Keywords in Radical Geography: An Introduction

Nik Theodore

Department of Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Tariq Jazeel

Department of Geography, University College London, London, UK

Andy Kent

Editorial Office, Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography, Cardiff, UK; antipode@live.co.uk

Katherine McKittrick

Department of Gender Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada

Le mot juste: "Radical" Geography

"It appears that *Antipode* will survive, at least for a while, as a radical journal of geography." Thus began Richard Peet's (1972:iv) modest statement outlining *Antipode*'s first editorial policy—quite modest, in fact, considering radical geography's decidedly immodest goals to "transform the scope of a conventional discipline criticized as irrelevant to the great issues of the time" (Peet 2000:951). The journal itself was to directly contribute to this transformation by fostering "the search for organizational models for promoting social change" (Peet 1977:244) and providing a medium "for the dissemination of non-traditional ideas" (Stea 1969:1). Rather than being (just) "another Geography journal", *Antipode*'s "aspiration [then and now] was to produce geographical knowledge that might connect to a larger project for the transformation of economy, society and environment" (Castree and Wright 2009:2).

As has been well chronicled, *Antipode* was founded in 1969 as an intellectual and political intervention in the discipline of geography; in the wider social sciences; and in a world riven by war, racism, sexism, colonialism, and injustice. "The key to *Antipode*'s origin is the term 'radical'", recalled *Antipode*'s first editor, Ben Wisner (n.d.). "We were groping for root causes of … problems, contradictions, inconsistencies, and hypocrisies", spurred by the promises of the Civil Rights movement in the United States as well as the spectre of nuclear war; the ravages of poverty and famine; and the violence of racism, colonialism, inequality, and uneven development. "Early radical geography was anarchic and exuberant, naïve yet nuanced" (Peet 2000:951) and, for better or worse, the pages of *Antipode* reflected these qualities. The journal has, from its inception, moved with and across wider debates in radical geography. For this reason, we write with an

Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50, First Edition. Edited by the *Antipode* Editorial Collective.

understanding that radical geography and *Antipode* are in conversation, co-constitutive and relational rather than distinct intellectual projects.

Early issues of the journal were eclectic, exploring, for example, the imperialist underpinnings of geographic thought, the militarisation of remote sensing technologies, and white supremacy and racism in geographical texts and urban policy (Anderson 1969; Blaut 1969, 1970; Donaldson 1969; Earickson 1971; Stewart 1969). Articles debated radical methodologies and the merits of advocacy planning, as well as the possibilities for revolutionary social change versus more incremental institutional reform (Amaral and Wisner 1970; Breitbart 1972; Corey 1972; Morrill 1969; Peet 1969; Stea 1970). Volume 1 included an interview with community organiser Ruby Jarrett on what today would be termed "spatial stigmatisation" and "racial-territorial enclosure" (Jarrett and Wisner 1969).

In their survey of the development of radical geography in North America, Linda Peake and Eric Sheppard characterize the late 1960s to mid 1970s as a time of politicised discovery in the face of the unquestioned whiteness of "a segregated and institutionally racist discipline" (2014:315):

> The … [period] saw a flourishing of different voices in *Antipode*, *Transition*, and the USG [Union of Socialist Geographers] newsletters; socialist, feminist, anti-racist, anarchist and environmentalist approaches to studying social problems and advocating social change were all evident. This reflected the multivalent, intersecting protest and social movements unleashed by a 1960s politics of radicalism, anti-racism, sexual liberation and emancipation, in which various protagonists were involved in multiple ways, and the complex linkages between these and academic trajectories. (2014:314)[1]

The vitality of these ideas and movements energised a growing cadre of geographers who were searching for a vehicle to challenge conservative disciplinary structures. Channelling such "anarchic" energies can be an exacting endeavour, however, and attempts to archive radical thought without a shared theoretical framework struck some as incoherent. If *Antipode*'s early volumes were a politicised, though inchoate, foray into some of geography's many misrepresentations, silences and other misdeeds, David Harvey's (1972:6) clarion call, published in volume 4, issue 2, to overthrow prevailing paradigms would soon make plain the stakes for the discipline:

> The objective social conditions demand that we say something sensible and coherent or else forever (through lack of credibility or, even worse, through the further deterioration of the objective social conditions) remain silent. It is the emerging objective social conditions and our patent inability to cope with them which essentially explains the necessity for a revolution in geographic thought.

A proliferation of Marxist scholarship followed, published in the pages of *Antipode* and, to a much lesser extent, in other, more mainstream, geography journals. Thus, the emergence of a sub-discipline that could be named *as* radical geography was, through the early to mid 1970s, emerging *pari passu* with the dominance of Marxist critiques across the social sciences and humanities. However, while Marxism provided coherence, as an emergent orthodoxy it began to crowd out other nascent strands of radical geographical thought. Fortunately, by the

early 1980s, radical geography once again opened out to grasp the heterodox strands of critical thought that were initially incubated in the early pages of the journal and had continued to develop elsewhere within the sub-discipline.

Unlike some other widely read reflections on this period, Peake and Sheppard's (2014) account veers away from celebrating the various achievements made during this time, preferring instead to evaluate the evolution of radical geographical scholarship against the ideals, tenets and demands of radical thought and praxis. As Marxism came to represent a new orthodoxy among radical scholars, some of the openness and creativity that characterised the emergence of radicalism in the discipline was, for a period at least, lost. With few outlets within mainstream geography for the publication of radical texts, *Antipode*'s privileging of articles centring on Marxist theory (O'Keefe 1979) inadvertently narrowed the scope for the publication of other forms of radical research. The impacts of this *de facto* closure were widely felt as early as the mid 1970s across the sub-discipline of radical geography. The field was slow to embrace a number of radical politico-intellectual currents, notably feminist theorising focusing on the situatedness and social construction of knowledge (Christopherson 1989; McDowell 1992a, 1992b). As far as *Antipode* is concerned, aside from a few noteworthy exceptions, early feminist scholarship primarily developed outside the pages of the journal.[2] In addition, radical geography more broadly retreated from the study of race and racism (Peake and Sheppard 2014; cf. Mahtani 2014), something that today is being remedied through the growing subfields of Black geographies and Indigenous geographies.

Although the development of non-Marxist viewpoints and analysis proved challenging, the journal was nonetheless the site of some of the earliest efforts in Anglophone geography to publish "theory from the South", something that continues to energise debates concerning the contested geographies of knowledge production. The call for papers for a special issue on "underdevelopment and domination/dependence" edited by Milton Santos (1975:91), for example, singled out prevailing North American and Eurocentric biases that rendered much of what had been written in geography of little interest to readers in the global South. A rejection of "the empirical and atomized formulations which have been imposed as theories on the Third World … [was to be] questioned", in part through the affirmative inclusion of scholars from "underdeveloped countries" (ibid.).[3] However, even this laudable effort exposed a disjuncture, still in evidence today, between cultures and norms of academic writing as it is practiced in various parts of the world. Ultimately, fewer scholars from the global South were included in the special issue than originally had been envisioned, something that, as Ferretti and Pedrosa (2018) argue, was deeply troubling for Santos.

In the late 1980s, Susan Christopherson's feminist indictment of the discipline encapsulated a critique that had been building in many quarters, calling into question the very knowledge-making and pedagogical practices that constitute radical geography:

> For even among those who advocate political action and theoretical transformation, educational and institutional practice has remained profoundly conservative. Despite

> the lip-service given to the integrity of individual experience, little attention is given to how to teach women, minorities and working-class people … to translate their experiences into theory. (1989:87)

Flatly unconvinced that geography was prepared to confront its class, race and gender biases, Christopherson offered little hope for a "transformed geography" willing to fundamentally interrogate the exercise and basis of authority, "including our own" (ibid.). In case there might be any misunderstanding, Christopherson's response to the rhetorical question of whether she expects such a transformation was shorn of optimism: "No." The reasons for this terse judgment lay in what Christopherson identified as growing elitism within the discipline and a propensity to engage in intellectually moribund citational practices. Although Christopherson was writing 30 years ago, her appraisal of radical geography's epistemology *and contradictions* remains every bit as vital and compelling today. "[S]ome people are quickly out of fashion", she writes (1989:88), while the "[j]ustifiable fear" "of being left out" or "of being labeled" leads many to gravitate to "the 'in' subject" of the moment. Given the debates that are swirling across radical geography in 2019 concerning the field's knowledge-making and theory-building practices, readers today will no doubt have an immediate reaction to Christopherson's pointed and perceptive critique. Likely this will take the form of knowing assent, the assumption being that this critique is directed at someone other than the reader her/himself.[4]

This is not the place for us to weigh in on the nature of the discipline's contemporary debates about appropriate modes of knowledge production. We will do so anyway. One of the generative aspects of changing currents within geography has been the heightened awareness of longstanding biases regarding which authors are read, debated and cited. The prevailing winds determining which theories, concepts, methodologies, *and scholars* are regarded as being "in" or "out" of fashion periodically shift. For this reason, the politics of citation do not tack in a single direction, though the dominant course unquestionably was set long ago. Geography's institutionalised racism, the discipline's class and gender biases, and its underlying heterosexism (Chouinard and Grant 1995; Nast 2002) are among the deeply ingrained biases that have contributed to the field's damaging silences and exclusions along the axes of race, gender and sexuality (Katz 1996). That knowledge production has suffered as a direct result of these silences and exclusions is without question. Scholars must continue to struggle against structures and practices that discriminate and exclude; the transformation of geography, the prospects of which merited such profound scepticism by Susan Christopherson, must continue to be the goal.

At the same time, we must guard against a dangerous crosscurrent that threatens to stifle debate even as new corridors are opening for an expanded and robust discussion of epistemology and consideration of a more expansive set of subjects, methodologies, analyses, and critiques. Christopherson's observation that "some people are quickly out of fashion" points to a troubling characteristic of the discipline, one that is every bit as present today as when she penned these words three decades ago. By now it should be clear that stifling scholarly debate,

which can prematurely rob us of key observations and insights, is antithetical to radicalism within geography and to the transformations that are long overdue. That the field has failed to live up to its own mandates of openness and inclusiveness provides no warrant for attempts to shut down areas of scholarship and to shut out scholars in the process. We need more engagement, not less; deeper engagement, not the summary dismissal of theories and ideas rendered unfashionable. Calls for increased political relevance and greater clarity in writing are well received (Mitchell 2006). But at the same time let us not lose sight of the importance of different modalities of thought and writing, including those that are theoretically dense and not immediately accessible. As problematic as the "race for theory" (Christian 1987) can be, a "race from theory" entails its own dangers and has its own costs. If geography, as a transforming discipline, is always in the process of becoming, we will need theory, in its manifold forms and modalities, to assist us in navigating this transformation and in producing knowledge that challenges injustice.

Yet this is to raise another important question concerning what constitutes theory, or what distinguishes a theoretical text from data, narrative, or the "mere empirics" of disciplinary inquiry. To begin to push at this question is to also render transparent the political economy of radical geographical knowledge production insofar as it is to turn the lens back on to Christopherson's observation that "some people are quickly out of fashion". For fashion has a market, and the market for radical knowledge bears upon the intellectual life of the sub-discipline. Herein lies a tension that *Antipode* has had to, and must continue to, navigate: it is a journal that plays a significant role in channelling the currents of radical knowledge production, yet its mandate has always been to be something of a counterpoint to prevailing orthodoxies. That much is central to its radical mandate. To give space to theorisation that may not (yet) be legible *as* theory has to be part of the journal's task, as long as that theorisation is committed to complementing, building, and extending radical ways of knowing while also seeking social change. Since the journal became a commercial affair in 1986, this tension between market and radicality is one that all its editors have had to negotiate.

Resisting the impulse to quiet different voices was essential to the evolution of Anglophone radical geography in the last decades of the 20th century. The discipline as a whole was fortunate that, throughout the 1970s and well into the 1990s, scholars continued to develop radical thought and practice, though often outside, or in complicated relationships with, the early radical geographical project. According to Peake and Sheppard (2014:315), "[t]his period was especially important for the establishment of the emerging fields of geographies of race and racism, feminist (Marxist, liberal and other variants) geography, and (although slightly less so) for geographies of sexualities", though the fact that these emergent approaches and traditions "existed within or alongside radical geography and in other times and places apart from it" (2014:314) can be seen as "indicative not only of the transversal and unpredictable intellectual and spatial paths of the evolution of Anglophone North American critical geography, but also of the impossibility of attempts to explore its evolution through a core (Clark [University], SFU [Simon Fraser University]) versus periphery (everywhere else) model of

knowledge dissemination" (2014:314–315). The radical tradition within geography, in other words, has—since its very beginnings in the 1960s—been a much broader and more polyvalent undertaking than it is sometimes characterised.

So, what should we make of radical geography's achievements over the course of its first 50 years? "In 1969 when the first issue of *Antipode* was published the very notion that there could be a radical approach to geographical questions was an anathema to much of the profession", write Eric Sheppard and Joe Doherty (1986:1): "Geography had never had a significant critical, radical tradition." Seen in this light, the evolution and enduring relevance of radical geographical thought is notable. At the same time, Peake and Sheppard's appraisal of radical geography's trajectory and achievements is also likely tempered by the further realisation, frequently remarked upon in editorials published in *Antipode* and other journals, that in the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s radical geography continued to face sustained resistance, both within and beyond the academy. "A series of subtle oppressions" (Peet 1985:3) experienced by radical geographers left many feeling "beleaguered" (Blomley 2006:87), "battered and bruised" (Chouinard 1994:2), "diminished, dispirited and divided" (Walker and McDowell 1993:2).

In retrospect, now more than five decades into Anglo-American geography's radical turn, these characterisations might strike some readers as surprising. The number of geographers who self-identify as "radical" or (more commonly) "critical" has soared, as have the citation counts of many of the field's leading figures; the days in which Left geographers could be regarded "an embattled minority" (Walker 1989:81) within the discipline having long past (Castree 2000; Johnston 2000; Peake and Sheppard 2014). So too there has been an embrace of radical geography beyond the Anglo-American academy (Belina et al. 2009; Finn and Hanson 2017). For its part,

> *Antipode* has played a crucial role in recasting and transforming the discipline of geography, the forms of geographical theory, and the practice of geographical research. Hostility to inequality, intolerance, and injustice are now at the core of the discipline and the plea for relevancy has been heard. (Peck and Wills 2000:3)

Though falling well short of the transfiguration called for by Christopherson, that progressive change has occurred within the discipline is undeniable. Along with *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*; *Gender, Place and Culture*; *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*; *Human Geography: A New Journal of Radical Geography*; and now-defunct outlets including *Transition* and the newsletter of the Union of Socialist Geographers, all of which share a commitment to advancing radical geographical analysis and praxis, *Antipode* helped catalyse and propel a transformation of the discipline such that "by the late 1990s radical/critical geography … [had] become the new canon, the new mainstream" (Peake and Sheppard 2014:318). Admittedly, though, for some radical/critical geographers (see Blomley 2006; Castree 2000; Chouinard 1994; Peet 2000; Waterstone 2002) this has been a dubious achievement as the pressures of academic professionalisation have made unwanted incursions that have come at the expense of activism, action and engagement with the world in which radical scholarship seeks to intentionally intervene.

A "Living Archive" of Radical Geography

How might one assess the achievements of *Antipode* and its transition from an upstart, countercultural journal whose founders were committed to disciplinary and societal transformation, though a protracted period in which the journal's very survival was in doubt (see Heynen et al. 2017:8–12), and on to its position as one of the mainstays of the discipline? For Peake and Sheppard (2014:309), "*Antipode*'s emergence was the relational effect of multiple conditions of possibility", occurring as it did during a period of social upheaval in the 1960s that laid bare many of the dangers and contradictions of the times. Key to its significance, certainly far more than citation counts, impact factors and other such metrics, is the simple fact that "it created visibility, and a place, for radical geography by dint of being a concrete and recognized academic object (a journal)" (Peake and Sheppard 2014:309). Here Stuart Hall's inquiry into the formation and consolidation of the archive is instructive to the task of historical assessment. As was the case with *Antipode*, "No archive arises out of thin air", Hall (2001:89) writes; "Each archive has a 'pre-history', in the sense of prior conditions of existence". Peake and Sheppard's illuminating contribution to the historical record documenting the emergence of radical geography in North America—one that invites further elaboration[5]—reveals that a number of geographers, both those who have been widely acknowledged and those who have been wrongly overlooked, played important roles in shaping emergent geographical thought, methodologies, and praxis, contributing to what ultimately would coalesce into geography's radical edge (see also Peake 2015).

"Constituting an archive represents a significant moment, on which we need to reflect with care. It occurs at that moment when a relatively random collection of works, whose movement appears simply to be propelled from one creative production to the next, is at the point of becoming something more ordered and considered: an object of reflection and debate" (Hall 2001:89). Such was the case when *Antipode* was established, seemingly without reference to the radical experiments and practices that preceded the publication of the first issue (Peake and Sheppard 2014). Yet from volume 1, issue 1, and over the course of the next 50 years, *Antipode* has played an important role in both propelling and ordering radical geographical debates. From its founding, *Antipode* has sought to be an outlet for dissident voices, and statements from past editors regularly attest to the avowedly ecumenical orientation of the journal, even if at times the scope of debate was narrowed through editor discretion and decision-making, and even though at times such claims of ecumenical embrace have been a matter of vigorous dispute.[6] As Hall observes, the constitution of a journal *qua* archive is a moment that demands careful reflection. For this reason, since its founding, the journal has invited critique of its own practices (Stea 1969), and critique it has received (for example, see Castree and Wright 2005; Hague 2002; Jacoby 1987; Nast 2002; Waterstone 2002).

The forgoing discussion, like the annals of *Antipode* themselves, makes clear that radical geographical interventions have never been easy or singular or transparent; rather they have been full of contradictions, silences, and shortcomings. This is one reason careful reflection upon the archive is required. But this entails more

than reflection as a form of "looking backward" across a field's oeuvre. *Antipode* should be understood as constituting "a 'living archive', whose construction must be seen as an on-going, never-completed project" (Hall 2001:89). Imperfect and unfinished, open-ended and mutable, "the journal has aspired to be a place of theoretical innovation pushing the ways in which geographers (and others) go about framing a heterodox radical politics" (Heynen et al. 2017:12). Hopefully the underlying modesty inherent in such an undertaking is clear even if it is not evinced by the boldness of the aspiration. *Antipode*, and the field of radical geography in which it is embedded, is an ongoing project. The journal is an expression of those who publish in it and of those who steward the archive at any moment in time. It is a reflection of the discipline and its cognate fields, and its specific identity is therefore indeterminate. In these senses, *Antipode* is always evolving and never fully knowable.

Antipode: Avant la lettre

As *Antipode* enters its sixth decade, its editorial statement has been amended. The (ever-expanding) list of radical subfields (Marxist/socialist/anarchist/antiracist/feminist/sexual liberationist) has been removed, not because these markers are unimportant or because there is a diminished commitment to any of these forms of scholarship, but because the list seems too fixed and static and incapable of reflecting radical approaches that are as of yet unnamed. Here we heed Raymond Williams' (1983:16) warning that in "periods of change" language "and concern for clarity can quickly become brittle", stifling thought and creativity. The journal's revised editorial statement continues *Antipode*'s ecumenical tradition while acknowledging the ongoing transformation of geographical analysis and the concomitant decentring of what it means to be radical, and it upholds the importance of analyses that are theoretically and empirically substantive while also providing a subtle reminder regarding the content and tenor of academic debate. It reads:

> *Antipode* publishes innovative papers that push at the boundaries of radical geographical thinking. Papers will be rigorous and substantive in theoretical and empirical terms. Authors are encouraged to critique and challenge settled orthodoxies, while engaging the context of intellectual traditions and their particular trajectories. Papers should put new research or critical analyses to work to contribute to strengthening a Left politics broadly defined.[7]

The journal thus engages radical geography by imagining it not as an unchanging sub-discipline, but rather as a site, or point of constellation, through which to engage and engender a spatially oriented Left politics. The focus emphasises intellectual and activist praxis, thus displacing the question of who is or is not "radical", and instead drawing attention to already existing and future sites of struggle, liberation, and political change (cf. Gilmore 2017). In a small way, then, *Antipode*'s commitment to publishing, presenting, and supporting the work of geographers and non-geographers imperfectly expresses this kind of vision; in the pages of the journal, through the mentorship of early-career scholars at the

biannual Institute for the Geographies of Justice, in our annual lectures, and through the Antipode Foundation scholar-activist and workshop grants, we seek to honour and support radical politics and action.[8]

Lingua franca: Keywords in Radical Geographical Thought

The chapters collected in this volume commemorating *Antipode*'s 50th anniversary are short, suggestive, conversational and experimental, and they encompass a multitude of ways that radical intellectual scholarship and debate within geography and across its peripheries has unfolded, and continues to do so. They delve into the journal's intellectual history, they speculate on current conjunctures, and they reach for new, unthought horizons of critical potential. Many are playful. But play, we note, is perhaps the most creative of elans and should not be confused with political apathy, or frivolity. When play enables another way of seeing, being, or critically engaging, we should not assume it to be a- or anti-theoretical.

Given, as we have stressed above, the difficulties of knowing *Antipode*'s archive with any certainty, we have, in this volume, left the interpretation of the radical geographical project to our contributors. The 50 short essays gathered here reflect the visions, preoccupations, and not least the speculations of 50+ authors close to the journal. Their essays speak to radical geography's past-present-future in all the ways our contributors imagine them to. *Keywords in Radical Geography* is not, therefore, a dictionary of predictable or generalised words historicised and defined by each author. Instead, contributors have selected terms, concepts, or sets of ideas that resonate with them, that may be important to their research, or that simply provide for them a wormhole to a more free place or a more utopian imagination. Each author discusses the term and/or idea they have chosen in relation to radical geography. The task was simply to connect the entry to key themes and aspirations in radical geography rather than to describe and define radical geography in any sense. Eschewing any pretence of building a coherent narrative, we hope this will be a fitting testimony to the role *Antipode* has played in the generation of radical geographical engagements with the world, and the profusion of different types of radical intervention across the broader discipline of geography.

Keywords?

The title of this volume might well bring to mind Raymond Williams' classic *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. First published in 1976 and revised in 1983, *Keywords* offers "an inquiry into a vocabulary: a shared body of words and meanings" used in discussions of culture and society (Williams 1983:15). This endeavour is alive and well in the 21st century. Two recent edited volumes, *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (Bennett et al. 2005a) and *Keywords for Today: A 21st Century Vocabulary* (McCabe et al. 2018), similarly provide "a critical reflection on the key terms constituting our contemporary vocabulary of culture and society" (Bennett et al. 2005b:570). To be sure, some might

say that these books include entries that are important to their authors, but arguably are not part of "our contemporary vocabulary"; their authors' interests aren't necessarily shared by others. And absent in them are words that most of us would have expected or hoped to see given their significance in current debates. What is more, one might ask, "who is this 'us'?". Sociology and anthropology, like geography, are diverse, changing fields constituted by a plurality of perspectives. So where are those perspectives from the South, subaltern perspectives, and so on? Of course, the contents of both single- and co-authored works will always be partial (and for various reasons), just as Williams himself warned that *Keywords* was "necessarily unfinished and incomplete", welcoming "amendment, correction and addition" (1983:27, 26). This notwithstanding, we can say that the tables of contents of these books are more or less predictable, non-arbitrary, more or less as they "ought" to be.

Our book is quite different. At first glance, its table of contents looks capricious, if not chaotic. Entries are organised, perhaps rather unimaginatively, via the convention of the alphabet. Indeed, like Williams (and Bennett et al., and McCabe et al.), we are concerned that alphabetic listing obscures the many, diverse and provocative connections between entries. But those connections are there to be made (and remade, and remade again) by readers. As Williams writes, "a book is only completed when it is read" (1983:25)—like an archive, it is not; *it becomes*. The contents of this book are surprising, to say the least, and beg questions. Glancing at it, one might wonder why "Mercury", "Enough" and "Badge", say, are present. Are they really "key terms"? (Badge? *Really*? You cannot be serious …!). And why include these words when "Development", "Migration" "Neoliberalism" and "War", for example, are absent? Well, our book is the product of the creative input of many rather than some version of top-down planning. As editors, we afforded the book's contributors freedom to choose their own words. Like the editors of *Keywords for Today*, we see language as not only "a shared understanding", but also "a site of division" (McCabe et al. 2018:xi), of contestation, of disagreement, and of struggle. Our concern is less with radical geography's "single meaning" than with its "many competing semantic elements" (ibid.). The significance of a given word is neither self-evident nor unproblematic. To make this clear, perhaps the relevance of these words within (and, indeed, beyond) our discipline ought *not to be* obvious but, rather, is there to be demonstrated by our contributors. The meaning of these words is an open question, and arguably the task of exploring meaning and usage can open new political possibilities that otherwise might go unnoticed. The case is the contributors' to make. We think they are a persuasive bunch, passionate and rigorous in their reflections on why "Love" and "Fragments", "Vulnerability" and "Monument", and all manner of other weird and wonderful words speak—*matter*—to radical geography's histories, current condition, and possible future directions. And in this sense, each entry might also be the beginning of a new conversation … which is also what the radical project must be about.

This approach is fitting for a journal like *Antipode*, which has always welcomed the infusion of new ideas and the shaking-up of old positions through dialogue and debate. Despite the prevailing Marxist currents in parts of the journal's early

life, it has never been committed to a single view of diagnosis or critique. Just look at the editorials marking its 10th, 20th, 30th and 40th anniversaries (Castree and Wright 2009; O'Keefe 1979; Peck and Wills 2000; Walker 1989): successive editorial teams have repeatedly reasserted the journal's openness and inclusivity, its commitment to broadening debate, its ecumenism and absence of dogma, its willingness to diversify and complicate. As Phil O'Keefe (1979:1) suggested in the late 1970s, despite *Antipode*'s communion with radical geography, the very equation of the journal with a specific discipline may be misleading insofar as its founders and subsequent editors were always committed to "working within and above disciplinary boundaries". And as we enter our sixth decade we would like to think we are still in a place where the new, the innovative, the creative, and the heretofore unthought radical edges of spatial theorisation and analysis can find a home. Neither unquestioningly bound to what has come before, nor wilfully distant and adrift from it, we hope to continue the tradition of striving, with passion, to know and understand the difficulties facing us without underestimating the possibilities—neither despairing about domination and oppression nor naively hopeful about resistance and alternatives.

Endnotes

[1] The Socially and Ecologically Responsible Geographers (SERGE) formed in 1971, publishing the journal *Transition* until 1986. The Union of Socialist Geographers (USG) formed in 1974; an archive of its newsletter, published until 1982, is available at https://antipodefoundation.org/2017/06/28/usg-newsletter-archive/ (see Peake and Sheppard 2014; Thatcher et al. 2017).

[2] Though *Antipode* likely was the first Geography journal to publish a feminist analysis (Walker and McDowell 1993:2), see Pat Burnett's (1973) "Social change, the status of women, and models of city form and development".

[3] The special issues were published in 1977—volume 9, numbers 1 and 3.

[4] A symposium in honor of Susan Christopherson was published in 2017, including contributions from Jennifer Clark, Amy Glasmeier, Cindi Katz, Katharine Rankin, and Rachel Weber (see: https://antipodefoundation.org/2017/10/23/on-being-outside-the-project/).

[5] Eric Sheppard and Trevor Barnes' (2019) edited book, *Spatial Histories of Radical Geography: North America and Beyond*, which is part of the *Antipode* Book Series (https://www.wiley.com/en-gb/Antipode+Book+Series-c-2222), goes some way towards this.

[6] Our archive of past editors' reflections is available online: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/14678330/homepage/editor_s_past_reflections.htm

[7] This statement was written by Nik Theodore, Kiran Asher, Dave Featherstone, Tariq Jazeel, Andy Kent and Marion Werner in late 2018 and opens our guidelines for authors (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/14678330/homepage/forauthors.html).

[8] For more on all these activities, see https://antipodefoundation.org

References

Amaral D J and Wisner B (1970) Participant-observation, phenomenology, and the rules for judging sciences: A comment. *Antipode* 2(1):42–51

Anderson J (1969) Moral problems of remote sensing technology. *Antipode* 1(1):54–57

Belina B, Best U and Naumann M (2009) Critical geography in Germany: From exclusion to inclusion via internationalisation. *Social Geography* 4(1):47–58

Bennett T, Grossberg L and Morris M (eds) (2005a) *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell

Bennett T, Grossberg L and Morris M (2005b) Originals, remakes, assemblages: A retrospect on *New Keywords*. *Criticism* 47(4):567–571
Blaut J M (1969) Jingo geography (part I). *Antipode* 1(1):10–15
Blaut J M (1970) Geographic models of imperialism. *Antipode* 2(1):65–82
Blomley N (2006) Uncritical critical geography? *Progress in Human Geography* 30(1):87–94
Breitbart M (1972) Advocacy in planning and geography. *Antipode* 4(2):64–68
Burnett P (1973) Social change, the status of women, and models of city form and development. *Antipode* 5(3):57–62
Castree N (2000) Professionalisation, activism, and the university: Whither "critical geography"? *Environment and Planning A* 32(6):955–970
Castree N and Wright M W (2005) Home truths. *Antipode* 37(1):1–8
Castree N and Wright M W (2009) The power of numbers. *Antipode* 41(1):1–9
Chouinard V (1994) Reinventing radical geography: Is all that's Left Right? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12(1):2–6
Chouinard V and Grant A (1995) On not being anywhere near "the project": Ways of putting ourselves in the picture. *Antipode* 27(2):137–166
Christian B (1987) The race for theory. *Cultural Critique* 6:51–63
Christopherson S (1989) On being outside "the project". *Antipode* 21(2):83–89
Corey K E (1972) Advocacy in planning: A reflective analysis. *Antipode* 4(2):46–63
Donaldson F (1969) Geography and the black American: The white papers and the invisible man. *Antipode* 1(1):17–33
Earickson R (1971) Poverty and race: The bane of access to essential public services. *Antipode* 3(1):1–8
Ferretti F and Pedrosa B V (2018) Inventing critical development: A Brazilian geographer and his Northern networks. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 43(4):703–717
Finn J C and Hanson A-M (2017) Critical geographies in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Geography* 16(1):1–15
Gilmore R W (2017) Abolition geography and the problem of innocence. In G T Johnson and A Lubin (eds) *Futures of Black Radicalism* (pp 225–240). New York: Verso
Hague E (2002) *Antipode*, Inc? *Antipode* 34(4):655–661
Hall S (2001) Constituting an archive. *Third Text* 15(54):89–92
Harvey D (1972) Revolutionary and counter revolutionary theory in geography and the problem of ghetto formation. *Antipode* 4(2):1–13
Heynen N, Kent A, McKittrick K, Gidwani V and Larner W (2017) Neil Smith's long revolutionary imperative. *Antipode* 49(s1):5–18
Jacoby R (1987) *The Last Intellectuals*. New York: Basic Books
Jarrett R and Wisner B (1969) How to build a slum, part one. *Antipode* 1(1):37–42
Johnston R (2000) Intellectual respectability and disciplinary transformation? Radical geography and the institutionalisation of geography in the USA since 1945. *Environment and Planning A* 32(6):971–990
Katz C (1996) Towards minor theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14 (4):487–499
Mahtani M (2014) Toxic geographies: Absences in critical race thought and practice in social and cultural geography. *Social and Cultural Geography* 15(4):359–367
McCabe C and Yanacek H with the Keywords Project (eds) (2018) *Keywords for Today: A 21st Century Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
McDowell L (1992a) Doing gender: Feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography. *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers* 17(4):399–416
McDowell L (1992b) Multiple voices: Speaking from inside and outside "the project". *Antipode* 24(1):56–72
Mitchell K (2006) Writing from left field. *Antipode* 38(2):205–212
Morrill R (1969) Geography and the transformation of society. *Antipode* 1(1):6–9
Nast H J (2002) Prologue: Crosscurrents. *Antipode* 34(5):835–844
O'Keefe (1979) Editorial. *Antipode* 11(3):1–2

Peake L J (2015). Rethinking the politics of feminist knowledge production in Anglo-American geography. *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien* 59(3), 257–266
Peake L and Sheppard E (2014) The emergence of radical/critical geography within North America. *ACME* 13(2):305–327
Peck J and Wills J (2000) Geography and its discontents. *Antipode* 32(1):1–3
Peet R (1969) A new left geography. *Antipode* 1(1):3–5
Peet R (1972) Editorial policy. *Antipode* 4(2):iv
Peet R (1977) The development of radical geography in the United States. *Progress in Geography* 1(2):240–263
Peet R (1985) Radical geography in the United States: A personal history. *Antipode* 17(2/3):1–7
Peet R (2000) Celebrating 30 years of radical geography. *Environment and Planning A* 32 (6):951–953
Santos M (1975) Special issue on underdevelopment and domination/dependence. *Antipode* 7(1):91
Sheppard E and Barnes T (eds) (2019) *Spatial Histories of Radical Geography: North America and Beyond*. Oxford: Wiley
Sheppard E and Doherty J (1986) Editorial. *Antipode* 18(1):1–4
Stea D (1969) Positions, purposes, pragmatics: A journal of radical geography. *Antipode* 1 (1):1–2
Stea D (1970) Another discourse on method. *Antipode* 2(1):52–64
Stewart R F (1969) Troubling textbooks. *Antipode* 1(1):34–36
Thatcher J, Sheppard E and Akatiff C (2017) The Union of Socialist Geographers remembered. *AntipodeFoundation.org* 1 May. https://antipodefoundation.org/supplementary-material/the-union-of-socialist-geographers-newsletter-1975-1983/ (last accessed 23 November 2018)
Walker D (1989) Guest editorial. *Antipode* 21(2):81–82
Walker R and McDowell L (1993) Editorial. *Antipode* 25(1):1–3
Waterstone M (2002) A radical journal of geography or a journal of radical geography? *Antipode* 34(4):662–666
Williams R (1983) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (2nd edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press
Wisner B (n.d.) "Notes from Underground: The Beginning of *Antipode*." https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/14678330/homepage/editor_s_past_reflections.htm (last accessed 16 January 2019)