Book Section:
Narayanaswamy, L. orcid.org/0000-0003-1172-0583 (2023) Race matters in teaching about international social policy and protection. In: Irving, Zoë, (ed.) Teaching Social Policy: International, Comparative and Global Perspectives. Elgar Guides to Teaching . Edward Elgar Publishing Limited , Cheltenham, UK , pp. 98-114. ISBN 9781035302000

https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035302017.00016

Race matters in teaching about international social policy and protection

Lata Narayanaswamy, University of Leeds, UK

Abstract

The place of race and social divisions of ethnicity have been a (limited) part of comparative social policy research for some time, and there is more to be done in incorporating race as a central dimension in teaching about the emergence, design, delivery, impact and outcomes of welfare states and social policy. This chapter will explore how a lens of coloniality might help us to think in more nuanced ways about social policy and protection. Drawing on the experience of teaching at the intersection between social policy/protection and international development, the analysis will highlight why reflecting critically on race and racial justice is crucial to understanding how we conceptualise social policy. The chapter will consider different pedagogical approaches that support these more nuanced conceptualisations that bring social policy and intersectional difference into dialogue, with a particular emphasis on racialised differences in the composition and delivery of social protection.

Keywords: race, social protection, intersectionality, inequality, immersive pedagogy, role-play

Introduction

Understanding and interrogating the ways in which human societies meet basic human needs form the core of pedagogical approaches to the study of social policy and social protection (as it is more commonly referred to in the context of global development discourse and practice: see for example Hanlon et al. 2010; Devereaux & Sabates Wheeler, 20014). According to the UK's social policy association (SPA), social policy's 'fundamental concerns are about human need, social justice, and individual and collective wellbeing'.[1] Human need may be understood in terms of self-actualisation and human motivation (Maslow, 1943) or about whether we as humans merely survive or strive to 'flourish' (Dean, 2010: 9). What all mainstream approaches have in common is the tendency – which we see reflected in global goals such as the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – to take as the starting point a universal human subject, the idea that there is some essential humanity to which our understanding of basic needs might be reduced (see Telleria, 2021).

So who counts in the distribution of social policy/protection resources? In teaching that addresses social policy or social protection, centring intersectional understandings of the

[1] https://social-policy.org.uk/

origins and consequences of policy choices in relation to human need and well-being is crucial. There is no singular 'human' to which all policy might apply, nor is the notion of welfare value neutral. Indeed, Richard Titmuss (1974: 4), a key theorist in the British social policy cannon, has asked 'whose social policy?', going on to note that we must avoid investing social policy with a 'halo of altruism', concluding that 'what is "welfare" for some groups may be "illfare" for others'.

Racial difference is one variable through which contestation over the distribution of resources operates. We can identify how the systems that distribute resources are not value neutral, but instead interact with systems of oppression. In teaching about the roles of various stakeholders in ensuring well-being, we must open up the possibility of critiques that are attendant to these differences and their effects. This chapter will explore how a lens of coloniality might help us to think in more nuanced ways about social policy and protection. The analysis will begin by highlighting what is meant by 'decolonisation' in the context of education, and how this lens helps us to be attentive to race and racial justice in how we conceptualise social policy, drawing out two related dimensions. The first is that race shapes elementally who is even considered to be 'human' in the first place in relation to needs, social justice and well-being. The second and related dimension is how this has affected our understanding of resource distribution for social protection both in the colonial centre and its historical and contemporary peripheries i.e., that space we call 'development'. The chapter will then move on to consider different pedagogical approaches that support these more nuanced conceptualisations that bring social policy and intersectional difference into dialogue, with a particular emphasis on racialised differences in the composition and delivery of social protection.

What do we mean by 'decolonisation' and what does it have to do with education?

There is no one definition of 'decolonisation'. Whilst its early usage was meant to refer simply to the process of former colonies becoming independent, '[d]ecolonisation is now used to talk about restorative justice through cultural, psychological and economic freedom' (O'Dowd & Heckenberg, 2020). This notion of restorative justice is crucial for those activists committed to redressing colonial harm in settler societies. For activists in countries where colonisers violently displaced indigenous populations in order to appropriate and 'settle' on the land over 400 years, including all of the Americas and Australia, discussions around 'decolonisation' must start with the theft of this land and associated erasure of identity that this theft represents (Tuck and Yang, 2012; see also Narayanaswamy et al., 2021).

When we teach something called 'social policy', we do not do so in a vacuum, outside of these considerations. The role of education and associated institutions have also been brought into sharper relief, not only as potential beneficiaries of slave ownership and empire, but also as central to narrowing the ways in which we understand the world (see Vadasaria & Perugini, 2021). Indeed, it would be naïve to presume education systems exist

outside the social, political, and economic systems in which they are designed and delivered. Drawing on the work of Amadiume (2000) and Kothari (2005), I have argued elsewhere that during the period of empire education 'was not about redistributing power but was instead meant to "civilise" populations in the imperial colonies through interventions promoted by organisations linked to either the church or the monarch' (Narayanaswamy, 2017: 5).

With Europe as the centre of the 'modern' universe, the 'University knowledge system' that was 'created some 500 to 550 years ago in Europe by white male scientists' became the ultimate arbiter of the 'bounds' of 'civilised' ideas and 'grammars' (Hall and Tandon, 2017: 7). Campaigns such as #WhyisMyCurriculumWhite have sought to raise concerns about the continuation of this historical tendency of teaching and research across the sciences, social sciences and humanities to privilege a narrow set of ideas that were, and continue to be, those formulated predominantly by White, largely upper-class men (Peters, 2018). Curricular approaches that focus narrowly on a received set of 'wisdom', decolonial activists argue, do not do justice to the diversity of people and associated knowledges that shape everyday lives the world over. Furthermore, there is rarely if ever any acknowledgment of how not only resources, such as minerals, flora and fauna, but indigenous knowledges about these resources, were simultaneously both extracted and erased, including by academicians, as part of the colonial enterprise (Scheibinger, 2017). Universities were, and continue to be, the bedrock of a knowledge system that both facilitates, reinscribes and vigorously defends this erasure as part of its claim to 'objectivity' and 'academic rigour' (Dunford, 2017): '*Those within the walls became knowers; those outside the walls became non-knowers'* (Hall and Tandon, 2017: 8; my emphasis). Taken together, considerations of coloniality offer a direct challenge to the way we understand curricula and their contribution to knowledge in HE. It is therefore more important still for us as teachers and researchers of social policy to understand how that same coloniality has huge implications for how resources are distributed for, and who is considered worthy of, social protection.

Who is allowed to be considered 'human' and on what terms?

The violent construction of race, developed to justify the enslavement of darker-skinned bodies, disproportionately those from the continent of Africa, both created but also justified ongoing colonial conquest (Narayanaswamy et al., 2021), embedding a racial hierarchy that, as Mills (1997: 1-3) highlights so eloquently, placed 'whiteness' at the top:

> Ironically, the most important political system of recent global history – the system of domination by which white people have historically ruled over and, in certain important ways, continue to rule over nonwhite people – is not seen as a political system at all. It is just taken for granted; it is the background against which other systems, which we are to see as political, are highlighted … What is

> needed, in other words, is a recognition that racism (or, as I will argue, global white supremacy) is itself a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties.

As Mills emphasises, this construction of race, underpinned by the ideology of white supremacy, continues to inform the distribution of power and wealth, determine class and citizenship status and impact life outcomes in a diversity of contexts. We may contrast this 'relative' humanity for some against a 'universality' that operates at the global level in goals such as the SDGs:

> … the ontological structure of the UN's agenda creates an essentialist and teleological understanding of history that privileges universality – unity – at the expense of diversity… an inherently ethnocentric understanding of global issues (Telleria, 2021: 607).

Presuming the existence of a universal or neutral recipient of a particular form of protection or (re)distribution invisibilises racialised dynamics that render darker-skinned bodies as unequal in how they might seek out, or access any kind of communal support (see Narayanaswamy, forthcoming).

Its worth noting here that identifying differentiated need against universalising tendencies is not necessarily new. Feminist interventions into the realm of social policy have, for instance, highlighted the tendency for social protection systems to rely on 'dominant normative assumptions about gender difference, with breadwinning prescribed for men and caring/homemaking for women' (Cook and Razavi, 2012: 15). Similar norms about racial difference, which as Mills argues are largely invisibilised, may offer a partial explanation for the absence of race as a key dimension of how we conceptualise welfare states in the Global North and the discipline of social policy more broadly. Emerging as a key focus of enquiry in the last 15 years, this is a growing area of scholarship, with a recent special issue of the journal *Social Policy & Society* offering a range of contributions on '"Race", Learning and Teaching in Social Policy in Higher Education' (Cole, Craig and Ali, 2022). Whilst coloniality is frequently a key referent in these spaces, the point of departure for the present analysis is two-fold. The first, extending contentions put forth in this volume in Chapters 2, 5 and 6 that global and comparative social policy has a tendency to be Western-centric, with a disproportionate focus in particular on G7 countries, this analysis reflects on how the invisibilisation of race in social policy/protection must be understood as part of what Shilliam (2018: 6) suggests are 'the concerns' of 'elite actors' to preserve 'the integrity of Britain's imperial – then postcolonial – order', where the G7 still represents a (post/neo)colonial centre. Secondly, attempts to preserve this 'integrity' have ramifications for how we conceptualise social policy/protection; I would argue we can extend to the global level Shilliam's (2018: 4) contention that the lens of race helps us to reveal 'shifting

distinctions between those considered deserving and undeserving of an acceptable level of social security and welfare'. Interrogating whose humanity does and does not count in the 'postcolonial order' affects the (re)distribution of social protection resources. This is not just a matter for Social Policy, but also extends to how we conceptualise notions of 'development', which Ziai (2017: 67) argues should be more 'precise[ly] … described as the explanation and amelioration of global social inequality'. Widening the lens to consider (de)coloniality, race and intersectional difference in our teaching of social policy/protection is thus crucial to the advancement of the discipline.

Race, intersectionality and 'relative' humanity

What then does an intersectional analysis offer us in terms of pedagogies to support more nuanced insights into social policy and protection? As noted above, the idea of differentiated need is not new. Crenshaw's (1989) idea of 'intersectionality' is helpful, however, both as a theoretical as well as pedagogical tool. Elements of identity do not exist separately but, Crenshaw (1989) argues, are intertwined and co-constitutive; I am unable to separate my gender from my race or my religion or my sexuality. Nor is this about identifying a cumulative burden; rather it is the ways in which our co-constituted identities exist simultaneously within us that in turn shapes our lived realities, which may simultaneously produce both inclusion and exclusion. If I take myself as an example: I live in a darker-skinned body that is considered minoritized in the UK, which may be a source of certain types of exclusion, but am also an academic with a permanent post in an elite university, which may also form the basis of particular types of inclusion. Where social protection may be geared towards tackling inequalities, intersectional analyses support more nuanced conceptualisation of the challenges different groups or stakeholders may encounter:

> No one, is *just* poor, or *just* working class, or *just* a woman or *just* a disabled person. There is also no hierarchy of inequality, where some forms of inequality 'trump' others. Each person experiences a combination of inequalities differently, and these will shape how each person responds in different situations (Porter, 2018).

We can use an intersectional and a colonial lens to interrogate how we conceptualise health – widely understood as a key form of social protection – bringing to life the question of the 'relative' humanity of some bodies over others.

A historical lens can reveal that unequal access to health is inextricably linked to colonialism and the gendered, racialised hierarchies it seeded. Eugenics, or 'race science', undertaken by academics such as Francis Galton, was ostensibly health research attempting to use 'selective breeding to create optimal humans', but in reality provided post-hoc justifications for the racial differences used to justify slavery (see Narayanaswamy et al., 2021). Unethical medical experimentation for treating illnesses such as smallpox were also undertaken in

both the colonial centre and periphery on the bodies not just of slaves, but also the urban poor, hospital patients and orphans (who may also have been darker-skinned) (Scheibinger, 2017). Advances made in gynaecology in the 19th century also illustrate the overlap of colonial gender and racial norms. James Marion Sims, frequently lauded as the 'Father of American Gynecology', used the bodies of enslaved Black women to treat conditions brought on by obstetric trauma, but where Black women's bodies were presumed not to feel pain in the same way as White women's bodies (Cooper Owens, 2017: 2-3). In short, the bodies of the poor and enslaved, both in the West and in the colonies were seen as disposable: human enough for experimentation on their bodies to have value, not human enough to be worthy of any ethical considerations.

Nor did this sub-human experimentation end with the abolishment of slavery or empire. There are two studies worth considering, both explained and analysed in some depth by Paul and Brookes (2105) and from where I have drawn the following summary of key details. The Tuskegee study of men with untreated syphilis was undertaken in 1932; Black men were left untreated without their consent to understand whether the disease progressed differently in racialised bodies. A second study in New Zealand in 1966 also raises similar concerns around ethics and 'relative' humanity: a gynecologist was attempting to demonstrate that untreated carcinoma in situ of the cervix would not lead to cancer, so simply withheld treatment. Paul and Brookes (2105) note that research participants in both studies were relatively powerless within the health system, revealing a continuity rather than a break with the colonial gendered and racial hierarchies discussed above, despite the formal/legal end of slavery and European empire.

Understanding these colonial legacies in turn sheds new light on the continuities we may observe in relation to unequal access to health and health systems today. Jean-Paul Mira, head of the intensive care unit at the Cochin Hospital in Paris, said at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in April 2020:

> If I can be provocative, shouldn't we be doing this study in Africa, where there are no masks, no treatments, no resuscitation? A bit like as it is done elsewhere for some studies on Aids. In prostitutes, we try things because we know that they are highly exposed and that they do not protect themselves.[2]

Mira was, quite rightly, accused of racism and subsequently apologised, but the outrage his comments generated reflect a world view that presumes our starting point is a sense of shared, universal humanity. When we bring a historical, colonial lens on to these outrages, however, we observe that his statement reflects the same dynamics described above: homogenised 'African', racialised, gendered others whose bodies can be exploited for medical experimentation to support health innovations for, in this case, wealthier Western populations to tackle COVID-19. Similarly, advocacy has picked up momentum around the fact that maternal health outcomes for Black women in the UK are poorer than the UK

[2] www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-52151722

average[3]. Again, when put into historical context, we can see that women's claims[4] and, as noted, black women's claims in particular, around how pain is experienced are not taken sufficiently seriously, a challenge that has a clear historical, colonial antecedent.

The 'relative' humanity of gendered and racialised bodies over the ages that these brief examples of health innovation have helped to illustrate provide a further lens through which to understand the differential entitlements to social protection that exist from a global, comparative perspective.

Understanding racism and social protection in the colonial metropole

As noted earlier, other chapters in this volume make clear that even at the global level, international comparative social policy tends disproportionately to focus on the different welfare states of the world's wealthiest or so-called developed countries. An analysis of the British welfare state provides insights into the ways in which race shapes the 'relative' humanity of some bodies over others within the colonial metropole, alongside the gendered expectations that become associated with the preservation of these hierarchies.

The ambition historically of British social policy, as encapsulated in Beveridge's articulation of 'five giants', or social ills that must be vanquished, is a comprehensive vision for a cradle-to-grave welfare state that sets a key benchmark for how to both conceptualise and implement universal social protection. Whilst Beveridge's five giants identify important dimensions of social protection, whom he considered to be worthy of such protection is often given less attention. Race and racism play an important role in the dynamics of the history of Britain's welfare state, and despite principles of 'universality' built into, amongst other inspirations, Beveridge's report, colonialism and thus who was considered within the purview of the state's intervention/citizenship is, as we will now explore, overtly racialised.

So who is the welfare state for and what function, ideally, would it serve? An intersectional lens on to Beveridge's landmark report itself offers some clues into the ways in which he puts gender and racial norms in service of an idealised nation:

> The attitude of the housewife to gainful employment outside the home is not and should not be the same as that of the single woman. She has other duties … In the next thirty years housewives as Mothers have vital work to do in ensuring the adequate *continuance of the British Race* and of British ideals in the world' (Beveridge, 1942: paras 114,117; pp. 51 and 52; my emphasis)

[3] www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/oct/02/something-has-to-be-done-tackling-the-uks-black-maternal-health-problem

[4] www.bbc.com/future/article/20180518-the-inequality-in-how-women-are-treated-for-pain

Shilliam (2018: 75) further triangulates these two passages with Beveridge's other writings and speeches, arguing that Beveridge's calls to 'pursue universal insurance and welfare must be contextualized within the late nineteenth-century imperial division between Anglo-Saxon family and colonial subject'. Drawing out the emphasis on the 'continuance of the British Race', Shilliam also notes Beveridge's concern that 'at its "present rate of reproduction" the race could not continue (Shilliam, 2018: 75, citing Beveridge, 1943: 150), hence the call to 'Mothers' to prioritise the preservation of the 'British race'. This focus on the endurance of 'Britishness' in racialised terms and the 'preservation of empire', Shilliam (2018: 75) argues, rests at the heart of 'universal provision of social insurance and welfare in Britain'. In reflecting on Shilliam's book, Salem (2018) also draws our attention to the irony of this position, insofar as what quickly became clear with the advent of Britain's welfare state was that: 'It was primarily Black and Asian labour that was channelled into low-skill sectors, and occupations servicing the welfare state—most prominently the NHS—drew on the colonies for labourers to do low-grade work'.

Nor could we argue that, as colonial subjects on the cusp of independence (as much of Empire was poised to be at the time that Beveridge's report was published in 1942), that a 'contributory' principle might preclude the inclusion of colonial subjects into the category of 'universal' insurance of the colonial centre. This, as Bhambra (2022) notes, does not adequately reflect the wealth that Britain, as a post-imperial nation (by the time the welfare state was established in 1948), had in fact relied heavily on the extraction of taxes, duties and other monies from colonial subjects who then had no claim on the welfare state their contributions had substantially funded.

Understanding racism and social protection in the colonial peripheries/development

Through an analysis of the British welfare state we are able to identify the persistence of racial hierarchies and who is, in reality, considered to be a part of a 'universal' category for the purposes of welfare provision. This section builds on the analysis by Noyoo in Chapter 5 who helpfully lays out both the disciplinary antecedents of 'social policy' as well as its limits in terms of how we widen the field itself, notably to take account of welfare worlds beyond the North or the West. Noyoo's contribution is notable in highlighting explicitly the racialised social policy conurbations that afforded European settlers a much higher standard of living than even their counterparts in various colonial metropoles, where social policy was explicitly designed and directed at ensuring a much higher standard of living and well-being than domestic, darker-skinner (former) colonial subjects, with the result that 'the standard of living of European settlers in … [now South] Africa was much higher than in Europe because of such exclusive and racially-based welfare states' (Noyoo, this volume, p.x).

Given this particular history of racialised difference that shaped access to entitlements in the colonial periphery, in the context of development or the (post)colonial peripheries, we can draw out two distinct but related ways that coloniality manifests in how social protection is now conceptualised. The first is that (post)coloniality shapes the imaginary of what is and is not possible in relation to resource (re)distribution, due to path dependencies emerging out of colonial histories, including those shared by Noyoo, that are also tied up with ideas of 'development'. The second and related point is that, whilst the trajectories themselves are diverse across what we call 'developing' countries, the ambitions for social protection in development do not match those of the universal, cradle-to-grave welfare states of the 'developed' West.

Meeting basic human needs has, for many decades, been at the heart of how we conceptualise the purpose and function of international development, and the SDGs are heavily invested in those areas of social policy – such as health, education, childcare and pensions to name a few – as key to achieving 'sustainable development'. As Copestake (2015) notes in a Special Issue of the *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, there is considerable overlap between the two disciplines and much to be gained by combining these inquiries. Both development and social policy agree that there are 'social problems' and 'social risks' that affect individuals, families and communities, whether these are caused by market failures, conflict, natural disasters, human failure or some combination of these. And both disciplines agree that some form of external intervention (by states, philanthropists, private individuals, civil society, business) is invariably necessary to address these concerns. Indeed, the SDGs would suggest a convergence around a set of ambitious global targets that are unlikely to be achieved without social policy/protection in both developed and developing country contexts: 'There is a growing consensus around the view that social protection constitutes an effective response to poverty and vulnerability in developing countries, and an essential component of economic and social development strategies' (Barrientos and Hulme, 2009: 439). As de Haan (2013; 15) reminds us, 'social policies show a great deal of path dependence and are closely intertwined with national histories, ideologies and models of citizenship and inclusion'. Given this tendency, (post)colonial peripheries that we are now calling developing countries will inevitably have different trajectories and associated legacies that will affect the nature of any social protection offered given challenges created by, for instance, rural/urban divides, demographic pressures (including different age/population profiles), unique disease burdens, diverse colonial legacies and differential challenges posed by climate change (see Gough, 1999).

The question of how developing countries respond to human needs is also shaped, however, by an idea of 'development' that takes as its starting point a clear divergence between a wealthy, civilized 'developed' world consisting of Europe, Canada, the US and Australia, and a relatively backward, under-developed world made up of former colonial possessions struggling to meet even basic human needs (see Narayanaswamy, 2021;

Narayanaswamy (a), forthcoming). Here again it is helpful to highlight Noyoo's well-taken point in this volume that 'the teaching of social policy at African universities has been captured by the "social protection agenda" which seeks to reduce social policy analysis to mostly an appraisal of social cash transfers' (Noyoo, this volume, p.x).

Given the path dependencies and associations with both backwardness and basic needs, I would extend Noyoo's argument to suggest that this tendency to speak in terms of 'protection' and isolated instruments such as cash transfers versus more integrated social policies is itself rooted in a less ambitious interpretation of how human needs are to be met in so-called developing countries. The literature is clear that social policy in Western states, broadly conceived, represent at least in part a continuous dialogue about how welfare states iron out the exigencies, excesses and undesirable outcomes of the function of markets in order to optimally balance the needs of people and the needs of capital in the collective interest of society (see Farnsworth, 2012). Comprehensive welfare states have, particularly in the post-war period, aspired to strengthen individual and collective capacity to contribute to wider goals of growth or life expectancy, alongside securing safety nets to avoid abject poverty or destitution associated with early industrialisation (Gough, 1979).

The establishment of social protection approaches in developing countries, by contrast, suggests a frame designed to address key vulnerabilities and basic human needs, lacking the ambition of a more holistic welfare state. Social protection in development has consisted of a focus on 'safety nets' as a key poverty alleviation strategy, itself conceived as 'minimalist social assistance in countries too poor and administratively weak to introduce comprehensive social welfare programmes' (Devereaux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004: 1). Carter et al. (2019: 5) summarise prevailing definitions that draw on the work of Devereaux and Sabates-Wheeler (2004) to define social protection as 'concerned with protecting and helping those who are poor, vulnerable, marginalised or dealing with risks'. In setting out this definition they highlight explicitly that this focus on risk, vulnerability and marginalisation is 'in line with usage in international development [and] may be different from social policy definitions in high-income countries' (Carter et al., 2019: 5).

And indeed, we can see how social protection ambitions are distinct from wealthier, 'developed' welfare states approaches. The Social Protection Floor Recommendation R202, 2012[5] (SPF) encapsulates this tendency, emerging out of a wide-ranging dialogue across a diversity of stakeholders to establish new norms for global social policy and governance (see Deacon, 2013). Whilst a consensus at the global level around the form and function of social protection is undoubtedly an achievement, the focus on vulnerabilities for those who are unable to work, using the language of 'floors' and 'basic society security guarantees' to avoid 'poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion' reiterate the less ambitious form of protection on offer for so-called developing countries.[6] The World Bank, who was also a

[5] www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_INSTRUMENT_ID:3065524
[6] www.ilo.org/secsoc/areas-of-work/policy-development-and-applied-research/social-protection-floor/lang--en/index.htm

stakeholder in the SPF negotiations, similarly suggests that 'social protection systems help the poor and vulnerable cope with crises and shocks', where otherwise the focus is health and education to help people back into work.[7]

What these definitions allude to is that the ambition for social protection may be constrained for reasons of affordability in the (post)colonial periphery. What is the cause of this penury? Whilst the global economy is complex, there are longstanding calls for debt relief, the precedent for which was set when 50% of what was then West Germany's debt accrued from postwar reconstruction was forgiven in 1953, a move that advocates are claiming is long overdue for developing countries similarly in debt crisis.[8] Debt and tax justice, Dempsey et al (2021) argue, are critical to releasing urgent funds to tackle the climate crisis. Yet the 'development' architecture in the post WWII period has functioned in ways that, as I have noted elsewhere, 'must not fundamentally undermine the (neo)colonial extractivism on which the current system depends', which is itself a legacy of colonialism (Narayanaswamy, forthcoming). Keeping developing nations tied to global economic systems that function through the use of conditional 'aid' such as the social transfers that Noyoo discusses mimics the colonial tendency to presume that racialised, developing 'others' are incapable of managing more complex governance systems without external aid and support, when in reality issues such as debt servicing, conflict and trade imbalances perpetuate developing/developed divides and the uneven (re)distribution of social protection resources within this (see Hickel, 2018).

Pedagogical approaches to support intersectional learning on social protection

So how do we make these issues real for students in the classroom? How do we make the complexity of the aforementioned issues legible to students? What pedagogies might support more critical, reflexive learning trajectories around race and social policy/protection?

In 2014 I designed a final-year undergraduate module entitled 'International Development and Social Policy' that sought to make the link that Copestake (2015) had identified was surprisingly missing between the two disciplines. Making this link necessitates an intersectional approach that takes account of coloniality and the associated historical trajectories, without which it is, in my view and as the analysis above makes clear, simply impossible to make sense of the diversity of social protection forms that exist in the world today.

The module overall is split in two, with the first half focusing on building a broad understanding of the theoretical space between international development and social policy/protection, focusing on human need, crisis, gender/intersectionality and policy

[7] www.worldbank.org/en/topic/socialprotection
[8] https://debtjustice.org.uk/blog/germanys-debt-cancellation-the-london-debt-accords

processes. The second half of the module goes into detail through different lenses of social protection, with each week questioning how social protection may be delivered through, for instance, cash transfers, the provision of health, education or employment. Over the years I have also adapted this teaching to take account of the overarching challenge of climate crisis, which is increasingly the most urgent issue that risks our collective ability to meet even basic needs.

Throughout this module I have adapted teaching to make it current, linking for instance to current events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as using not just academic but also grey literature consisting of webinars, podcasts, reports produced by bilateral and multilateral agencies, as well as INGOs, to help situate these issues in the real world of decision-making. I focus on systems rather than individuals and/or particular countries or policies, instead using case studies of, for instance, education or employment programmes to bring the discussion back to how it helps us to understand how resources are being distributed, or not, through social protection policies in practice.

A key feature of this teaching has been to use a lens of coloniality throughout, notably in relation to how we might understand prevailing, present-day power imbalances. Within this I have been increasingly clear with students that we must not separate out the social protection challenges of so-called developing countries. Indeed, as welfare states are retrenching in wealthier countries (see Farnsworth & Irving, 2015), increasing numbers of people are falling through ever-bigger cracks in the safety nets of more comprehensive welfare states, trends that follow similar patterns of inclusion and exclusion to those of developing countries (see Ghosh, 2019). Students have taken an interest in, for instance, increasing homelessness in the UK or the treatment of refugees. I have actively encouraged enquiry in and about the function of wealthier welfare states by, for instance, encouraging students to consider how these states might be falling short on their responsibility to meet the SDGs.

Particularly for international development students, a key frustration is why is the world so unequal? Why, they ask, is the pace of change so slow? To support more immersive pedagogical experiences that provide insights into decision-making processes, I have undertaken two types of role-play engagements in the classroom that help students to make the link between the theory and practice of social policy/protection and what it means to have to make choices about the (re)distribution of these resources through a dual lens of intersectionality and coloniality. The first was a role-play designed to be a debate between high-level stakeholders about the inclusion of a basic income as a key measure in the ILO's SPF. Students work in pairs to represent key stakeholders, including the ILO itself, as well as the World Bank, trade unions, INGOs, think-tanks, aid donors and governments. Online virtual learning spaces were used to circulate position statements in advance of the meeting, with students making short statements during the debate itself. After the meeting the different representatives must agree a communique with the outcome of the debate. What is helpful about an immersive experience designed in this way is that students get first-hand experience of the sorts of choices around action and non-action that stakeholders make and why, as well as gaining an insight into why some ideas have more purchase than

others in a range of decision-making contexts. Active discussions in the classroom whilst students are in character give them the opportunity to engage with the trade-offs, but in ways that are attendant to the inequalities embedded in the system, in order for them to brainstorm not just outside, but beyond the proverbial 'box'. I also encourage students to critique the process itself: what did and did not work? So often we tend to see these systems as fixed, but recurrent, overlapping and urgent crises demand that we start to re-assess the assumptions around both what the problems are, how they came to be and what collectively we need to do about them, including through which mechanisms.

The second role-play format builds on the written assessment for the module. With one shorter position paper (as the mid-term) and a longer policy-brief as the final assessment, written outputs are also geared towards encouraging students to build writing skills that address key audiences: who do you want to influence and what do you want them to know about the problem you are seeking to solve? How do you want them to solve it? There is an opportunity to turn the mid-term position paper into a non-assessed presentation in the last week of class. This mid-term consists of asking students to make recommendations to the ILO on how to improve the SPF, drawing on examples to help illustrate their ideas.

To support the development of presentation skills, I have introduced short, sharp presentations, role-playing a pitch for ideas to a Director at the ILO in a Pecha Kucha format.[9] As a format, Pecha Kucha is an excellent pedagogical tool as it supports students in really focusing on the key message. It is a form of presentation designed to be visually stimulating and quickly bring the audience's attention to key ideas. It originated amongst Art and Design students but has migrated over to the Social Sciences as well. This format consists of 20 slides that are timed to advance every 20 seconds. I ask students to reduce this in order to ensure everyone has an opportunity to present, so 6 slides, 20 seconds for each slide, giving a total presentation time of 2 minutes. Students have to pitch their ideas to improve the SPF in 2 minutes, a winner is chosen and prizes are given as well. I always endeavour to provide constructive feedback shared with everyone, thus building not just written but also oral communication skills.

Some concluding thoughts …

Bringing a lens of coloniality to teaching in international social policy/protection allows us as researchers and educators to amplify the ways in which colonial legacies underpin many of the social 'ills' we seek to challenge in our collective present. The global dynamics of 'developed' and 'developing' countries rooted in the proliferation of different European empires continue to inform the uneven (re)distribution of social protection resources at a global level. Taking more dynamic, comparative and also historical approaches to teaching in social policy emphasises how intersectional difference, including race and gender, can

[9] https://www.ucc.ie/en/appsoc/resconf/conf/cst/criticalsocialthinkingstudentresearchinitiative2015/sym/pk/

support students to understand the differential shortcomings of diverse social protection systems. Through engagement with more immersive pedagogies, we may also support students to think ‘outside the box’ in ways that both recognise how gender and race shape the ‘relative’ humanity of some bodies over others, even within professed commitments to universal social provision, and how we might collectively strive to build more genuinely inclusive social protection systems.

Bibliography

Amadiume, I. (2000), *Daughters of the goddess, daughters of imperialism: African women struggle for culture, power and democracy*, London: Zed Books

Barrientos, A. and D. Hulme (2009) 'Social Protection for the Poor and Poorest in Developing Countries: Reflections on a Quiet Revolution', Oxford Development Studies, 37: 4, 439-456.

Beveridge, W. 1943. *The pillars of security and other war-time essays and address*, London: Allen Unwin.

Beveridge, W. (1942) *Social Insurance and Allied Services (The Beveridge Report)*. London: HMSO.

Bhambra, G.K. (2022) 'Relations of extraction, relations of redistribution: Empire, nation, and the construction of the British welfare state', *British Journal of Sociology*, **73(1)**: 4-15.

Carter, B., Roelen, K., Enfield S. and Avis, W. (2019). Social Protection Topic Guide. Revised Edition. K4D Emerging Issues Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

Cole, B., Craig, G., & Ali, N. (2022). Introduction: 'Race', Learning and Teaching in Social Policy in Higher Education. *Social Policy and Society, 21*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1017/S1474746421000713

Copestake, J. (2015), 'Whither development studies? Reflections on its relationship with social policy', Special Issue: Meeting Emerging Global Policy Challenges: Positioning Social Policy Between Development and Growth?, *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 31:2, 100-113.

Cook, Sarah and Shahra Razavi. 2012. Work and Welfare Revisiting the Linkages from a Gender Perspective. Research Paper No. 2012-7. Geneva: UNRISD.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139-167.

De Haan, Arjan (2013). 'The Social Policies of Emerging Economies: Growth and Welfare in China and India', IPC-IG Working Paper No. 110. Brasília, International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth.

Deacon, Bob, *Global social policy in the making: The foundations of the social protection floor*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Dean, H. (2010) *Understanding Human Need*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Dempsey, J., Irvine-Broque, A., Bigger, P., J. Christiansen, B. Muchhala, S. Nelson, F. Rojas-Marchini, E. Shapiro-Garza, A. Schuldt & A. DiSilvestro, (2022) 'Biodiversity targets will not be met without debt and tax justice'. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **6**, 237–239. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01619-5

Devereux, S. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004), 'Transformative Social Protection', IDS Working Paper 232, Brighton: IDS.

Dunford R. (2017) 'Toward a decolonial global ethics' *Journal of Global Ethics*, **13(3)**: 380-397.

Farnsworth, K. and Z. Irving (2015). Austerity: More than the sum of its parts Social Policy in Times of Austerity: Global economic crisis and the new politics of welfare. K. Farnsworth and Z. Irving. Bristol, Policy Press.

Farnsworth, K. (2012) *Social Versus Corporate Welfare: Competing Needs and Interest within the Welfare State*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ghosh, J. (2019) 'A Brave New World, or the Same Old Story with New Characters?' *Development and Change* **50(2)**: 379-393 DOI: 10.1111/dech.12485

Gough, I. (1999), 'Welfare Regimes: On Adapting the Framework to Developing Countries', Bath: University of Bath

Gough, I. (1979) *The Political Economy of the Welfare State*, London: Macmillan.

Hall, B.L. and Tandon, R. (2017) 'Decolonization of knowledge, epistemicide, participatory research and higher education'. *Research for All*, 1 (1), 6–19. DOI 10.18546/RFA.01.1.02.

Hanlon, J. A. Barrientos & D. Hulme (2010), *Just Give Money to the Poor: The Development Revolution from the Global South*, Virginia: Kumarian Press.

Hickel, J. (2018), *The Divide*, London: Penguin Random House.

Kothari, U. "Authority and Expertise: The Professionalisation of International Development and the Ordering of Dissent." *Antipode* 37, no. 3 (2005): 425–446.

Maslow, A.H. (1943) 'A Theory of Human Motivation'. *Psychological Review*, 50 (4), 430-437.

Mills, C.W. (1997), *The Racial Contract*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Narayanaswamy, L. (2023), 'Race, Racialization and Coloniality in the Humanitarian Aid Sector', in S. Roth, T. Denskus & B. Purkayastha (eds), *Handbook on 'Humanitarianism and Inequality*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing (forthcoming).

Narayanaswamy (a), L. (2023) 'What is 'development', and can we 'decolonise' it? Some ontological and epistemological reflections', in K. Biekart, L. Camfield, U. Kothari & H.

Melber (eds) *Challenging Global Development: Towards Decoloniality and Justice*, London: Palgrave Macmillan (forthcoming).

Narayanaswamy, L. with S. Efange and J. Woodroffe. 2021. 'Decolonising Aid'. Gender and Development Network, UK (GADN) Policy Brief, June.

Narayanaswamy, L. (2017) *Gender, Power and Knowledge for Development*. London: Routledge.

Noyoo in this volume

O'Dowd, M.P. & R. Heckenberg. 2020. 'Explainer: what is decolonisation?'. *The Conversation UK*, June.

OWENS, D. C. (2017). *Medical Bondage: Race, Gender, and the Origins of American Gynecology*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Paul, C., & Brookes, B. (2015). 'The Rationalization of Unethical Research: Revisionist Accounts of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study and the New Zealand "Unfortunate Experiment"'. *American journal of public health*, *105*(10), e12–e19. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302720

Peters, M.A. (2018). Why Is My Curriculum White? A Brief Genealogy of Resistance. In: Arday, J., Mirza, H. (eds) Dismantling Race in Higher Education. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_14

Porter, F. (2018), 'Untangling inequalities: why power and intersectionality are essential concepts', Oxfam's *From Poverty to Power*, January 12 [blogpost], https://frompoverty.oxfam.org.uk/untangling-inequality-big-ideas-in-small-spaces/ (accessed 7 March 2023).

Schiebinger, L. (2017), *Secret Cures of Slaves: People, Plants, and Medicine in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Salem, S. (2018), 'Race, nation and welfare: Eugenics and the problem of the 'anti-social' citizen', *The Disorder of Things* [blogpost], https://thedisorderofthings.com/2018/06/29/race-nation-and-welfare-eugenics-and-the-problem-of-the-anti-social-citizen/ (accessed 7 March 2023).

Shilliam, R. (2018) *Race and the Undeserving Poor: From Abolition to Brexit*. London: Agenda Publishing.

Telleria, J. (2022). Diversity vs the 2030 agenda. A deconstructive reading of the United Nations agenda for sustainable development. *Critical Social Policy*, *42*(4), 607–625. https://doi.org/10.1177/02610183211065699

Titmuss, R. M. (1974). Social Policy: An Introduction. London, George Allen and Unwin.

Tuck E., and Yang K.W. 2012. Decolonization is not a metaphor. Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society, 1(1): 1-40.

Vadasaria. S. & N. Perugini (2020) 'Arthur James Balfour: The University of Edinburgh's Imperial Chancellor (1891-1930)', *Race in Retrospect: Special Issue Retrospect Journal*, 29: June 2021, pp. 24-27.

Ziai, A. (2016) *Development Discourse and Global History: From colonialism to the sustainable development goals*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Author Biography

Lata Narayanaswamy is Associate Professor in the Politics of Global Development, School of Politics and International Studies (POLIS), University of Leeds, UK. Since 2001 Lata has worked as a research practitioner, consultant and now an academic, and her research critically reflects on the gendered/intersectional and post/decolonial dynamics of development knowledge and its perceived contribution to addressing global development challenges. As a former development practitioner, she is keen to ensure that her teaching provides students with sense-making tools to not just understand, but also to (re)imagine the world and how students envision their roles in it as changemakers, problem-solvers and innovators.