

The Case *for* Minor Gestures

How to cite this article: Abdulla, D., & Vieira de Oliveira, P. J. S. (2023). The Case for Minor Gestures. *Diseña*, (22), Article.6. <https://doi.org/10.7764/disena.22.Article.6>

DISEÑA | 22

January 2023

ISSN 0718-8447 (print)

2452-4298 (electronic)

COPYRIGHT: CC BY-SA 4.0 CL

Original Research Article

Reception

March 30 2022

Acceptance

December 19 2022

 Traducción al español aquí

Danah Abdulla

University of the Arts London

Pedro J. S. Vieira de Oliveira

Independent Researcher



This paper lays out the groundwork for a concept we define as *minor gestures* within design education. Moving away from a conversation centered around decolonization—a term, we argue, that has been co-opted to become a placeholder for equality, diversity, and inclusion, and tick-box exercises within academic institutions—we assert that minor gestures create the conditions for meaningful conversations on what it actually means to move towards decolonizing design education. Using examples from our own pedagogical practices, we sketch out and outline a proposition for minor gestures as theory-in-the-making, or an incomplete pathway towards meaningful, structural change.

Keywords

 Decolonial design education

 Design pedagogy

 Minor gestures

 Decoloniality

 Critical pedagogy

Danah Abdulla—Ph.D. in Design, Goldsmiths, University of London. Designer, educator, and researcher, currently she holds the position of Program Director of Graphic Design at Camberwell, Chelsea, and Wimbledon Colleges of Art (University of the Arts London). She is a founding member of the Decolonising Design platform. Her research focuses on new design narratives and practices, decolonizing design, possibilities of design education, design culture(s) in the Arab region, the politics of design, and publishing. Recent publications include *Designerly Ways of Knowing: A Working Inventory of Things a Designer Should Know* (2022, Onomatopoe), 'Keep Your Distance, Wear a Mask and Stay Safe: The Visual Language of Covid-19 Print-based Signage' (*Visual Resources*, Vol. 36, Issue 3), and 'Disciplinary Disobedience: A Border-thinking Approach to Design' (in *Design Struggles: Intersecting Histories, Pedagogies, and Perspectives*; Valiz, 2021).

Pedro J. S. Vieira de Oliveira—Ph.D., Universität der Künste Berlin. After obtaining a BA degree in Graphic Design from the Universidade Estadual Paulista, he obtained a MA degree from the Hochschule für Künste Bremen. Independent researcher, sound artist, and educator, he is a former Postdoctoral Fellow in the Arts at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. He is a founding member of the Decolonising Design platform. Recent publications include 'On the Persistence of Colonial Listening in Germany' (*The Journal of Media Art Study and Theory*, Vol. 2, Issue 2), 'The Earview as a Border Epistemology: An Analytical and Pedagogical Proposition for Design' (in *Bloomsbury Handbook of Sonic Methodologies*; Bloomsbury, 2021), 'Dealing with Disaster: Notes toward a Decolonizing, Aesthetico-Relational Sound Art' (in *Bloomsbury Handbook of Sound Art*; Bloomsbury, 2021), and 'Weaponizing Quietness: Sound Bombs and the Racialization of Noise' (*Design and Culture*, Vol. 11, Issue 2).



The Case for Minor Gestures

Danah Abdulla

University of the Arts London
Camberwell, Chelsea, and Wimbledon Colleges of Art
London, United Kingdom
d.abdulla@arts.ac.uk

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4322-4675>

Pedro J. S. Vieira de Oliveira

Independent Researcher
Berlin, Germany
pedro@oliveira.work

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0004-8578-776X>

1 The murder of George Floyd by Minnesota police in May 2020 and the subsequent protests across cities worldwide has led to increased demands to decolonize curricula from universities across the world. These include the development of toolkits for convening modules (such as diversifying reading lists), university wide anti-racism action plans and strategies (including diversity hiring quotas), and diversity and inclusion training, to name a few. This has not been limited to universities, however many companies have adopted similar strategies.

2 Variations of this saying are attributed to Abu Bakr and Joseph Ratzinger.

INTRODUCTION: A MINOR GESTURE

The emergence of the term ‘decoloniality’ within higher education has been accompanied by a demand for tangible actions that can be enacted *now*.¹ While knowledge requires action, action without knowledge is futile.² The danger in demanding a formula or a ‘toolkit’ of decolonial actions—ready at will—is that it risks becoming another form of bureaucracy, denying that decoloniality is based on context, is not measurable, and is a slow process. Moreover, the demands to decolonize curricula and diversify staff are largely within the equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) agendas, which focus on fair treatment, equal access to opportunity, and recognition of different values, abilities, and perspectives. EDI agendas however are about reform, recognition, and tolerance (increased diversity becomes the primary demand), as opposed to rethinking, reimagining, and directly confronting current practices (Noxolo, 2017). In practice, this shows that despite institutional claims to ‘decolonize’, educators and students interested in meaningful, liberatory, decolonization work are left to their own devices, to think within the micro-scale of the classroom how such claims could be taken seriously and enacted *now*.

The same can be said about meaningful structural change. Large-scale and meaningful actions—a revolution—demand planning and time. The development of possible decolonial actions and paths toward structural change is important, but can also render us to feel powerless. Therefore, we could argue “that higher education is not only incompatible but irredeemably incommensurable with decolonization” (Mayorga et al., 2019, p. 87) because this contradicts its ideological purpose and practice. To liberate ourselves from this powerlessness, we propose a stance—similar to Mayorga, Leidecker, and Orr de Gutierrez’s (2019) approach—to designers, design educators, and design students, that paves the way for decolonial actions and paths by enacting what we call *minor gestures*.

3 While the definition of minor gesture presented in this paper bears some similarities to Erin Manning's (2016) use of the same term (as an opposition to the dominant discourse from the margins), Manning's work applies it specifically to neurotypical accounts of perception and agency.

The placement of *minor*, a word whose meaning is considered not important or serious, in front of *gesture*, that is, a movement to convey a meaning, might seem at odds. Our aim however is not to follow literal definitions but to propose looking at the words 'minor' and 'gesture' without contempt. In other words, to develop a new meaning for the term *minor gestures*, one that subverts its original connotation to transform it into a descriptor of a *radical act*.³

Thinking in terms of minor gestures allows us to work on the very pervasiveness of the infrastructures of capital and colonialism. At the same time, minor gestures do not eschew the necessity of addressing the structural causes of inequality, mental illness, dehumanization, and environmental destruction; minor gestures can be a way of de-structuring and disarming that which seems inevitable to escape from.

Minor gestures are localized, subversive acts that can be performed to expand the limits of a given enclosed system. Minor gestures should not be viewed as small individual actions such as responsible consumption, diversifying a reading list, donating to a cause via direct debit as a form of activism, or the *#ClapForCarers* initiative during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic (which fails to address the extensive cuts to healthcare services since the 1970s in countries across the Global North). We understand those acts as not pushing things further *collectively* but instead delegating responsibility to the individual or someone else. Minor gestures are radical in the sense of exposing, addressing, and tackling the *root*, while they escape being caught or apprehended by common, diminishing connotations. Precisely because they are marginal, expanding *from* and *with* the spaces of liminality, minor gestures can reveal the workings of power that seem to be—but are not—perennial. They can fragment the process of dismantling infrastructures of power while avoiding detectability. Indeed, minor gestures are minor exactly because they make themselves disappear in the fabric of everyday actions, all the while remaining effective.

Whereas we believe that minor gestures can exist in many forms and be practiced in any space, here we focus on minor gestures that can be enacted as pedagogic strategies, specifically within design departments in higher education. Such a focus emerges from our own situated practices and concerns as educators: one of us teaches in the United Kingdom and the other teaches in Germany and Sweden. Both authors come from and/or have ties with the Global South (Palestine and Brazil); both have studied and now live and work in the so-called Global North (the United Kingdom and Germany). Despite holding doctoral degrees, both of us still dwell at the margins of academia, be it through precarious hourly-based contracts (or lack thereof), or with the expectation to always perform and *deliver* more than our European colleagues. These different localities of being, knowing, and sharing encompass different academic histories and structures: from the exis-

tence (or not) of student fees (location dependent), to language differences experienced and worked within the classroom (as students and educators, but also *with* them), with distinct pedagogical approaches that, in turn, yield different concerns.

Yet we both consider that these minor gestures we speak of—as a beginning—are to be framed as acts against the impositions of both a neoliberal(izing) academia as well as a class- and nationality-based ‘glass ceiling’ that reinforces the gap between what students *want* and what curricula *deliver*. Moreover, we propose these minor gestures as a pathway toward structural change. For instance, the hierarchical structures of power within higher education institutions and the interpersonal relationships between educators, students, and peers within the space of the lecture, the seminar, and/or the studio. Therefore, minor gestures view pedagogy as central to politics (or, as Paulo Freire would propose, a *method*), and the classroom as one of the most fruitful spaces for both the rehearsal and enactment of structural changes in academia and education.

Our offering is to think of minor gestures here as theory-in-the-making, as in a constant state of incompleteness. In other words, not as a method or a set of specific guidelines that can be turned into metrics and numbers, but as a provisional arrangement of practices that takes its provisionality as its core characteristic. Therefore, we would like to propose to look at these minor gestures as acts of decolonization; we understand decolonizing work as a “process, a movement without a set ending point” (Schultz et al., 2018, p. 93), and this is a good way to begin. But let us set the word decolonization aside briefly lest we incur the risk of overusing it.

In a similar way, we think of a ‘gesture’ as something in the constant act of doing—an action one does, but not necessarily completes or needs to fully complete. A gentle push, a nod, a wave or a movement whose long-term implications and meanings lie within the in-between of action and interpretation. This starting point also opens up spaces for defining what minor gestures are *not*—that is, *what we are not speaking of* when we speak of minor gestures. Minor gestures are not focused on individual instead of systemic actions, as with the example of sustainable consumption given earlier. We want to emphasize that minor gestures do not replace the need (and the demand) to dismantle institutional power, nor the collective, organized struggle towards systemic change. Instead, a minor gesture is to be viewed as a ‘build up’, a place to start, but never a finality.

From here, we would like to outline some ideas that emerged from our experiences and those we have seen enacted elsewhere, as an attempt to think not only of this text in itself as a minor gesture, but also of minor gestures as a political imperative.

ON THE PROBLEM OF INSURMOUNTABILITY

The most insidious violence of colonialism is to constantly paint itself as insurmountable. Educators, researchers, and practitioners interested in rethinking what art and design learning has been and what it should become find themselves (and we include ourselves in this) constantly confronted with the seemingly gargantuan task of decolonizing curricula within institutions. More importantly, the emotional toll this takes on academics of color doing the work of decolonization often makes the push for deep structural change seem not only endless but impossible.⁴

⁴ See, for example, Rodríguez, 2018.

As a departure point, minor gestures require an admission that a politics of insurmountability is a powerful illusion. It works precisely by telling us that change is only possible by engaging in grand, all-encompassing power sweeps—grand gestures—that would create a substantial, immediately recognizable, and describable shift. Alas, this illusion of insurmountability can lead to stasis or paralysis—by design. We might feel that gestures that beget meaningful change have to be led by immediate or major actions; or worse, we might feel that the best solution is not to act at all, lest we fail. A politics of insurmountability is but a dangerous illusion precisely because it feeds on this possibility, framed as its utmost necessity, of a grand gesture. Hence, we hang on to dangerous yet comfortable mottos such as “there is no ethical consumption under capitalism,” or “the system must be changed from within.”⁵

⁵ If “there is no ethical consumption under capitalism”, then minor gestures would allow us to think of what “ethical consumption” means before submitting to consumption because there is no other option. If ethical consumption can—possibly or speculatively—be exercised, what forms of minor gestures can be triggered by reformulating the idea of consumption under a framework of a reimagined ethics?

Here we see two problems that are not mutually exclusive but influence one another directly, and to which we would like to go a bit deeper with the idea of minor gestures. The first is the tension between individual actions and collective accountability; it might be easier to let go of the necessity of individual actions because what sustains inequality and oppression is, in fact, coloniality, capitalism, and their mechanisms of control. While this affirmation is in itself correct, it should not exclude the possibility of localized individual actions that ignite, add to, or support collective, larger actions. The second problem is the misguided idea that systems can only change, not fall; here we see the replacement of one idea with its immediate opposite, while still adhering to the same structures, hierarchies, and modes of existence that vouch and sustain for the emergence of power imbalances. Some institutions—particularly universities—are beyond change for they are invested in and for the status quo (Harney & Moten, 2013; Rodríguez, 2018). The changes minor gestures can ignite might happen in “reorganizing realities” (Anzaldúa, 2015, p. 43), that is, in turning them into everyday praxis for those directly involved and affected by power imbalances—not for the institutions that create and sustain these imbalances in the first place.

Thinking of these interrelated problems, minor gestures emerge exactly at this tension between accountability—what *must* be done—and praxis—

what can be done, *now*. It begins with an uncomfortable admission: it is impossible to ‘tick all the boxes’ of anti-oppressive work because each individual inhabits a different amalgamation of identities, *loci*, and culture that makes the work of ticking these boxes in itself impossible. Minor gestures do not accommodate but exist in opposition: they are “disturber[s] of the status quo” (Said, 1994, p. x). To remain in this space of tension between accountability and praxis is a manner of acknowledging and working within the ebbs and flows of power we inhabit and reproduce, and to cease with the idea that there are boxes to be ticked, to begin with.

Minor gestures allow us to subvert the spaces which we occupy and are in control of within our own body-politics—that is, understanding the implications of being at academic institutions while at the same time occupying a position of otherness within it. Solitary action here might not suffice, but this insufficiency should not be a reason for (or reasoned as) inaction; instead, minor gestures occur in what Stefano Harney and Fred Moten would call the ‘ensemble’—the practice of practice, the unseen but nevertheless felt chain of reaction (Harney & Moten, 2013). A multitude of minor gestures can, collectively, and plurally enact and enable radical rethinking and reformulation beyond the question of insurmountability. Put differently, minor gestures are minor in their occurrence, but major in how they echo.

NEW LEXICONS, NEW METAPHORS

“Definitions,” bell hooks reminds us, “are vital starting points for the imagination. (...) A good definition marks our starting point and lets us know where we want to end up” (hooks, 2000, p. 14). Developing a new lexicon that is used in the classroom and daily life—and insisting on the use of this language—is a minor gesture because it enables different ways of thinking and knowing. A clear example of this is the ‘conflict’ framework used to refer to Israel/Palestine. In news outlets and university degree programs, it is referred to as the Arab-Israeli ‘conflict’, where the term conflict implies a disagreement that can be solved if both parties sat and talked it out (tied to Peace and Conflict studies). But as historian Abdel Razzaq Takriti (2019) emphasizes, the conflict framework prevents us from calling things by their name. It is not a conflict, it is *colonization*; it is settler versus native. Using these terms entails a minor gesture because not being afraid to use this language in an honest manner enables us to see the present and slowly begin to embody these terms. Here, language could break barriers, stretch boundaries, and redefine not only the content but also (and more importantly) the terms of the conversation (Mignolo, 2007).

To transform language within design could begin reconsidering the normalized usage of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ design skills, which connote a gendered division in the discipline. Soft skills (decorative) are equated with personal habits

and traits and are seen as feminine, whereas hard skills (functional) are technical knowledge, associated with masculine characteristics. The former is associated with more 'feminine' and 'soft' design areas such as textile design, interior design, and fashion design, whereas the latter is associated with more 'technological' and 'functional' fields such as graphic design and industrial design (Attfield, 1989).

Yet to speak of metaphors is not only to replace one word with another. As Gloria Anzaldúa reminds us, "metaphors are gods" (2015, p. 39). What this means, in this context, is that metaphors begin with language, but this language must be turned into action lest we incur the risk of emptying them of their (new or old) meanings. In other words, a minor gesture is not just using different words, but turning their use into propositions for actions, starting *now*. In the classroom and studio environment, this goes beyond merely changing the wording to address gender inequalities within the discipline, as if it were only a matter of vocabulary choice. Rather, finding new metaphors means nurturing critique without contempt, encouraging vulnerability by becoming vulnerable, deconstructing the fixity and certainty of design's terminology to embrace serendipity, thinking of error without failure, and brushing against the idea that the world is a problem that needs a designed solution.

Feminist scholarship and praxis teach us about these metaphors: we can think of the figure of weaving, knitting, and relating as that which constitutes how knowledge is formed and practiced, but at the same time that the knitting of knowledge must be practiced inside the classroom/studio space, facilitated and enacted with the educator. Such a reorientation 'matters' (Ahmed, 2010), as it reshapes the relationship students have with themselves, their tutors, and their peers, and reshapes the designs they produce. Put simply, a minor gesture that seeks new metaphors enacts the metaphor in the new space it creates, rather than just leaving that space uncared for and unattended. Those actions are rehearsals for other actions, in similar or different forms, that follow organically from the environment of care created, nurtured, and evaluated collectively.

A minor gesture within design programs is a shift away from celebrating the designer as an author, where designing is something one does in solitude, and to emphasize the collectivity and sharing involved in design practice. This could be through writing learning outcomes across the entire degree that incorporate collaboration, autonomy (as opposed to independence), humility, and empathy. We can think of using with giving, exchanging with caring, or any other mode of understanding ethics within the idea of putting things to use that would fall on the margins of a given system.

CHALLENGING DISCIPLINE

Is knowledge within disciplines adequate to address inequalities? How were dis-

ciplines formed? Can we question this knowledge? How can we liberate ourselves from the constraints of specializations within a discipline—in this case, design? If decolonization is a re-evaluation of political, social, and economic structures, then questioning the structure of a discipline and beginning to practice it in new ways constitutes a minor gesture.

We would argue that the way in which design is taught and practiced in most higher education institutions is framed around well-defined problem-solving that is focused on quick-fix outcomes that neglect the design process. Minor gestures, as a beginning, are acts against the impositions of neoliberal academia—the refusal of gathering results and presenting tangible outcomes. In that way, it focuses on the process rather than the outcome.

In this last section, we would like to focus on minor gestures as a form of questioning the strict confines of the design classroom and/or the studio. We present examples of minor gestures enacted in the classroom that challenge the problem-solution model of design education, using the new lexicons and metaphors discussed earlier to shift our focus to questions of how design is to be practiced, thought about, and explored. In that sense, minor gestures within design education concern the ‘hows’ of design, instead of the ‘whats’, and extend these concerns to the ethos of the studio/classroom. Moreover, these are examples that were not presented as minor gestures first and foremost, but emerge as such when reflecting back on their unfolding. With that, we want to emphasize the connection between minor gestures and *temporality*: because they are not constrained to ‘a’ method but rather are a set of practices, minor gestures are a constant *doing* whose ‘impact’ cannot be measured immediately but might surface with and in time. Hence, the examples presented therein are not to be thought of as ‘models’ nor as ‘case studies’ for minor gestures; rather, it is exactly by being *minor* that they present—and contain—the possibility for (long-term) reflection and expansion.

Revising Content, Reassessing Relevance

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, revisiting what we—as design educators—teach has become more of a necessity. But revising entire curricula, while attempting to continue teaching online and deal with increased levels of administration, is by no means possible. Moreover, institutions all over the world continued to practice business as usual, preventing students and educators alike from slowing down and taking the time to comprehend the events. This renders the ability to begin rethinking content even less possible. Instead, the options were to move everything—as it was—online, and three years on, the focus is now on returning to in-person teaching.

It is precisely the events of the pandemic, which have put a light on the relevance of content taught in design degrees, that make revisiting what we

teach and assessing its relevance such an urgent matter. Rather than producing a full-scale revision, the development should be gradual. This does not entail shifting the topics towards addressing the pandemic, but assessing the importance of the discipline in the context we find ourselves in, and understanding how we have contributed to making this world unsustainable as designers (defuturing), and moving towards sustainment. However, these changes should not be understood as sufficient in themselves, but rather as opening up gaps from which it might be possible to build up systemic change, starting from the learning environment. Therefore, a minor gesture would entail developing a series of briefs that deal with contemporary issues, and gradually introduce them into the classroom/studio. For example, design briefs encourage students to focus on finding solutions to problems, but often these problems are symptoms of larger issues. Writing briefs where design is not defined as a problem-solving, solution-oriented field but an opening of possibilities through negotiations with the given (Dilnot, 2005) challenges students to move beyond the obvious and encourages them to read and research more widely and imaginatively. In other words, it invites them to comprehend the implications of design and designing on the world. Moreover, many of the world's problems—such as public health for example—are often not viewed as design problems.⁶ Grounding briefs in pressing contemporary themes and issues and providing students with the necessary context to tackle these “provides a crucial foundation for understanding and intervening in the world” (Olson & Worsham, 2007, p. ix). An example of this approach is discussed in the next section.

⁶ There are programs addressing this through expanding the education of a designer; for example, the Ph.D. in Transition Design at Carnegie Mellon University (see Irwin, 2015).

⁷ For a more extensive discussion on integrating border-thinking within design and on questioning disciplinary boundaries, see Abdulla, 2021.

⁸ The total number of students was 550 alongside 30 tutors. The module was convened by the first author and three other academics from different design departments.

Disciplinary Boundaries, Challenging Concepts

A minor gesture would be to exercise writing a new syllabus that begins to question the strict disciplinary boundaries of design.⁷ This process can be accomplished as a collaboration with students in different design specializations (for example fashion, graphic, interior, product, interaction) working together on a project that is not dictated by designed outcome(s). A minor gesture would focus on slowly deconstructing with the students *what*, *how*, and *why* such assumptions of strict specialization are embedded into the core of designerly learning, teaching, and doing.

This approach was enacted within a collaborative module with second-year BA students from across disciplines in the UK in the Autumn of 2020.⁸ Using themes including health, wealth, security, community, and mobility, we invited academics from research centers and institutes across the university to write briefs focused on the design process, and to work collaboratively in interdisciplinary teams. Students were encouraged to move away from a focus on designed outcomes, to step outside their discipline, and work collaboratively on developing possibilities. The ten-week project was complemented by lectures and seminars on topics around the themes, and on how to collaborate and work in teams.

Granted, such an approach often generates a brief moment of stasis, exactly because students are confronted with the very opposite of what design would usually teach them: moving away from a focus on strict disciplinary boundaries and developing an outcome. This is why questions must be introduced slowly to take advantage of what students *already know*—their anxieties, desires, and the shortcomings they see and feel as they move within the curriculum. For instance, can we really approach structural problems with project-driven solutions? And what constitutes a project and what does a project seek to achieve? Is it enough to focus on that achievement? If not, how do we collectively find paths toward an answer, rather than the answers themselves? As mentioned previously, briefs should address contemporary themes that enable students to question the politics of design and the implications designing has on the world (and the worlds within that world), rather than drive them to jump into solutions mediated solely by the act of designing. Indeed, it provides students with the opportunity of expanding their understanding of design and engaging in its specializations and other disciplines, and to begin comprehending that design is a collective and not an individual activity. Within this scenario, we also want to emphasize again that students themselves *already know* how to go about these matters. The next example applies that thought.

In April 2021, one of the authors was invited to coordinate a module on ‘Social Design’ within an MA course in Sweden.⁹ Instead of introducing already established concepts of ‘social design’, together with the students—a group of eight, mostly women-identifying, with three of them stemming from the Global South—, we unraveled the different meanings of the ‘social’, and whether or not design is already or could be part of those meanings. We outlined, through personal experience and close reading of texts on care and identity, the ways in which the ‘social’ could be understood for that module. A general guideline for the seminar then emerged from the students themselves: they were concerned with ‘refusing’ and ‘exposing’ methods, ‘problems’, projects, positions, and approaches rather than immediately designing something that could be understood as ‘social design’. In other words, they showed interest in the ‘social’ emerging *among themselves first*, and the ways in which they would navigate their own ideas and methods, towards creating proposals that would not *be* ‘social design’, but would *bring the social into being*. For instance, one group of students proposed minor interventions in domestic and waged labor through the perspective of rest and leisure. They developed a provisional and incomplete design method which consisted of ‘holding a project by its edges’; that is, embracing the contingency of their methods, while also acknowledging that contingency would be a requirement for the project to be ‘effective’. The students understood—and made it part of their questioning—that a month-long project could only achieve so much, and they acted within that frame-

9 The course had the second author as coordinator and tutor, together with two co-tutors.

work to expose the limitations given by such a time frame, but also to point to other pathways that could be followed, even if just 'held by its edges'. The 'social', we concluded in that module, implies a negotiation; the role of the designer is then to be a listener, a node, and never the sole provider of a master 'solution'.

In the two examples discussed here, we see that a collective realization alone can be considered—in hindsight—as a minor gesture; it triggered a shift, even if provisional, in the students' thinking about their role at that moment, their positionality as practitioners and citizens at large, as well as their trajectory as students within a pedagogical program. Alas, the consequences of this minor gesture cannot be measured or quantified, but to the extent that they trigger these other ways of feeling oneself, they are effective and successful.

SOME [MINOR] CONCLUSIONS

Minor gestures are about reimagining pedagogy to allow for different ways of thinking and knowing, and concrete examples of direct action. We are living in a crisis, where the imagination has been kidnapped, rusting away in shackles, replaced by what education scholar and cultural critic Henry Giroux calls the 'disimagination machine': "A set of cultural apparatuses (...) that functions primarily to undermine the ability of individuals to think critically, imagine the unimaginable, and engage in thoughtful and critical dialogue. Put simply, to become critically informed citizens of the world" (2013, p. 263).

Minor gestures are a way to enable us to become critically informed citizens through the creation of spaces for us to sense the world, view the way people act in the world, and to think about the world in order to transform it. It is a space to ignite *imagination*.

This paper has laid out the groundwork for what we have defined as minor gestures. Starting from our situated histories and current struggles as educators, we outlined how we are interested in *forming alliances* with our students toward liberating learning from disciplinarity. Moving away from a conversation centered around decolonization—a term, we argue, that has been co-opted to become a placeholder for equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) and tick-box exercises within institutions—, minor gestures create the conditions for meaningful conversations on what it actually means to move towards decolonizing education. In this paper, we provided two examples that are deliberately not comprehensive nor exhaustive of what minor gestures can be. These examples are not to be taken as methodologies or toolkits, but rather as conversation starters. Here, metrics such as 'impact' cannot function, just as the impact of *study* (after Harney and Moten) cannot;¹⁰ it requires *time* to ferment, to mutate, to become something else. The move away from requiring immediate affirmation (assessing impact and results) is necessary for growth as an educator. In reflecting on her experience

10 According to Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, studying is "a sort of sociality" which is not "limited to the university" (2013, pp. 111–113). For them, studying happens outside the logics of the 'call to order' imposed by the institutions (i.e., when class starts); it happens in kitchens, smoking rooms, reading circles, knitting circles and so on (Harney & Moten, 2013).

of successful teaching, bell hooks writes how one must surrender the need for immediate affirmation and instead “accept that students may not appreciate the value of a certain standpoint or process straightaway” (1994, p. 42). She continues, “shifting paradigms or sharing knowledge in new ways challenges; it takes time for students to experience that challenge as positive” (hooks, 1994, p. 42).

It is exactly because they are *minor* that we address them in this way: as a generous invitation for thinking with us about how more, different, localized minor gestures might take place. It is important to emphasize once again that minor gestures are *always* contextual: they emerge by analyzing the needs and the conditions that present themselves to the studio/classroom environment as a challenge not only to the educator but also in dialogue with the students. Minor gestures begin and benefit from their contingency, and can only exist insofar as the boundaries between knowledge, experience, desire, and action are provisionally blurred towards an understanding of the commonalities that these different aspects bring *in and with their differences*. In other words, minor gestures are *praxis*; they are acts that shape the world on the way to *changing the world*. When resistance is no longer an option but a necessity, these glimmers of dissent—minor gestures—could be effective on the route to liberation; to make hope practical and slowly move towards decolonization. **D**

REFERENCES

- ABDULLA, D. (2021). Disciplinary Disobedience: A Border-thinking Approach to Design. In C. Mareis & N. Paim (Eds.), *Design Struggles: Intersecting Histories, Pedagogies, and Perspectives* (pp. 227–241). Valiz.
- AHMED, S. (2010). Orientations Matter. In D. Coole & S. Frost (Eds.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (pp. 234–258). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822392996-011>
- ANZALDÚA, G. (2015). *Light in the Dark/Luz en lo Oscuro: Rewriting Identity, Spirituality, Reality* (A. Keating, Ed.). Duke University Press.
- ATTFIELD, J. (1989). FORM/female FOLLOWS FUNCTION/male: Feminist Critiques of Design. In J. A. Walker, *Design History and the History of Design* (pp. 199–225). Pluto Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt18mvngc.15>
- DILNOT, C. (2005). Ethics? Design? In S. Tigerman (Ed.), *The Archeworks Papers, Volume 1, Number Two*. Archeworks.
- GIROUX, H. A. (2013). The Disimagination Machine and the Pathologies of Power. *Symploke*, 21(1–2), 257–269.
- HARNEY, S., & MOTEN, F. (2013). *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*. Minor Compositions.
- HOOKS, BELL. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice to Freedom*. Routledge.
- HOOKS, BELL. (2000). *All About Love*. Harper Collins.

- IRWIN, T. (2015). Transition Design: A Proposal for a New Area of Design Practice, Study, and Research. *Design and Culture*, 7(2), 229–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17547075.2015.1051829>
- MANNING, E. (2016). *The Minor Gesture*. Duke University Press.
- MAYORGA, E., LEIDECKER, L., & GUTIÉRREZ, D. O. DE. (2019). Burn It Down: The Incommensurability of the University and Decolonization. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, 8(1), Article 1.
- MIGNOLO, W. D. (2007). Delinking. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 449–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647>
- NOXOLO, P. (2017). Decolonial Theory in a Time of the Re-colonisation of UK Research. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 42(3), 342–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12202>
- OLSON, G. A., & WORSHAM, L. (2007). *The Politics of Possibility: Encountering the Radical Imagination*. Routledge.
- RODRÍGUEZ, C. O. (2018). *Decolonizing Academia: Poverty, Oppression and Pain*. Fernwood.
- SAID, E. W. (1994). *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. Vintage.
- SCHULTZ, T., ABDULLA, D., ANSARI, A., CANLI, E., KESHAVARZ, M., KIEM, M., MARTINS, L. P. DE O., & J.S. VIEIRA DE OLIVEIRA, P. (2018). What Is at Stake with Decolonizing Design? A Roundtable. *Design and Culture*, 10(1), 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17547075.2018.1434368>
- TAKRITI, A. R. (2019, May 16). *Decolonising the Study of Palestine 71 Years after the Nakba* [Lecture]. Education, Occupation and Liberation Programme, London, UK. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jppn7fuPbZ8>