnolog[able]y is ultimately about creating the ‘educated’ graduate within an educational institution and not the credentialised graduate who has learned some things - rather some thing - to be able to actively contribute to addressing the neoliberal/global pandemic seriously and judiciously. The move/me[a]nt towards alternatives does not involve neoliberalism’s epistemology nor ideology as there are no neoliberal solutions for the neoliberal global pandemic.

6 Conclusion: So/ Now What?

This discussion paper has endeavored to disclose the pandora's box linked to the convenient deployment of technology pre/during/post COVID-19 by contouring the multi-centuric neoliberal global pandemic which uses education (formal, informal, and non-formal) as a public space to metastasize its 'manufactured consent'. I have advocated that we te[a]chnolog[able]y in our respective lived spaces to unveil the destructive systemic realities of neoliberalism/globalisation with the aim of creating 'another world[s]' that *acknowledges* Other[s] knowledge[s] and allows space for different ways of knowing and being in the world beyond the mono-systemicism of capitalism. The deliberations within this paper are timely and urgent given the accelerated use of technology prompted by COVID-19 and emergent fashionable moves to maintain the trajectory of this practice. It is acknowledged that no specific pragmatic approach[es] has been provided to operationalise this move/ment other than to teach critically about neoliberalism and 'develop' different ways of knowing and being in the world. This is deliberate to abstain from engendering a hierarchical hegemonic move given the acknowledgement of multi-centric realities. However, a conceptual spine rooted in decolonisation in which to dismantle the current world system, coloniality of power, epistemic imperialism, and cognitive imperialism has been designated for (re)imagining and manufacturing change contextually. This paper is thus calling for educational spaces (formal, informal and non-formal) to te[a]chnolog[able]y and generate actions, practices, research, and move/ments counter to neoliberalism through the praxis of learning from one an'O'ther irrespective of geopolitical locale.

References

- Abdi, A.A. 2006. Culture of Education, Social Development, and Globalization: Historical and Current Analyses of Africa. In Abdi, A., K.P. Puplampu & G.J. Sefa Dei (eds): *African Education and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Chapter 1. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Altbach, P.G. & G.P. Kelly (eds.). 1978. *Education and Colonialism*. New York: Longman.
- Amin, S. 2007. *Empire of Chaos*. Delhi: Aakar Books.

- Apple, M. 2000. *Cultural Politics and the Text*, in *Official Knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Arrighi, G. 2005. Globalization in World-Systems Perspective. In Appelbaum, R.P. & W.I. Robinson (eds.): *Critical Globalization Studies*. Chapter 3. New York: Routledge.
- Bello, W. 2019. *Counterrevolution: The Global Rise of the Far Right*. (*Agrarian Change and Peasant Series Book 8.*) Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.
- Bello, W. 2005. *Deglobalization: Ideas for a New World Economy*. (*Global Issues.*) Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.3362/9781788530538>
- Bhagwati, J.N. 2004. *In Defense of Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- BBC 2018. 'World's richest 1% get 82% of the wealth', says Oxfam. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-42745853>
- Bourdieu, P. 1998. *The Essence of Neoliberalism*. Available at: <https://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu>
- Burgis, T. 2015. *The Looting Machine: Warlords, Oligarchs, Corporations, Smugglers, and the Theft of Africa's Wealth*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Carnoy, M. 2014. Globalization, Educational Change, and the National State. In Stromquist, N.P. & K. Monkman (eds.): *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across the Globe*. Chapter 2. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Herman, E.S. & N. Chomsky 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- de Sousa Santos, B. 2008. *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*. London: Verso.
- Escobar, A. 2004. Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality and Anti-Globalisation Social Movements. *Third World Quarterly* 25, 1: 207 - 230.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659042000185417>
- Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Avon Books Inc.
- Giroux, H. 2005. Cultural Studies in Dark Times: Public Pedagogy and the Challenge of Neoliberalism. *Fast Capitalism* 1,2: 75 - 86. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.32855/fcapital.200502.010>

- Held, D. & A. McGrew 2007. *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*. Boston, MA: Polity Press.
- Kapoor, D. & S. Jordan (eds.). 2019. *Research, Political Engagement and Dispossession: Indigenous, Peasant and Urban Poor Activisms in the Americas and Asia*. London: Zed Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350222274>
- McNally, D. 2008. *Another World is Possible: Globalization & Anti-Capitalism*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- McMichael, P. 2017. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Mignolo, W.D. 2000. *Local Histories/ Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Neeraj, J. 2007. *Globalisation or Recolonisation*. Pune: Alka Joshi.
- Nyerere, J. 1968. *Education for Self-Reliance: Freedom and Socialism*. New York: The Free Press.
- Oxfam 2018. *World's Billionaires have More Wealth than 4.6 Billion People*. Available at: <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/worlds-billionaires-have-more-wealth-46-billion-people>
- Peet, R. & E. Hartwick 2015. *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments Alternatives*. 3rd Edition. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Polanyi, K. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Quijano, A. 2000. *Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Scholte, J. 2005. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Selwyn, N. 2013. *Education in a Digital World: Global Perspectives on Technology and Education*. New York: NY: Routledge.
- Spring, J. 2009. *Globalization of Education: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203886854>
- Statista 2020. *The 100 Largest Companies in the World Ranked by Revenue in 2019 (in Billion U.S. dollars)*. Available at: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/263265/top-companies-in-the-world-by-revenue/>
-

Te[a]chnolog[able]y: A Move/me[a]nt to Counter the Neoliberal

Sustainable Development Goals 2020. *COVID-19 Response*. Available at:
<http://un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sdgs-framework-for-COVID-19-recovery>

Wallerstein, I.M. 2004. *World-System Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Tejwant K. Mohabeer Chana
Mauritius Institute of Education
t.mohabeer@mie.ac.mu or:
tmohabeer.mu@gmail.com