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Abstract
Advocates of ‘slow scholarship’ have called for building relations of care and solidarity across the university. But, when academia is romanticized, the possibilities for these relations are limited. To de-romanticize academia, we frame universities as terrains of struggle between competing political projects with colonial and decolonial histories. Nostalgia for the university is often tied to an ideal of liberal democracy. Feelings of anxiety about ‘speed-up’ originate in the liberal ideal of the slowly deliberative citizen in the public sphere. We show that this over-politicizing of temporality has the converse effect of depoliticizing other important political struggles. While jettisoning these problematic assumptions of ‘slow scholarship’ advocates, we maintain their desires for building relations of care and solidarity. This requires revealing the university’s ‘temporal architectures’ and ‘spatial clockworks’—how some people’s temporally and spatially privileged situations are interdependent with others’ oppressed spatio-temporal situations. For
example, the (slow) scholarship of tenured faculty is dependent on the (sped-up) time and labor of graduate students, contingent faculty, and service workers—as well as the constrained spatio-temporal conditions of off-campus domestic workers and incarcerated persons. These intertemporal and interspatial relations intersect with other dynamics, including racism, sexism, labor exploitation, and bureaucracy. We demonstrate an approach of intertemporally and interspatially reflective scholarship through analyses of the movements of #theRealUW and #DismantleDukePlantation at our own campuses, the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Duke University. This allows us to envision possibilities for solidarity across different struggles, for expanding alternative modes of study and temporal sub-architectures, and for amplifying already existing forms of resistance in the university’s undercommons.
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Introduction

Time is a perpetual topic of conversation on campus—it goes too quickly and there is never enough of it. As the Great Lakes Feminist Collective (GLFC) pointed out in their 2015 article, “For Slow Scholarship,” the neoliberal university increasingly “requires high productivity in compressed time frames,” with more demands on academics’ time (Mountz et al., 2015, 1236). In doing so, GLFC joined broader appeals to slow scholarship and a ‘slow university’ (Hartman and Darab, 2012; Martell, 2014; O’Neill, 2014) that applied ideas from the popular ‘Slow Movement’ (including ‘slow food’)—which “challenges the frantic pace and standardization of contemporary culture”—to education (Berg and Seeber, 2016, ix-x). However, GLFC called for explicitly feminist and collective “alternatives to the fast-paced, metric-oriented neoliberal university”—specifically those that involve a ‘slowing down’ that promotes an ‘ethics of care,’ solidarity, and commitment to ‘good scholarship’ (Mountz et al., 2015, 1236). Subsequently, scholars have taken up GLFC’s invitation in various ways, including advocating for a ‘slowing down’ in physical geography (Lane, 2016), exploring the relationship between academic labor and (mental) health (Drozdzeski and Dominey-Howes, 2015; Parizeau et al., 2016), considering the refusal of work in the neoliberal university (Gildersleeve, 2016), and examining research ‘impact’ (Evans, 2016). In this paper we aim to contribute to this important conversation about the potential of slow scholarship specifically, and the politics of time-space more generally. Specifically, we consider who does and does not have control over
their own (and others’) time-space and how unjust inter-temporal, inter-spatial relations are integral to maintaining the university’s status quo.

We take the relay from the Great Lakes Feminist Collective’s argument that slow scholarship needs to be a collective political project rather than merely an individual one—and one that addresses power and inequality in the university. In introducing a feminist ethics of care into slow scholarship, GLFC argues that scholarship should involve “taking care of others,” and that this may allow not only for “different ways of experiencing and valuing time,” but also for participation in collective action, such as labor organizing (Mountz et al., 2015, 1251). In advocating for a ‘slow-down,’ the authors assert that they have “no nostalgia” for “an elitist, exclusionary university,” but instead see the project of a feminist slow scholarship as part of the struggle for university accessibility and the “decolonization of knowledge” (1253-54).

Our interest in feminist slow scholarship is inspired by the struggles around education and labor on and off our campuses, and by our personal experiences of precarity, debt, shame, and marginality in our positions as a graduate student (Elsa Noterman) and contingent faculty member (Eli Meyerhoff). Further, broadening our circle of care, we are motivated by the negative experiences of our friends, students, and fellow workers in universities. Testimonials about academic depression, sexual harassment, and suicide, such as those from the blog, Academia Is Killing My Friends,¹ highlight the human impact of the statistics on the working conditions of graduate students and contingent faculty. The latter make up about 70% of the professoriate in the U.S. (AAUP, 2015). And there is also the low-wage, exploitative, gendered, and racialized work of campus custodians, clerical staff, and other service workers, which is often not included in the same statistics.

We find ourselves in a situation of perplexity. On the one hand, within the academy, we are considerably marginalized in relation to administrators and tenure-track faculty who control our access to academia’s resources. On the other hand, we are privileged in our positions as white, settler-colonial descendant, cis-gendered, and professional-class people. This tension gives us a sense of perplexity about our intersecting oppressions and privileges.² Decolonization, as Harsha Walia (2012) reminds us, “can require us to locate ourselves within the context of colonization in complicated ways, often as simultaneously oppressed and complicit” (5).

---

¹ ‘Academia is Killing My Friends: Anonymous stories of abuse, exploitation and suffering in academia,’ http://academiaskillingmyfriends.tumblr.com. More recently, people have used #MeToo to call out the systemic problem of sexual harassment in academia (see, for example, Goldhill and Slobin, 2017).
² Cricket Keating (2005) discusses how people can simultaneously hold positions of relative privilege and relative oppression along different axes of privilege/oppression, and how these positions can be overlapping and co-constituted with each other across different people.
Our and others’ experiences of perplexity constitute the embodied basis for our attraction to the feminist slow scholarship approach, which aims to re-work the academy in ways that prioritize relations of care over the neoliberal institutions that pit us against each other. Yet, we contend that the problem goes beyond the neoliberal university’s speed-up, and is within “the larger academic project” itself, a project which the authors of the “For Slow Scholarship” essay present as something to be protected from neoliberal threats (Mountz et al., 2015, 1245-6). While we share the authors’ rejection of nostalgia for “an elitist, exclusionary university,” we argue for a more thoroughly decolonial, anti-racist historicizing of the university’s space-times.

For a deeper critique of the academic project, we draw on the intellectual traditions of not only decolonial thought (e.g., Mignolo, 2011), but also resurgent Indigenous knowledges (e.g., Tuck and Yang, 2012; Simpson, 2014) and Black radical thought (e.g., Martina, 2015; Roberts, 2015; Wynter, 2006). These approaches underline that, against any romanticizing of the university, the academic system isn't broken: it was built this way. The history of universities in the Americas is thoroughly entwined with settler colonial, white supremacist, and hetero-patriarchal capitalism (Wilder, 2013). Thus, rather than merely tinkering within the system to fix it, we argue that it is critical to challenge and overcome the material and ideological bases of the university itself. Egbert Martina (2015) asserts: “Thinking Black freedom demands a critical engagement with what ‘care’ might look like in a world in which Black life is valued. To imagine revolutionary practices of care that foster and ensure the flourishing of Black life means to abandon, refuse, and destroy the ‘world’.” We envision a project of inter-temporally reflective scholarship as one of “everyday decolonization,” or an ongoing process by which we recognize and “supplant” the colonial logics of the university (Hunt and Holmes, 2015), and “create the conditions in which we want to live and the social relations we wish to have” (Walia, 2012, 5). Rather than trying to overcome the university from some imagined external position, we take the relay from movements—such as for the formation of Black Studies, Native American Studies, and Women’s Studies—that have sought to struggle simultaneously within, against, and beyond the university. In this paper, by examining two localized cases, we explore how this approach allows us to more precisely describe what it means to ‘overcome’ the university by engaging in the “undercommons”—the challenge of being in but not of the university, while taking on a “criminal” relationship to the university’s resources (Moten and Harney, 2013).

In this paper then, we aim to expand feminist slow scholarship’s liberatory horizons through a combination of decolonial, intertemporal, and interspatial approaches. First, we draw connections across historical changes and continuities in forms of academic institutions, framing them as terrains of struggle between conflicting political projects and their associated modes of study. This analysis
involves recognizing the colonial logics operating in education itself, as one possible mode of study among alternatives, and understanding universities as “beneficiaries of the illegal settlements of Indigenous land and unjust appropriation of Indigenous jurisdiction” (Walia, 2013, 237). Second, we trace the university’s “temporal architectures” (a term we borrow from Sara Sharma, 2014) as a means of exploring how the interdependencies of temporal privilege and oppression operate in our universities. This analysis involves tracing, for example, how the (slow) scholarship of (tenured) faculty is already dependent on the (sped-up) time and labor of graduate students, lecturers and campus service workers—as well as the temporalities of those outside the university, such as prisoners and domestic workers. Further, we analyze how these intertemporal relations intersect with other dynamics, including unequal, interdependent spatial relations (a ‘spatial clockwork’), racism, sexism, labor exploitation, and bureaucracy. This allows us to describe possibilities for developing relations of solidarity across different struggles within and outside the university. Thus, in undertaking this analysis, we aim to move beyond mere allyship and toward becoming *accomplices* in shared struggles, organizing alongside those who inhabit the university’s boundaries and those who are exiled and excluded from it. We conclude this paper by proposing ways that intertemporal, interspatial, decolonial *study* (rather than just scholarship) offers opportunities to engage in politics in ways that attend to ongoing colonial logics and intertwine an ethics of care and solidarity with everyday acts of resistance.

**Deromanticizing the University with a Decolonial Genealogy**

In the Spring of 2016, students on at least seventy-eight U.S. campuses created lists of demands, related to ending systemic and structural racism on campus and connecting university struggles to broader social movements, especially the Movement for Black Lives. Many of these demands included the removal of names and symbols that represent the legacies of colonialism and slavery on their campuses. The students not only revealed these histories of oppression, but also continued a long tradition of struggles against colonialism and

---

3 For example, the office furniture of many state universities is produced by prison labor (Zatz, 2008), and domestic workers provide child care and cleaning services that often ‘free’ time for faculty members.

4 Our experiences from positions at research universities shape this paper, and likely skew our analysis toward this type of institution. We recognize that the terms ‘academic system,’ ‘university,’ and ‘college’ elide important, complex differences between various types of higher education institutions - such as public and private research universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, regional public universities, and for-profit universities - and that experiences with slow scholarship likely differ across and within these institutions. In continuing this project, we aim to include more of the voices and experiences of people who are positioned at other types of higher education institutions.

5 For their lists of demands, see [http://www.thedemands.org/](http://www.thedemands.org/).
racism in universities. Inspired by these students, we wonder: how could feminist slow scholarship harmonize better with anti-racist, anti-colonial movements?

Academic institutions have always been terrains of struggle between conflicting political projects. We inevitably take sides in these struggles. To take for granted any of academia’s institutions is to depoliticize them and, implicitly, to take a side in favor of maintaining them. In the “For Slow Scholarship” essay, the Great Lakes Feminist Collective express their commitment to certain sides in some of these struggles: for feminism, against neoliberalism, for decolonization, against “elitist exclusions” in the university, amongst other positions. They implicitly engage the question of what the politics of slow scholarship should be. Taking this provocation further, we ask: how should slow scholarship be articulated in relation to political projects that critique not only the neoliberal university but also academia itself? In other words, what role should slow scholarship play in resistances to the intertwined political projects of liberalism, capitalism, and modernity—i.e., what Jodi Melamed (2011) calls “liberal-capitalist modernity,” whether articulated in its settler-colonial, white-supremacist, racial-liberal, liberal-multicultural, and/or neoliberal-multicultural forms? Without this consideration, we argue, slow scholarship problematically remains bound to the preservation of the “academic project.”

As a way to denaturalize the academic project and its (slow or fast) temporal orders, we frame it with perspectives from decolonial thought. We see academia as a key institution in what Walter Mignolo (2011) calls the “modernist/colonial” project (a phrase indicating that coloniality is the “underside” of modernity), which adopts a “zero-point epistemology” in relation to knowledge production. The “zero-point epistemology” originates with 16th century European colonial maps, indicating the lines of imperial control, in which the observer views planet Earth ‘from above’ and with the Atlantic Ocean at its center (79). This epistemology uses the assumption of the zero-point as “always in the present of time and the center of space” to hide its own localness—the geo- and body-particular location in which it is made—while simultaneously “assuming to be universal and thus managing the universality to which everyone has to submit” (80). From the site of this zero-point, modernist/colonial differences are mapped out—from the difference of ‘primitive’ vs. ’civilized’ that was, and still is, used to disqualify the ways of knowing and living of non-Western peoples, to the differences of ‘educational’ vs. ‘non-educational,’ ‘academic’ vs. ‘non-academic,’ and ‘scholarship’ vs. other types of studying and writing that are used to legitimize the boundaries and norms of schools and universities.

---

6 This has resonances with Donna Haraway’s (1988, 581) critique of “instruments of visualization” that rely on the “god trick of seeing everything from nowhere,” as opposed to the “embodied objectivity” of “situated knowledges.”
In opposition to this zero-point epistemology, countless people have resisted colonization and affirmed decolonial modes of thinking that dwell in the ambiguities across colonial differences. Learning from decolonial struggles, we can draw a simple but systematically useful heuristic: ‘I am where I think,’ which “is one basic epistemic principle that legitimates all ways of thinking and de-legitimizes the pretense of a singular particular epistemology, geo-historical and bio-graphically located, to be universal” (Mignolo, 2011, 81). The decolonial imperative—as well as feminist epistemologies—call upon us to attend to how our ways of imagining and knowing the world come from particular place-and-body political situations.

The Great Lakes Feminist Collective’s slow scholarship approach takes on such a place-and-body political epistemology with their attention to the embodied experiences of working in academia. Decolonial thought inspires us to use this epistemological approach to further interrogate an abstracting, zero-point view of the “academic project.” As a de-romanticizing antidote, we apply a decolonial analysis to ideas about academia and spatio-temporality, attending to the body-and-place political conditions of the production of these ideas. This takes the form of, what we call, a decolonial, inter-temporal analysis. In the rest of this section, we present one aspect of this analysis with a critical genealogy of educational and academic institutions.

Education is but one “mode of study”—i.e., a mode of composing the means and relations for collective studying—among alternative possibilities, such as Indigenous modes of study (Meyerhoff and Thompsett, 2017). The term ‘education’ in English emerged in 1530s England, in response to people’s rebellions as a technique of governance by King George VIII’s regime (e.g., Morison, 1536, 128-9). Developments in educational institutions have long relied upon modernist/colonial dichotomies to legitimate the education-based mode of study while delegitimizing alternatives. With the expansion of colonial-capitalism across the Atlantic, its promoters, such as John Locke, articulated colonialist ideas of ‘education’ (Armitage, 2004; Locke 1669, 1693). People who had gone through European schools were framed as ‘educated’ and, thus, as part of a ‘society’ more advanced on a developmental scale of ‘time’ (separate from ‘space’ represented on colonial maps with a homogenous grid). By contrast, this colonialist framing ignored and devalued Indigenous American and African peoples’ own modes of study, framing them as ‘uneducated’ and, thus, as closer to ‘nature’ and ‘behind in time.’ These dichotomous narratives associated education with ideals of autonomy, self-governance, independence, humanity, whiteness, and civilization in contrast with figures of the ‘uneducated’ or ‘uneducable’ Black, Indian, savage, dependent, ungovernable, uncivilized, anti-human Other. Through subscribing to these narratives, European settlers imagined themselves as individualized heroes—struggling against Othered villains—for the projects of settler-colonialism, white supremacy, and capitalism. European settlers deployed these narratives to
legitimize the early American colleges, founded with money from the slavery regime and with purposes of deculturalizing Indigenous peoples, training Christian missionaries to convert Indigenous peoples, and educating leaders of settler armies, managers of slave plantations, slave traders, and merchants of slave-made goods (Wilder, 2013).

Even as they were being built, the early U.S. universities were sites of struggle between different political projects, which were entwined with different modes of study. Enslaved African people constructed the universities’ buildings, maintained their landscapes, and serviced their faculty and students. Despite the fact that these enslaved Africans were excluded from participation in the universities’ education, they practiced their own, self-organized alternative modes of study. On the margins and in the shadows of the university, out of sight of the slave-masters, African people studied together informally, in ways that nurtured their relationships and built their capacities for maintaining their communities, evading work, and, potentially, rebelling against and escaping from their slave-masters. Building on Neil Roberts’s (2015) notion of “freedom as marronage,” we could see these enslaved peoples’ mode of studying for maroon flight and community as a kind of ‘academic freedom as marronage.’ Their subversive mode of study, in but not of the university, was an early example of studying in the ‘undercommons.’

Struggles on the terrain of educational institutions have continued throughout their history. Another key academic institution, graded exams, emerged in the early 1800s United States in reaction to people’s struggles, as part of a wider political movement of ‘civilizing’ through mass policing, mass education, and Indian boarding schools (Hanson, 1993, 194; Neocleous, 2014, 121-137; Whitehouse, 2014). New modes of policing and education were instituted as forms of ‘crowd control’—to maintain the capitalist, colonial, white supremacist, and hetero-patriarchal mode of ordering the world in response to disordering threats.

---

7 We are inspired here by Moten and Harney’s (2013) metaphor of “the maroon community” to describe the undercommons: “[The subversive intellectual] disappears into the underground, the downlow low-down maroon community of the university, into the undercommons of enlightenment, where the work gets done, where the work gets subverted, where the revolution is still black, still strong. … Maroon communities of composition teachers, mentorless graduate students, adjunct Marxist historians, out or queer management professors, state college ethnic studies departments, closed-down film programs, visa-expired Yemeni student newspaper editors, historically black college sociologists, and feminist engineers. … How do those who exceed the profession, who exceed and by exceeding escape, how do those maroons problematize themselves, problematize the university, force the university to consider them a problem, a danger? ... The undercommons, its maroons, are always at war, always in hiding. … It is not just the labor of the maroons but their prophetic organization that is negated by the idea of intellectual space in an organization called the university. This is why the negligence of the critical academic is always at the same time an assertion of bourgeois individualism” (26, 30, 31).
These struggles riddled the political terrain of higher education as well. During the Red Scare around World War I, a cluster of key academic institutions—tenure, academic freedom, and professionalist faculty trade unions—emerged as part of faculty’s compromise with university administrators (Barrow, 1990). Adopting these institutions foreclosed alternative possibilities for faculty self-determination and self-defense, such as through radical unions with an industrial rather than professional trade focus, aimed at building relations of solidarity across divisions of faculty, students, other kinds of workers, and the unemployed.

Despite the historical dominance of modernist/colonial projects in universities, political movements have asserted alternative, oppositional projects. This history of struggles can be seen in the attempts to create and maintain departments of Black Studies, Third World Studies, Native American Studies, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, among others. Framing these struggles for Studies departments as a kind of “minor politics” (Thoburn, 2003), these ‘minor’ movements faced the challenges of, on the one hand, avoiding marginalization and co-optation while, on the other hand, working to resist and subvert the university’s ‘major’ projects, to appropriate resources for studying from the dominant disciplines and university administrations, and to expand their alternative, ‘minor’ projects. These challenges are thoroughly inter-related, as the impetus and strength of these movements has come from outside the university, while the forces for co-optation inside the university have served to disconnect campus organizing from their lifespring in external political projects.

As a prime example, Black Studies was born out of the confluence of the Black Campus Movement with the wider movements of civil rights, anti-war, Black Power, Black Arts, and Black Aesthetics, among others. The most radical expressions of the Black Campus Movement sought to abolish white supremacist universities while expropriating their resources and replacing them with a Black University (Rogers, 2012). The first Black Studies program, at San Francisco State College, began as classes autonomous from the control of the administration or any established discipline, through a student-organized Experimental College that used student government to appropriate resources—classrooms, supplies, and funds to pay teachers—from SF State College (Biondi, 2012, 46). Members of the Black

8 Including those drawing on intersectional theory, which emerged from women of color feminist movements that recognized that “the major systems of oppression are interlocking” (Combahee River Collective 1995, 232).

9 Historian of higher education, Mark Paschal (2012), has examined the long tradition of how major transformations of universities has come from external movements: “History teaches that universities, even before the modern era, act as a conservative influence—the inertia of their forms is such to dampen efforts to revolutionize them. It is through the founding of outside bodies that can apply pressure—in line with the development of knowledge associated with a rising class—that universities have had reform thrust upon them in the past.”
Panther Party taught and took some of these courses. In order to expand and strengthen these courses, the students and faculty organized for an official Black Studies Department. They collaborated across movements in a coalition of ethnic student groups called the Third World Liberation Front, and engaged in a five-month long strike (from November 6, 1968 until March 21, 1969—still the longest strike by students at a U.S. academic institution), until the administration gave into their demands for a College of Ethnic Studies that contained a Black Studies Department.

In their reaction to this movement, SF State administrators were pioneers in what soon became a wider trend: the ‘contingentization’ or ‘adjunctification’ of faculty labor. Before the late-1960s, the category of ‘adjunct’ was used as an honorific term for people who were employed elsewhere while teaching at the university on the side. But, in counter-response to the emerging Black Studies as well as Women’s Studies programs, according to Nick Mitchell (2016), “by the turn of the seventies, there’s a full-fledged form of casualization that is being articulated through the adjuncts when university administrators realize it’s useful, particularly to be able to en masse hire people to be in these programs.” The lack of tenure protections for faculty in these programs made them susceptible to administrative manipulation. Once the students in the movements who had pushed for these programs graduated and the movements died down, the administration had free reign to reduce the programs’ strength. As Mitchell notes, they could “either not rehire those same people who have been hired into the programs or fire them, as San Francisco state … president Hayakawa, when the black studies faculty submitted their budget 20 minutes late … he just fired the entire department! … And then he just reconstituted Black Studies under his own vision” (ibid.). Seeing the birth of the administrative push for the contingentization of faculty as tied with the conservative backlash against the birth of radical, minor disciplines, motivates us to re-frame resistance to contingentization today in relation to other radical movements on campuses, including those against racism, hetero-patriarchy, and colonialism. To treat the ‘adjunct crisis’ as merely a ‘labor issue’ would be to depoliticize these links with other struggles.

Despite Black Studies’ powerful beginnings, some scholars have argued that the field became co-opted and lost much of its vital connection with liberatory movements (e.g., Biondi, 2012; Rogers, 2012; Rojas, 2010). Sylvia Wynter (2006), for example, argues that Black Studies movements became “sanitized of their original heretical dynamic” and were reincorporated “into the Liberal-universalist mainstream” as “‘African-American Studies,’ and as such, but one ‘Ethnic’ Studies variant among a diverse range of others, all contrasted with, at the same time as they were integrated into, the ostensible universalism of Euro-American centered mainstream scholarship” (112). To unroot this co-optation, Wynter argues for subversion of the university’s dominant epistemology, interrogating “the necessarily devalorizing terms of the biocentric descriptive statement of Man”
Drawing a parallel between Wynter’s argument and Walter Mignolo’s (2011) decolonial theory, this is the ‘zero-point’ epistemology of modernity/coloniality, with its dichotomies of ‘human vs. animal,’ ‘society vs. nature,’ and ‘space vs. time.’ Reclaiming the university for projects of Black liberation and decolonization requires jettisoning this modernist/colonial epistemology in favor of place-and-body political epistemologies and alternative modes of study.

This brief critical genealogy gives us reasons to question assumptions of academic institutions’ benevolence and inevitability as the only possible mode of organizing the means and relations of collective studying. Through continually recognizing and unsubscribing from these assumptions, we can open up imaginal paths for thinking about how these institutions maintain unequal relations in the university today. Reflecting on how they largely emerged as reactions to people’s struggles against oppression, we can better understand the possibilities for continuing these struggles, dismantling the university’s unequal relations, and cultivating alternatives.

Revealing Unequal Temporal Architectures and Spatial Clockworks

Critiques of neoliberal tendencies in higher education can imply nostalgia for a liberal-democratic ideal of the university. This ideal harkens back to the vision of a special space, whether the agora or the university, where citizens can enjoy “the slow intersubjective time of a contemplative and deliberative public sphere” (Sharma, 2014, 12). Hence the feelings of anxiety about ‘speed-up,’ which troubles the liberal ideal of the slowly deliberative citizen in the public sphere. Amid anxious discussions about ‘speed-up,’ there is often an assumed need to reject it in favor of a general call for ‘slowness’ (Pels, 2003; Honoré, 2004, 2014). The problem with this central politicizing of temporality is that it is often coupled with a relative depoliticizing of other important struggles on the terrain of universities, which—fast or slow—challenge the underlying assumptions of the academic project.

Politicizing temporality does not necessarily depoliticize these other struggles, but it does so when it is accompanied with the circulation of a naturalized image of the university as a kind of map that orders both space and time. Through composing the boundaries and populations represented on this map with various dichotomies (‘teachers’ vs. ‘students,’ ‘instruction’ vs. ‘research,’ ‘tenure-stream faculty’ vs. ‘contingent faculty,’ ‘class-time’ vs. ‘free-time,’ ‘value’ vs. ‘waste,’ ‘campus’ vs. ‘community,’ ‘semester’ vs. ‘break’ etc.), the map provides the viewer with a seemingly stable lens that simplifies their view of the complex terrain of university struggles. This map occludes certain power relations and inequalities. For example, those who subscribe to this image tend to see
themselves as separate from the map—hovering above it as observing ‘experts’—rather than as fully entangled in its power relations.\textsuperscript{10} Thereby, this map allows those who use it to frame ‘problems’ in ways that authorize themselves to prescribe ‘solutions’ in managerial and technical terms.

This is evident, for example, in the Great Lakes Feminist Collective’s list of “strategies” for feminist slow-scholarship practitioners—with the implicit referent subject of the authors’ positions as ‘expert’ tenure-stream faculty. To solve their narrated ‘problem of speed-up,’ they propose self-management techniques, such as more efficient personal email usage (“write fewer emails” and “turn off email”), as well as labor management strategies that include supporting “Adjunct Action” (rebranded in 2015 as “Faculty Forward”), the reform-focused Service Employee International Union (SEIU)’s campaign for contingent faculty (Mountz et al. 2015, 1249-1253). In each of these strategies, the authors depoliticize the unequal power dynamic between tenure-class and contingent-class faculty. For example, contingent faculty often do not have the temporal privilege of tenure-stream faculty to withdraw from email, due to their dependence on email communication for seeking and maintaining jobs, interacting with students on their heavy teaching loads, and maintaining networks of mutual support amidst the stresses of precarity. Likewise, while SEIU’s adjunct campaign engages in important organizing to improve the working conditions of all faculty, they undertake this organizing within the naturalized limits of the class divide between tenure-stream and contingent faculty—i.e., their reformist approach forecloses the possibility of abolishing the two-tiered faculty system.

As an antidote to such managerial approaches to the terrain of university struggles, we offer an alternative that not only affirms these struggles’ complexity, but also highlights their inter-temporal, inter-spatial, and intersectional connections. In doing so, we also call attention to the interrelations of space and time—as ‘time-space’—and how these relations are not only political, but can change the ways that we think about politics (Massey, 2005). For this purpose, we draw on our earlier critical genealogy, underlining how modernist/colonial dichotomies have been fundamental for both the development of different academic institutions and the entrenchment of an individualized, competitive form of academic subjectivity. In addition, we point to the ways that people understand their experiences of time-space through the modernist/colonial dichotomy of ‘time vs. space,’ in which they subscribe to a view of spatiality and temporality \textit{as if} they were separated and abstracted from each other. With these critical lenses, we reveal

\textsuperscript{10} Our critique of this spatio-temporal map image of the university is an adaptation of Timothy Mitchell’s argument in \textit{Rule of Experts} (2002) about the “self-deception” of development organizations in their mapping of the “object of development” of a particular nation-state: “as a discourse of external rationality, symbolized as the consciousness that unfolds Egypt as a map, the literature of development can never describe its own place in this configuration of power” (233).
how people’s subscriptions to modernist/colonial dichotomies serve to disavow, suppress, or legitimate the webs of structural inequalities and violences that pervade academic institutions. These structures are inter-woven with each other as aspects of how the political project of liberal-capitalist modernity—bound up with the education-based mode of study—is promoted and institutionalized on university campuses. For the purpose of offering tools for analyzing particular situations (which we demonstrate in the next section), we distinguish these structural aspects into four key types.

First, through *unequal temporal architectures*, the privileged temporalities of some subjects in the university depend on the (often hidden) labor of others, who experience more restricted and controlled temporalities. This interdependence is due to a certain “temporal architecture,” which, as put forward by Sharma (2014, 20), ensures that “built environments, commodities and services, and technologies [are] directed to the management and enhancement of a certain kind of subject’s time—a privileged temporality.” Whether this privileged temporality is ‘fast’ or ‘slow,’ the temporal architecture and “social organisation” of time-space (Massey, 2005, 180) ensure that as some workers gain control over their experiences of time-space, others lose such control and thereby come to experience temporality and spatiality as increasingly oppressive and as abstracted from each other (e.g. feeling that they are ‘running out of time’ and ‘boxed in’). A tenure-stream faculty member’s ability to take part in slow scholarship, for example, is dependent on the labor of teaching assistants and contingent faculty as well as campus custodial, clerical, transportation, food service, and maintenance workers who create and maintain the enabling conditions for ‘slowness’ (although not their own). Universities’ increasing reliance on “just-in-time labor” provided by part-time contingent instructors has only increased the disparities—in wages, benefits, and spatio-temporal privileges—between academic workers (Baker, 2016; AAUP, 2015). Low-wage and contingent workers can “afford much less than [faculty] to choose to go slow” (Martell, 2014, 14). Professors also have temporal interdependencies with students, as professors’ ability to take ‘slowed-down, self-determined’ time for research is funded through capital from students paying tuition and going into debt, giving students experiences of temporal anxiety about an imagined, but uncertain, future. Debt also constrains students’ experiences of temporality into an instrumental, commodified view of time: “this state of indebtedness—and the need to ‘pay up’ in the future—backforms onto courses of study as students (and their parents) map a path through the university in anticipation of this future as a subject in debt, deferring to some other time the pleasure of exploration and collective experimentation” (Meyerhoff, Johnson, and Braun, 2011, 490).

Second, unequal temporal architectures are complemented by unequal *spatial* relations in the university. In these *unequal spatial clockworks*, the spatial privileges of some are interdependent with others’ spatial oppressions. To
complement Sharma’s metaphorical concept of ‘temporal architecture,’ we propose the concept of spatial clockwork to indicate the stabilized, rigid, mechanical, and interdependent relations between people’s experiences of spatiality across different place-and-body positions (imagine a clock’s interlocking gears of various sizes turning together in synchronicity to ‘keep time’). As pointed out by Doreen Massey (2005), the question raised by “speed-up” is “not whether space will be annihilated but what kinds of multiplicities... and relations will be co-constructed” with new spatio-temporal configurations (91). University administrators maintain the university’s territorial borders with a kind of miniature “state effect” (Mitchell, 1999). Along with the defined temporal orders of semester and class period, spatial zones of legitimate ‘education’ are demarcated as the territories of campus and classroom, which are framed “as homologous with the areas of the school administrators’ and faculties’ authority over the community of people in those territories” (Dyke and Meyerhoff, 2013, 271). These territory-authority relations rely on a dualistic view of the world: the political being of ‘the university’ (analogous with ‘the state’) is framed as an abstract, unified representation separate from the material, socio-economic world (the places of the university campus and its surroundings, and the bodies of people that occupy and move through them). University administrators govern campus territories by legislating its rules from a ‘zero-point’ epistemological perspective and deploying police to patrol the campus, therein maintaining the university’s spatio-temporal borders (regulating who can be where and when) and enforcing its regulations with the threat of physical violence.

Third, the university’s hierarchies of labor of various kinds (emotional, imaginative, interpretive, manual, reproductive, etc.) are bound up with hierarchies of modes of study and knowledge. Some kinds of labor are framed as a ‘waste of time’ for some people and not for others. With the modernist/colonial dichotomy of ‘value vs. waste,’ processes of disposal—devaluing and rubbing some peoples’ emotional, intellectual, and reproductive labor—are the co-constitutive underside of tenure-stream academics’ and others’ production of ‘value’ in the university. The university’s uneven temporal architecture is bound up with these hierarchies, as seen, for example, along lines of race. The privileged temporalities of white students and faculty are dependent on the temporal labor of students and faculty of color, particularly their emotional and interpretive labor of negotiating the racialized norms about how to display their feelings in classrooms (Wingfield, 2010). The latter challenge is magnified for women of color faculty who grapple with self-doubt from wondering “whether or not they were doubly burdened by their gender and their race” (Kadowaki and Subramanian, 2014, 168). This emotional labor in the classroom is tied with processing experiences with racism on campus more broadly, whether institutional, overt, or micro-aggressive. People of color engage in this labor individually and collectively, such as in student groups, campus centers, and Ethnic Studies departments, wherein they create their own “subalternative architecture of time” (Sharma, 2014, 76)—making their own minor
time-spaces in order to study together and survive within, and despite, the major
institution. From an administrative perspective, this emotional labor of processing
racism is necessary for defusing racial ‘crises’ and producing an appearance of
peaceful ‘multiculturalism and diversity,’ so that people who subscribe to norms of
whiteness can avoid devoting their time to thinking about race.

Fourth, the temporal architectures, spatial clockworks, and hierarchies of
labor and knowledge are governed through bureaucratic modes of organizing.
Bureaucracies are, what David Graeber (2015) calls, “ways of organizing
stupidity,” which exist because of structural violences in myriad forms, especially
along lines of race, coloniality, gender, class, sexuality, and ability. Bureaucracies
are ways of managing, while maintaining, the relations characterized by “lopsided
structures of the imagination,” wherein “those on the bottom of the heap have to
spend a great deal of imaginative energy trying to understand the social dynamics
that surround them—including having to imagine the perspectives of those on
top—while the latter can wander about largely oblivious to much of what is going
on around them” (81). Layers of academic bureaucracy have been built upon each
other as “ways of organizing the stupidity” of academia’s structural violences.
With “divided governance” in academia, the administration’s governance of the
university’s political-economic affairs is complemented with the faculty’s
governance of knowledge production (Newfield, 2003), while faculty are also
recruited into administrative governance as a kind of “participatory management”
(Kamola and Meyerhoff, 2009). Academia’s bureaucracies have exploded
especially since the 1970s in the U.S., with the ranks of middle-management and
upper administration growing at a rate vastly disproportionate to student and
faculty populations (Nealon, 2007). One way of interpreting this bureaucratic
growth is as a defensive and recuperative reaction to anti-racist, feminist, and queer
movements gaining control over university resources and revealing the stupidities
of academia’s structural violences. These movements promote alternative modes of
study that—through rejecting the modernist/colonial dichotomies of the
university’s dominant mode of study—could organize the university in better ways
for realizing the potential intelligence of studying collectively.

Decolonial, Inter-temporal Resistance

For those seeking to resist the political project of liberal-capitalist
modernity at universities, our framing of the above four structural aspects of this
project offers conceptual tools for analyzing different terrains of struggle. As
illustrated by the movement for Black Studies, cultivating a politics to address
unequal temporal architectures and spatial clockworks involves revealing,
challenging, and disrupting the “embeddness” of time-spaces in “interlocking,
geometries of power” (Massey, 2005, 180). The Black campus movement has been
reinvigorated, more recently, with the 2015 Black-student-led uprising at ‘Mizzou’
(the University of Missouri). After the police killing of Mike Brown ignited an
uprising in nearby Ferguson in 2014, students at Mizzou increasingly protested against racism on their campus, forming the Concerned Student 1950 movement. On November 2nd, 2015, a graduate student, Jonathan Butler, after years of experiencing racism and ongoing frustration at the administration’s unwillingness to take action, decided to protest with a hunger strike (Landsbaum and Weber, 2015). Other students joined the protest, camping out in the middle of campus and boycotting classes. Supportive faculty threatened a walkout and the football team threatened to go on strike. These actions culminated in the resignation of the university’s president and chancellor.

This disruption of the uneven temporal architecture and spatial clockwork of the university depended, in part, on the embodiment of different relations to time-space by Butler and others. Through collective organizing and decision-making, they reclaimed control of campus time-space. Interrupting the normative temporal architecture, they ‘slowed down’ university time to address issues of racism on campus, while in other respects, they ‘sped up’ the experience of time for some people, as they motivated faculty and administrators’ to engage with the struggle on campus. Likewise, throwing a wrench into the university’s spatial clockwork, the students deployed their bodies in relation to particular places—such as when protesting students blocked the president’s car and camped out on the campus quad—forcing the administration to pay attention to their demands. In the process, the students expanded and re-entwined their own experiences of spatiality and temporality. In other words, they took control of how they moved through time-space—through the hunger strike, the walkouts, and when the football players threatened to withhold their mostly Black bodies from participation in the fast-paced, spectacular sport that the administration had made so central to the university’s identity and finances. By reorganizing campus time-space to allow for forms of collective care, solidarity, and resistance, they broadened beyond themselves the responsibility for the emotional and time-intensive labor of dismantling racism.

Inspired by Mizzou and other historical and ongoing campus uprisings—such as the #FeesMustFall movement in South Africa—we seek an approach to collective study (whether fast or slow) that synergizes with their decolonizing, abolitionist insurgencies within, against, and beyond universities. We ask: what can we learn from these movements for developing inter-temporally and inter-spatially reflective scholarship that is attentive to an ethics of care and acknowledges (and works to dismantle) the inequities of the university’s temporal architectures and spatial clockworks? To explore this line of inquiry, we analyze two examples from our own campuses: the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Duke University.

The Real UW

A spate of racist incidents on UW-Madison’s campus in 2016—including the posting of swastikas and images of Adolf Hitler on a Jewish student’s door, the
disruption and heckling of a Native American healing ceremony, the racially-charged assault on female students of color who were threatened, shoved and spat on, the costume worn by UW-Madison football fans depicting President Obama with a noose around his neck, and most recently, the founding of a white nationalist group on campus—have led to protest actions and campus-wide organizing by students, faculty, staff and community members. In the spring of 2016, students started a twitter campaign, #TheRealUW, in order to draw attention to the everyday experiences of discrimination and harassment on campus, the institutional racism of the university, and the university administration’s “indirect,” “watered down,” and largely rhetorical responses to racist incidents on campus, which have tended to cite liberal notions of freedom of speech while glossing over the past and current challenges faced by people of color at the predominately white institution (Geyer, 2016a; Saxena, 2016). This campaign, which also included a visual component (featuring photos of students holding boards with descriptions of the micro-aggressions they have experienced on campus) posted to Facebook, not only unsettled university time-space (capturing daily interruptions of campus spaces), but also offered swift interventions in the university administration’s social media branding efforts—especially their attempts to control the discourse around racism on campus.

Students, faculty and staff members have also pointed to the administration’s disparate responses to perpetrators of racist violence and those who draw attention to this violence (Geyer, 2016b). For example, when a student of color allegedly used graffiti to highlight racism on and off campus (including, “Racism is in the air. Don’t breathe”), UW-Madison police (UWPD) arrested the student in the middle of his Black Visual Art class on vandalism charges. According to witnesses of the arrest, one of the arresting officers said, “[the student] had his chance to get his message out and now it’s our turn” (Tomsyck, 2016). In response, faculty and staff members created a petition, denouncing UWPD’s actions, calling for accountability from the UW administration, and insisting that the student be allowed to graduate. Several faculty members suggested that the university administration was more concerned with protecting

11 While racist incidents on campus are not new, there have been a number of high profile incidents that have gained broader public attention—due in part to campus organizing. The number of incidents reported to the University’s Bias Response Team more than tripled during the first half of 2016 (Brookins, 2016).

12 For example, in response to the costume worn by fans at the UW football game depicting President Obama with a noose around his neck, the administration tweeted that while “repugnant and counter to the values of the university,” the costume was “an exercise of the individual’s right to free speech” (https://twitter.com/UWMadison/status/792571502251999232).

13 For posts related to #TheRealUW, see https://twitter.com/search?q=%23therealuw&lang=en. For photos and messages of the related ‘The Real UW - A Visual Campaign,’ see https://www.facebook.com/UWavisualcampaign.
“the symbols of UW as a progressive institution” (such as campus buildings) than the students “fighting for social change, and apparently their lives.” They also cited the seeming lack of respect for certain classroom spaces on campus, suggesting that because the interrupted class “deal[t] with ethnic studies content and social justice issues,” the UWPD did not consider it “worthy of respect” and failed to recognize the authority of the professor teaching the class when she attempted to intervene.\(^\text{14}\)

After the student’s arrest, hundreds of students, faculty and staff members across campus—led by a coalition of activists working to end violence against communities of color on and off campus—participated in a walkout and rally framed around “disrupting white supremacy and anti-black racism at UW-Madison.”\(^\text{15}\) Participants also called for community control over campus police, echoing a wider discussion in the city of Madison around police accountability and demilitarization. As put by a student and community organizer, “We just want to be part of the decision-making processes in terms of hiring, firing, and setting priorities of the UWPD” (Lamen, 2016). The action involved the occupation of a main campus library and several street intersections around campus for the amount of time that the arrested student was kept out of class, therein disrupting normative university time-space and illustrating how the institution’s temporal architecture and spatial clockwork value some people’s time and space over others.

The incidents and subsequent political organizing at UW-Madison not only highlighted everyday racial injustice and discrimination on campus, but also the university’s legacy of racism and colonialism. In early 2016, a Ho-Chunk healing ceremony for Native American survivors of sexual assault\(^\text{16}\) on campus was disrupted by a group of students living in the Dejope residence hall (named after the Ho-Chunk word for the Madison area) shouting stereotypical “war cries” (Kennedy, 2016). As pointed out in the campus protests that followed, this incident not only reflected ongoing racism and white ignorance on campus, but also drew attention to the university’s colonial history (and present). As one student activist put it, “The university wants us to believe that [recent racially-motivated incidents are] weird, it’s rare [...] It’s been happening since the inception of UW-Madison” (Savidge, 2016). Not only was the land that the university occupies, known as the Dejope or “Four Lakes” area, unjustly appropriated from Indigenous peoples, but

\(^\text{14}\) Quotes from the faculty and staff petition. To read the entire petition, see: http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/uw-madison-no-more-anti.


\(^\text{16}\) According to the 2015 Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Assault Climate Survey conducted by the Association of American Universities (AAU), at the University of Wisconsin, 47% of female-presenting Native American students reported being sexually assaulted (Westat, 2015).
the building of the campus itself destroyed and truncated multiple effigy mounds\(^\text{17}\) (originally constructed between 400 and 1200 AD), which continue to be important sacred sites and spiritual centers for communities like the Ho-Chunk Nation to this day (Birmingham and Rankin, 1994). While the remaining mounds on campus have been protected from further disruption\(^\text{18}\), there has been little recognition of these sites—or the people that constructed them—by those that now reside on and alongside them on a daily basis\(^\text{19}\).

The organizing at UW-Madison has also drawn connections between, on the one hand, individual experiences of harassment and discrimination, and on the other hand, the historical, institutionalized racism and colonialism that undergird the university itself. In making these connections across the university’s time-space—and raising questions of whose spaces, times, and lives matter on campus—students, faculty, staff and other community members have been building forms of collective recognition and resistance. Ultimately, the charges against the student who allegedly spray-painted campus buildings with political graffiti were dropped and the recent efforts to start a white supremacist group on campus were abandoned, due in no small part to both the speedy responses and deliberative planning of student organizers. The student government also successfully passed resolutions calling for increased transparency into the UW-Madison Police Department and for “reparations for the systemic denial of access to high quality educational opportunities in the form of full and free access for all black people (including undocumented and currently and formerly incarcerated people) to UW-Madison,” echoing the demands from the national Movement for Black Lives\(^\text{20}\). The hashtag, #TheRealUW, has continued to draw attention to racist incidents on campus and to the ways that, as put by Tyriek Mack of the Associated Students of Madison, “the University’s brand and prestige benefits from their practices of exclusion and white supremacy” (Desai, 2017). The campaign thus has highlighted the role of social media in movement-relevant scholarship, as it has allowed for not only collective and timely responses to events on and off campus, but has also been used to challenge the University’s ‘progressive’ brand and public image.

\(^{17}\) It is estimated that 80% of the effigy mounds located in Wisconsin have been destroyed (Recollection WI, 2015).

\(^{18}\) State law currently protects the burial mounds, but legislation proposed in December 2015 (Assembly Bill 620) would weaken these protections, allowing for the disturbance, desecration and, in some cases, destruction of these sites (Hughes, 2016). While lawmakers have yet to vote on the bill, local tribes and supporters have been protesting this proposed legislation.

\(^{19}\) There are now some efforts to increase awareness, including a tour of campus spaces that are key Indigenous sites and Wisconsin Act 31, which is a statutory requirement that all state school districts provide instruction in the sovereignty, history and culture of the twelve tribes in the state.

\(^{20}\) The entire resolution can be viewed at: https://www.facebook.com/blackoutnewsletter/photos/pcb.1192197934210740/1192181070879093/?type=3&theater.
**Dismantle Duke Plantation**

In our second case study, at Duke University, recent anti-racist protests involved a week-long occupation of an administration building and a month-long encampment in the quad outside the building. The protests were continuous with a series of responses to racist incidents on campus, leading to a crescendo in March 2016 in response to the revelation that a top Duke administrator, Vice-President Tallman Trask, had hit a parking attendant, Shelvia Underwood, with his Porsche and allegedly called her a “stupid n*****,” when he was ‘in a hurry’ to get to a football game on August 30, 2014. Investigative reports in the Duke Chronicle in 2016 revealed the University’s two-year attempt to cover-up and bury the controversy, which is intertwined with layers of institutional racism (Ramkumar and Chason, 2016a; 2016b). Framing their protest actions with the slogan and hashtag of #DismantleDukePlantation, the organizers of the protest group, Duke Students and Workers in Solidarity, have highlighted and problematized Duke University’s historical and ongoing settler-colonial, white-supremacist, liberal-capitalist modernist mode of organizing its relations with the land. The #DismantleDukePlantation movement seeks to call people’s attention to what Duke professor, Mark Anthony Neal (2016) calls the “plantation politics” of the university. They highlight how Duke University’s wealth was historically accumulated through tobacco plantations and factories that relied upon racial discrimination, segregation, and violence in the Jim Crow South to exploit the labor of Black workers. Also, with the protesters’ demands (such as a living wage for all campus workers) they draw attention to the contemporary ways in which the exploited labor of the approximately 70% Black service workers (with constrained experiences of time-space) creates the conditions for the mostly white administrators, faculty, and students to enjoy more privileged experiences of time-space (Neal, 2016). The administration’s response to the protests has been to attempt to re-bury the controversy by deploying its bureaucratic tools of Public Relations officers, ‘diversity’ managers, and high-priced lawyers, whose narratives seek to delegitimize and suppress the unsanctioned imaginative labor of the protesters. The administrators’ attempts to control the public narrative reveal Duke’s deep financial and emotional investments in maintaining an epistemology of “white ignorance” (Mills, 2007)—i.e., ways of ‘knowing what not to know,’ therein suppressing thought that might threaten the dominance in academia of liberal-capitalist, modernist/colonial relations.

21 For pictures, news, and analysis of these events by organizers of Duke Students and Workers in Solidarity, see https://www.facebook.com/dukestudentsworkersinsolidarity/.

22 The movement of Duke Students and Workers in Solidarity had some success in pressuring the Duke University administration to raise the minimum wage of campus workers to $12 to $13 per hour, effective January 1, 2017 (though this minimum does not apply to out-sourced workers with University contractors). See http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2016/08/minimum-wage-13-dollars.
The university’s unequal inter-temporal and inter-spatial relations extend beyond its borders. The university’s normative narrative of a dichotomy between ‘campus’ and ‘community’ obscures how the different conditions of people’s labor, life, and study across these time-spaces are thoroughly co-constituted with each other. For example, Sarah Sharma (2014) observes how, in the Durham neighborhoods around Duke University’s campus, mostly Latina women engage in the low-wage temporal labor of cleaning the houses of academics who work at Duke, enabling their “temporal ritual” of having a “clean house for the weekend” (24). The #DismantleDukePlantation movement highlighted another kind of extra-campus inter-temporal and inter-spatial relations around Duke: with persons incarcerated in jails and prisons. Although the Durham County Jail is geographically close to Duke’s campus—less than two miles away—students, faculty, and administrators have a vast emotional distance from the mostly poor, mostly Black and Latinx, people who are caged there. Many distancing effects suppress these university-based subjects’ potential thought of the shared temporal architecture and spatial clockwork that connects them with prisoners. Yet, some workers on campus are much more emotionally close with prisoners. At a teach-in on ‘Prisons and Universities’ that Duke Students and Workers in Solidarity organized in their protest encampment, a student noted how a woman who works on Duke’s campus, in a low-wage food service job, is the daughter of a Black man who died of medical neglect in the jail in January 2015—in the cramped, lonely time-space of a cell. This student, Mina Ezikpe, had been involved in organizing in solidarity with prisoners and their families, through local groups, Inside-Outside Alliance and the Durham Jail Investigation Team, and through her own research-advocacy on women’s re-entry after incarceration in North Carolina, as well as on-campus with students organizing a protest against a ‘prison-themed party.’ She engaged in interpretive, emotional, imaginative labor to produce narratives that could help her audience bridge their emotional divide between the university and the jail.

Other links of higher education with the prison industry, such as through endowment investments, have been highlighted through ‘prison divestment’

---

23 We use Latinx here as a gender neutral term, acknowledging identities outside the gender binary.
24 For information on the death of Dennis McMurray in the jail, and the perspective of his daughter, Shakiyla Young, see https://amplifyvoices.com/2016/02/21/they-all-need-to-be-kicked-in-the-ass/.
movements, such as at Columbia and CUNY. Faculty and student time-spaces are interconnected with those of prisoners: university students and faculty use time-space for their own self-making projects through earning credit hours, while prisoners have time-space imposed upon them. These educational and carceral modes of making time-spaces are complementary forms of disciplinary practices, and they are also co-constitutively related as *inverse* processes in a common “mode of accounting” that traverses the universities’ and prisons’ temporal architectures (Joseph, 2014). Students’ time earns them social credits while prisoners’ time pays off ‘debts to society.’ In the #DismantleDukePlantation protests, the students made lines of care and solidarity between their own struggles and those of prisoners when they used a chant—“We see you! We love you!”—to call up to the student occupiers on the balcony of the administrative building, and they announced that they had learned this chant from protesting at the local jail. Their actions inspire us to ask: for connecting abolitionist, decolonial movements across prisons and universities, how can we expand and democratize the temporal, emotional, imaginative labor involved in studying collectively and building relationships of care and solidarity across these sites?

**Conclusion**

Rejecting the assumptions that undergird a romanticized view of the academic system, we argue that the system isn’t broken, but rather it was built this way—shaped in the image of modernist/colonial fantasies. Rather than trying to work merely within the system to fix it, we should try to overcome it—grappling with the tensions of being *in* but not *of* it and, simultaneously, creating our own minor counter-institutions for collective studying. As the construction of systemically unequal academic structures has been guided through modernist/colonial ways of imagining the world, we contend that an antidote for dismantling these structures should be guided by decolonial, Indigenous, and Black radical imaginaries. With such an approach, we move away from the central politicizing of time present in ‘slow scholarship,’ which tends to rely on a dichotomy of ‘space vs. time’ and to de-emphasize other important axes of political struggles in the university. While we take the relay from the Great Lakes Feminist Collective’s feminist and collective formulation of slow scholarship, we argue for an approach to scholarship (slow or fast) that goes beyond critiques of neoliberal institutions of higher education to challenge the “academic project” itself. In doing so, we aspire to a decolonial strategy, not with a merely metaphorical sense of decolonization, but with a literal sense of decolonization that centers the reclamation of *land* for Indigenous resurgences (Tuck and Yang, 2012). Drawing

---

on Indigenous interpretations of ‘land’ as inter-relations between the soil, humans, non-human animals, plants, water, soil, air, etc., we heed Leanne Simpson’s (2014) call to engage these inter-relations of land as itself a “pedagogy,” in which studying, knowledge creation, relationship building, and movement organizing are intertwined with each other.

In undertaking this decolonial approach to campus struggles, we can give land-centered analyses of universities’ ‘temporal architectures’ and ‘spatial clockworks.’ We began an approximation of this approach in our above analyses of the #theRealUW and #DismantleDukePlantation movements. As a precondition for composing our forces in a project of dismantling the modernist/colonial academic system and supporting Indigenous resurgences and other alternative forms of world-making, we need to start with understanding what divides us. To go beyond being merely aspirational allies, we can only become *accomplices* in a shared struggle through tracing out how the spatio-temporal privileges of some are bound up with the spatio-temporal oppressions of others, thereby opening up possibilities for mutual liberation (Indigenous Action, 2014). Tracing our spatio-temporal inter-dependencies with others is necessary for understanding how our activities *in* the university can (or cannot) be disentangled from our activities that make us *of* the university, i.e., tied with its modernist/colonial ways of world-making. This can take the form of tracing how we are currently pitted against each other via certain constituted relations that include not only human-to-human relations but also inter-relations amongst humans, campus buildings, the campus grounds, roads, buses, flowers, bacteria, classrooms, books, computers, cafeterias, kitchens, custodians’ closets, blackboards, and many other non-human entities.

With the recent election of Donald Trump, the rise of political elites with open contempt for public institutions, and the growing presence of the so-called ‘Alt-Right,’ the kind of inter-temporal, decolonial intervention in institutions of higher education that we propose here has arguably become increasingly important for several reasons. First, amid the more explicit challenges to public education, there will be a need to ward off tendencies towards defensive orientations that seek to preserve the status quo or romanticize the institutions of the past. For example, in the face of current efforts to hollow out tenure and undercut professionalist faculty trade unions, there is the potential to put into question the ways that these institutions have maintained a two-tiered faculty system and limited the power of faculty to organize in solidarity with their fellow workers. Such questioning can open our horizons of possibility to alternative kinds of unions, such as with the Industrial Workers of the World, which have an industrial focus (i.e., for organizing across the whole education industry) that could build power to defend against the right-wing onslaught on public education and to push for radical democracy and intersectional revolutionary principles in university workplaces and beyond.
Second, the urgency of the political situation will demand more and different forms of fast as well as slow scholarship—not for the sake of publication metrics, but to enable timely responses to current events that academic institutions and norms do not currently value. As shown in the recent organizing at UW-Madison and Duke, students—and some faculty and staff—are using social media to enable fast collective studying about ongoing events, facilitate timely responses, sustain critical discussions about race both on and off campus, build communities of mutual aid and resistance, and intervene in and challenge the university’s discourses and branding. What would it mean to consider their tweets and Facebook posts as scholarship? Third, political mobilization is critical in the face of liberal discourses of freedom of speech that allow for and justify forms of hate-speech and violence. Rather than privileging the defense of public speech that, for example, harasses transgender students or names undocumented students, on campuses around the country groups are working to create communities that defend marginalized peoples—such as the formation of ‘sanctuary campuses,’ which adopt policies and practices to protect students and workers who are undocumented immigrants. And finally, tracing the university’s spatio-temporal inter-dependencies can disrupt the emotional economies supporting ‘epistemologies of ignorance’ that make people subscribe to a reified vision of their own time-spaces as more valuable than others, and can highlight how their own sense of safety in uncertain times is related to that of those in more precarious positions. Making the university’s temporal architectures and spatial clockworks visible through decolonial forms of study and scholarship is a necessary step toward disrupting them in our everyday practices.
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