SECTORS

Newsletter of the American Sociological Association's
Sociology of Development Section

Section Officers, 2022-2023

Chair
Enrique Pumar
Santa Clara University

Chair-elect
Erin McDonnell
University of Notre Dame

Secretary/Treasurer
Matthias vom Hau
Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals

Section Council
Shiri Noy (2023)
Denison University
Firuzeh Shokooh Valle (2023)
Franklin & Marshall College
Devparna Roy (2024)
Nazareth College
Alexandre White (2024) Johns Hopkins University Jennifer E. Givens (2024) Utah State University
Luis Henrique Vilaca (2004)
University of Notre Dame

Student Representatives
Perdana Roswaldy (2024)
Northwestern University

Mentorship Program Coordinator
Karin Johnson
Texas A&M University

Newsletter Editors
Mushahid Hussain (2023)
Cornell University
Grace Wang (2024)
Stellenbosch University

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Enrique Pumar

I want to thank the many of you who have dedicated so much of your time, energy, and support to sustain the success of our section.

Reflecting on the end of my tenure as Section Chair, I appreciate how much our community values the professional relations that enrich our academic and personal lives. Our many achievements are made possible because of the mutual respect and commitment we cherish to celebrate our field's intellectual diversity and social impact. Our program for the ASA annual meeting shows how our foundational principles come alive. Working with such an accomplished and diverse group of colleagues has enriched my life in more ways than I can count despite the considerable effort of our engagement. The support of our members is undoubtedly very much welcome and appreciated.

I look forward to seeing many of you in Philadelphia this summer and in Montreal in 2024 as we continue "our road less traveled." Take good care and be well.

SYMPOSIUM: RETHINKING THE GLOBAL NORTH/SOUTH DIVIDE IN DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

From its earliest days, sociology had concepts for describing global differences and societal change. From Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer to Emile Durkheim, Ferdinand Tonnies and Lester Frank Ward, sociologists discussed progress by drawing broad functional distinctions between "advanced" and "primitive" institutions and societies. Others imputed in such differences and transformation the socio-spatial dynamics of modern conflict. The idea of the "South" in Antonio Gramsci's essay "The Southern Question" showed how southern Italy had been colonized by capitalists from northern Italy (Dados & Connell, 2012). With the Cold War winding down, the terms "Global North" and "Global South" spread in academic fields such as international relations, political science, and development studies. North-South conceptual distinctions provided an alternative to the idea of "globalization" as growing homogenization of cultures, governance structures, and societies.

What or where is the "global south"? There are three directions regarding how this question is approached. First, this term broadly refers to the hemispheric south as well as decolonized (ex)peripheries of the old colonial centers of power. Early reference to the "South" at the United Nations goes back to the 1960s during the Cold War, when the concept began to emerge. "Global South" is thus taken as a collective term referring to poor and underdeveloped countries and regions of the world. Second, the term represents cross-regional and multilateral alliances between these countries. The Bandung Conference in 1955 was a watershed, reflecting the sponsoring countries' dissatisfaction with the reluctance of Western powers to consult with them on making decisions affecting Asia and Africa, and expressing a desire for anti-colonial

self-determination. Third, the term is used to signify social spaces of resistance against neo- and post-neoliberal forms of global capitalism (Haug, 2021).

North-South terminology, like the core-periphery, arose from an allegorical application of categories to name patterns of wealth, privilege, and development across broad regions. However, the term "Global South" often functions as more than a metaphor for underdevelopment. Development, both as a research theme and a policy issue, concerns scholars and practitioners from both the developing and the developed countries and regions. Due to the rise of global inflation, Russian-Ukraine War, Covid-pandemic, traditionally defined developed countries like the United States are facing increasing development challenges in their own terms, from infrastructure and energy to housing and healthcare. Amid ongoing world-economic processes and geopolitical tensions, the analytical distinction between "global north" or "global south" are therefore starting to blur. Issues defining the "global south", such as poverty, economic inequality, rural-urban migration, land rights, and ecological deterioration, for instance, are increasingly defining developmental challenges in the "global north." Feminist movements such as #Metoo that originated in the global north is having an increasing impact on women in the global south. The frames of global racial capitalism and trans-local migration studies are challenging typical understandings of development issues as nationally contained and demarcated along neat North-South axes.

We are at a critical crossroad, facing genuinely global challenges every day. As scholars of development, our understanding of these challenges and working towards effective solutions cannot merely rely on ready-made recipes and theories or a one-size-fits-all approach. The diversity of political institutions and systems within and across the North-South axis indicates as much. Our contributors to the Spring/summer 2023 symposium grapple with such questions, ideas, and methodological concerns in their thought-provoking essays. Agarwala explores the complexities and deficiencies of North/South distinctions through recourse to the central arguments in her new book, where she shows how the nexus of state practices and the shifting dynamics of class power shape India's 'migration-development' regime. In the process, she raises pertinent questions regarding developmentalist outlooks and their (post)colonial lineages, calling for greater attention to "diverse ground realities." Gold & Krause's contribution is motivated by similar concerns, focusing on the need for both theoretical precision and methodological reflexivity in selecting "model cases." They point to the possibilities of engagement with adjacent scholarly fields, which might enable us to think of North/South distinctions, their institutional and (geo)political contours, in new and productive ways.

Sectors Co-Editors,
Grace Yuehan Wang; Mushahid Hussain

The Migration Challenge for the Global North/South Divide

Rina Agarwala, Johns Hopkins University

In the past decade, the terms "global North" and "global South" have mushroomed within US-based development sociology discussions, journals, and conferences. More recently, they have also appeared as buzzwords among "Southern" political leaders vying for more power within the G20. On the plus side, they have come to offer a useful short-cut, signaling membership within a community of scholars (and politicians) critical of imperialism, geopolitical inequality, racism, and "Northern power" (nebulously defined).

However, the terms also suffer from some deficiencies. First, they lack salience in much of the world. Although I too have begun to use the terms when in the U.S., I rarely use them when conducting fieldwork in India, as they seem to emit a foreign self-righteousness that is (ironically) rooted in the global North. Second, they are often used to personify entire countries (or groups of countries) or refer to a particular "perspective," which occludes the precise actors who are cementing or resisting power hierarchies between countries. Third, their usage becomes confused when examining class and race-based power hierarchies within nations and across the transnational sphere. Finally, they lose analytical leverage when

trying to understand change in the geopolitical order. These deficiencies raise an important challenge – should these terms be broadened to address these deficiencies or should we simply accept and acknowledge their limited reach?

Global migration provides an ideal space in which to engage this challenge. As I illustrate in my recent book, The Migration-Development Regime: How Class Shapes Indian Emigration, nation states still serve as the sole actor with the legitimate authority to regulate, restrict, and govern the cross-border movement of people. Since the early 1900s, the "migration states" of receiving and sending countries have controlled who enjoys the right to enter or leave particular national borders. The terms global North/South usefully remind us that some nation states hold more power than others in exerting such controls over people's right to mobility. They also force us to broaden our geographical focus of migration flows to include not just South-North flows, but also the much larger South-South flows, and the recently expanding North-South flows. Finally, by enabling us to expose a Northern bias in migration scholarship that focusses on wealthy receiving countries, these terms have made space to examine migration from a Southern perspective that includes poor countries (which send and receive migrants).

But Southern governments and migrants also muddy neat interpretations of North/South power hierarchies and underscore the role that transnationalism plays in constantly reordering classes and races within and between countries under global capitalism. Within countries, for example, migration has created new class and race-based inequalities, raising questions around the boundaries of North/South categorizations. As I illustrate in my book, sending country governments of the global South are not merely passive agents in governing global migration. For example, the Indian government since the 1900s has legally restricted poor citizens from emigrating abroad, while allowing elite citizens to freely move-thereby deepening class inequalities within India and globally. In receiving countries of the global South (in Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and the Caribbean) and North (including the U.S. and Canada), the British colonial regime followed its 1833 abolition of slavery by encouraging the emigration of Indian workers to serve as racialized coolies (in indentured servitude, informal employment, and middle-class professional jobs). Today, some descendants residing in Northern countries remain poor and racially disenfranchised, while others residing in Southern countries have become wealthy CEOs of global companies. Should we use the terms global North/South to categorize populations within countries (as some have recently done)? Or should we simply use race and class-based terms to describe within-country hierarchies?

Southern governments and migrants have also complicated between-country power dynamics by building new cross-national bridges among elites. Since the 1980s, for example, the Indian state has enabled its elite emigrants to form what I call an "elite pact" with business and government leaders in India, which in turn have shifted India's position in the global capitalist order for the first time since the 1800s. Indian-Americans, in particular, have served as a key transnational vector for the transmission of neoliberal ideals and practices of privatization, self-sufficiency, and voluntarism from elite U.S. spaces to elites in India. This has reshaped Indian businesses, civil society organizations, education, healthcare, tax codes and real estate markets, making India a new type of global economic actor. The UK's Indian-origin, Hindu prime minister exemplifies how such transnational vectors also bleed into the intimate sphere; he is married to an Indian citizen and daughter of the founder of one of India's most successful IT firms. How can we (or should we) use the global North/South terms to account for these personal and professional elite pacts that are bridging the North/South divide (at least for elites) and shifting the South's position therein?

Poor migrants also complicate the North/South divide. In our work on informal workers' movements across 7 countries of the global South and North, for example, we found migrant workers are transferring movement strategies from the global South to the North, reminding us the global South can also re-shape the North and that globalization may offer pathways for labor solidarity. Indeed, as I illustrate in my book, Indian emigrants helped spread the anti-imperialist and anti-racist movement of the early 1900s and a pro-democracy movement in the 1970s. Relatedly, I detail how migrant workers who circulate between India and the Gulf transmit ideals of entrepreneurship and self-sufficiency and formulate identities of global cosmopolitanism within South-South corridors that do not even include the global North. These findings, alongside the sheer wealth amassing in the Gulf due to oil, finance, and tourism, suggest parts of the global

South may soon become less dependent on the North. Can those parts ever become part of the global North? Or should we formulate a new middle category to account for mobility similar to the "semi-periphery"?

Addressing these questions would distinguish the global North/South terms from those that already articulate the economic, political, and social divisions that order the world's countries. The still widely used terms "developing countries" and "less developed countries," for example, already expose the material deprivations the majority of nations face. Having emerged in the 1950s on the heels of Asian and African anti-colonial movements, they also reify national-level sovereignty and equality as a normative (albeit challenging) goal. The terms "core," "periphery," and "semi-periphery", already underscore how imperial histories continue to force countries into relations of exploitation and interdependency, thereby exposing the world as a single unit of analysis with a hierarchy of wealth that is entrenched in the long run. The terms "East" versus "West" offer a horizontal (rather than vertically hierarchical) axis of difference, forcing our gaze beyond the singular pathway of "catching up" in aggregate income to also explore social, ideological, and cultural forms of development. These terms assert "non-Western" identities and practices with the same dignity and legitimacy afforded to "Western" ones, but they also enable arguments that echo the orientalism of European colonialism. Finally, to many, the term "Third World" already signifies a political solidarity and agency among countries that are poor but empowered to lead. Articulated in Bandung and rooted in painful and personal experiences with domination and deprivation, the Third World reflects a commitment to alternative and innovative visions for a transformative future that meets material and other emancipatory needs; is free of racism and imperial control; eschews universal approaches to development; and pays attention to diverse ground realities.

But none of these terms have illuminated the power differences within nations or been used to analyze how transnational forces upend power hierarchies between countries. Yes-this is a tall order. But taking on this challenge to deepen the global North/South terms so they address this looming gap would increase their analytical leverage globally and for the globe.

Case Selection Within and Beyond the "Global South"

Tomás Gold, University of Notre Dame
&
Monika Krause, London School of Economics and Political Science

Suggesting a transition from one state to another, the concept of "development" is hard to separate from an opposition between the less and the more developed, which has long been linked to ideas about geography. In that sense, the sociology of development and the opposition between "developing countries" and "developed" countries were born together. If we note the parallel way in which the "global south" is opposed to the "global north," and follow recent critiques of the way the notion of the "global south" is used in academic everyday language (Benzecry 2021, Dados and Connell 2012, Haug et al 2021, Palomino 2019), it might be fair to say that the sociology of development and the category of the global south were also born together.

If we consider this history and follow the invitation of the book "Model Cases" (Krause 2021) to also ask about the dimension of case selection more specifically - which is partly separate from the more general diagnosis of Eurocentric ideology offered by postcolonial theory - what are productive ways forward? Which cases have been privileged as stand-ins for which categories? Which combinations of cases and disciplinary concerns are neglected due to the ways in which the category of the global south is conceived and the ways in which it is opposed to the global north? What is of particular interest with regard to development?

It is important to note that cases in Africa, Latin America, and Asia have not so much been generally neglected or excluded in what circulates as the "international social sciences," but have been incorporated in selective ways. The social sciences have been shaped by a tendency to assume that insights based on cases labelled as "more advanced" would later be applicable to all cases (Chakrabarty 2000). That means that for the investigation of categories of "general" interest to social scientists, cases in Western Europe and North America have been privileged. Within this pattern, particular categories have been linked to particular cases - consider the social scientific role of the English working class and the French revolution specifically - and cases in the UK and the US have been sponsored by the power of the english language and english-language journals.

For questions of development, cases in the global south have long been privileged cases, again with a more particular focus on some cases, such as Brazil and India – rather than Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, for example. For sociologists (whether they also identify as sociologists of development or not) working in and about the global south, this also means that not studying development is still the basis of important contributions to the social sciences in general. We need to draw on the full range of cases to understand states, markets, professions, families, and racisms.

For the sociology of development more specifically, countries of the global north are, in a certain sense, "neglected". As the call for this symposium rightly notes, global north contexts face "developmental challenges", which social scientists are investigating but which they are not necessarily always investigating in dialogue with existing scholarship on development. Within the geographic areas labelled as the global north, smaller countries, like Finland, Portugal, or Taiwan have been neglected outside the work of scholars based within these countries themselves. Due partly to the opposition between the global north and the global south, the "global east" has often been an afterthought both in the sociology of development and in other fields of sociology outside the region itself (Turbina and Mueller 2020). Cases from the Caucasus are peripheral with regard to a number of ways of categorising the globe, including but not limited to the north/south distinction (Deluguian 2005). Some recent work has expanded these frontiers in productive ways by bringing together less explored cases within the global south/east in dialogue with findings from North America and/or Europe (Arsel et al 2021; Garrido 2020).

Within the sociology of development in the countries of the global south, schemas associated with the opposition between the global south and the global north has led to a neglect of non-western global north donor organisations, such as those originating in Japan (but see Wilks 2021). In the sociology of humanitarianism, host states have been neglected (but see Pasha 2021), with the sociology of neoliberalism suffering from a similar problem (but see Slobodian and Plehwe 2022). More generally, the opposition between the global south and the global north transports assumptions about one opposition between center and periphery, which obscures the overlapping forms of influence and hegemony that shape most of the world. Expanding beyond current 'model cases' of north and south might be a valuable avenue to counter this general trend.

References:

Arsel, M., Adaman, F., & Saad-Filho, A. (2021). Authoritarian developmentalism: The latest stage of neoliberalism? Geoforum, *124*, 261–266.

Benzecry, C. (2021). The U.S., Latin America, and the Global South. Perspectives, 43(1).

Chakrabarty, D. S. (2000). Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dados, N., & Connell, R. (2012). The Global South. Contexts, 11(1), 12–13.

Deluguian, G. (2005) Bourdieu's Secret Admirer in the Caucasus. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Garrido, M. (2021). Reconceptualizing Segregation from the Global south. City and Community 20 (1): 24-37.

Haug, S., Braveboy-Wagner, J., & Maihold, G. (2021). The 'Global South' in the study of world politics: Examining a meta category. Third World Quarterly, 42(9), 1923–1944.

Krause, M. (2021). Model cases: On canonical research objects and sites. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Palomino, P. (2019). On the Disadvantages of "Global South" for Latin American Studies. Journal of World Philosophies, 4(2), 22–39.

Pasha, S. (2021). Humanitarianism, securitization, and containment in Jordan's Za'atari Refugee Camp. British Journal of Sociology 72 (4) 1141-1155.

Slobodian, Q. and Plehwe, D. (2022). Market Civilizations: Neoliberals East and South. Zone Books, Princeton University Press.

Trubina, E. and Mueller, M.. (2020). The Global East in global urbanism: Views from Beyond North and South. Eurasian Geography and Economics 61 (6), 627-635

Wilks, M.C. (2021). Development Imaginaries: Gender and Comparative Aid Chains in Cambodia. PhD Dissertation. University of Virginia.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD

Leveraging Unexpected Opportunities while Doing Fieldwork Abroad

Alejandra Cueto Piazza
Brown University

In developing economies, the so-called informal sector represents approximately 70% of total employment, while 24% of the total population lives in urban slums. States, however, face difficulties in counting how many people belong to the informal economy and how many live in informal settlements. In Argentina, where I am conducting my field, social movements of informal workers did more than organize and demand rights; these organizations also managed to create new categories to gather information about populations that otherwise would remain 'invisible' to the state. In 2016, social organizations and a right-wing party developed a unique methodology to count all the informal settlements throughout the country. Given that the bureaucrats of the National Institute in charge of national statistics in the country could not conduct a census in an urban slum, nonprofit organizations and social movements developed a methodology to identify and count them. Based upon this case study, my research focuses on explaining the role of non-state actors – specifically, social movements - in making specific populations more legible for the state, thereby changing how governments react to the demands of a specific socio-economic sector while simultaneously attempting to organize popular sectors from below.

To study social movements' role in counting the informal sector and making vulnerable populations more legible, I spent one year in Buenos Aires conducting interviews, participant observation, and collecting archival data. When I started fieldwork, I faced two related problems: 1) I did not have an established network in Buenos Aires that provided me with contacts to start conducting interviews, and 2) the study of left-wing social movements is somewhat saturated given the large number of scholars that have been studying Peronism for a long time, making some people less willing to grant me with interviews. I used different strategies to overcome these two difficulties.

First, to build a network, I met with local experts, signed up for a university-led course related to my research, and used social media to find key informants' public profiles. Specifically, I looked at the Instagram and Twitter accounts of social movements' members and politicians to identify events they would partake in. I would attend the event and introduce myself and my research project to ensure more proximity with a possible interviewee. This was a successful strategy because I was able to explain my goals and express my interest in person, and they were less likely to deny an interview.

To overcome the second problem, I relied on contingent opportunities I encountered during fieldwork. Given that traditionally Argentine academy focuses more on Peronist politics and organizations, contemporary right-wing politics is a less explored field. Right-wing public officers, politicians, and social leaders were open to talking about their stories, providing data, and contacting me with other informants – even left-wing leaders. This was a significant opportunity that opened unexpectedly during my fieldwork. Even though initially it was not my intention to study the connections between social movements and right-wing governments, I took this unique opportunity to study how a right-wing party, social movements, and nonprofit organizations embarked on a joint project to count informal settlements.

My field experience reaffirmed the insight that research is about the questions we have in advance but also the access we gain on-site – often unexpectedly. Even though I arrived at Buenos Aires with a theoretical puzzle in mind related to the role of social movements in organizing informal workers, I found an empirical gap that allowed me to conduct my research and rethink my theoretical puzzle along the way. This was only possible during fieldwork, and I am trying to give myself time to reassess my initial project based on these relevant empirical findings.

SOCIOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT AWARDS

Lifetime Achievement Award

2023: Samuel Cohn, Texas A&M University

Samuel Cohn Distinguished Service Award

2023: Alaka Basu, Cornell University

Book Award

2023: Rina Agarwala, Johns Hopkins University, *The Migration-Development Regime: How Class Shapes Indian Emigration.* Oxford University Press, 2022.

2023 Honorable Mentions:

Jordanna Matlon, American University, *A Man among Other Men: The Crisis of Black Masculinity in Racial Capitalism.* Cornell University Press, 2022.

Akshay Mangla, University of Oxford, *Making Bureaucracy Work: Norms, Education, and Public Service Delivery in Rural India.* Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Faculty Article Award

2023: Benjamin H. Bradlow, Princeton University, "Embeddedness and Cohesion: Regimes of Urban Public Goods Distribution." *Theory and Society*, Vol. 51(1): 117–144. 2022.

2023 Honorable Mention: Rhacel S. Parreñas, University of Southern California, "Discipline and Empower: The State Governance of Migrant Domestic Workers." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 86(6): 1043–1065. 2021.

Graduate Student Paper Award

2023 Co-winner: Joel Salvador Skye Niles, University of Colorado Boulder, "Colorblind Racism and Market-Based Development."

2023 Co-winner: Sophia Boutilier, Stony Brook University, ""What do you mean by that?": Meanings of Solidarity for Canadian International Development Workers.

EVENT REPORT

Encounters of Feminism with Authoritarianism

Devparna Roy, Nazareth College

The Feminist Development sub-section of the Sociology of Development section organized a virtual (Zoom) panel discussion titled Encounters of Feminism with Authoritarianism on Friday November 4th, 2022. The event was widely publicized, and those who joined the conversation had the rare opportunity to hear about contemporary feminists' responses to authoritarianism in three different countries of the Global South: India, Bangladesh and Iran.

To provide a context for this conversation, let us focus on the fact that women are facing many difficulties across different regions of the world due to the rising tides of state authoritarianism. As development scholars and practitioners, how do we understand feminist responses to state authoritarianism, particularly in developing countries? Various feminist NGOs and feminist movements struggle to promote what they understand to be 'real' development—economic growth which includes women's rights, social justice, and equity. However, autocratic regimes in developing countries have the goal of fostering their own versions of development, which may not include the promotion of women's rights and feminist visions of social justice and equity.

At the November 4th event, the first speaker was Professor J. Devika. Dr. Devika is a Malayali historian, feminist, social critic and academician from Kerala, India. She currently teaches at the Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram. She has authored several books and articles on gender relations in early Kerala society. She is bilingual and has translated both fiction and non-fiction books between Malayalam and English. She also writes on gender, politics, social reforms and development in Kerala on publications like Kafila, Economic and Political Weekly, and the Wire.

The second panelist was Professor Shelley Feldman. Dr. Shelley Feldman worked as an International Professor in the Department of Development Studies at Cornell University from 1987 to 2016. She was also the Director of the Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program at Cornell University and now serves as a Visiting Scholar for this program. She is author or editor of several books including Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work, and Accumulating Insecurity: Violence and Dispossession in the Making of Everyday Life. She has published numerous articles in feminist journals and development journals, and is the author of many book chapters.

Professor Feldman is an International Advisory Board Member for the North South University in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Most recently, until August 2022, she was the Max Weber Kolleg Senior Fellow at Universitat Erfurt in Germany.

The third speaker was Reyhaneh Javadi. At the time of the event, Reyhaneh was a second-year Ph.D. student of sociology at the University of Alberta and a Vanier Scholar, specializing in law and society, social movements, and gender inequality. She received her MA in Sociology and Social Anthropology from Central European University. She obtained her other MA and her BA in sociology from the University of Tehran, where she also worked as a social researcher. Reyhaneh has several publications, including a recently co-authored piece on Sex, Law, and the Archives.

This event was moderated by Dr. Devparna Roy of Nazareth College, who is also the chair of the Feminist Development sub-section. Here is brief report on the initial comments by the three speakers. These initial comments were followed by a freewheeling discussion among those present on the situations facing women and feminists in Iran, Bangladesh and India. While it is not possible to present the entire conversation which was rich, intense and complex, here are some highlights. Please note that the entire event lasted about a hundred minutes.

Following Dr. Roy's introductions of the three speakers, Dr. Devika explained that in the literature on development, the part of India where she does research—Kerala—is not identified with authoritarianism. Rather, Kerala is identified with successful development and democracy as well as with various experiments in social development and participatory planning. Dr. Devika clarified that in the very recent period, that is, from around 2017 onward, the dominant left party in Kerala, which had originally conceived of the development agenda as democratic developmentalism, was now translating democracy and developmentalism into a kind of authoritarianism which has consequences for gender justice. In the last five years, we are noticing a shift away from democratic developmentalism to a welfare-dole-distribution machinery. The communists had originally wished to keep the moral framework of socialism alive; however, this was no longer the case.

Kerala has witnessed a new form of authoritarianism where the ruling political front is forming a new alignment with predatory capital at the local and regional levels. The Communist Party of India (Marxist) or CPI(M) is leading the ruling front in Kerala for two consecutive terms. The great floods of 2018 and the COVID-19 pandemic have created the cult of the charismatic leader in Kerala. There has been a curtailing of state feminism; hence, powerful and successful women leaders like K. K. Shailaja have been shunted to less-visible positions and replaced by more pliant women leaders.

There are struggles against dispossession in Kerala, which is a feminist issue of course, and the women activists are facing violence at the hands of the police, the repressive instrument of the state government. There are political demands raised by urban liberal feminist supporters on social media and state responses to such feminists' demands are in the vein of lip-service only. After 2018, the state government in Kerala pretends to respond to the demands of liberal feminists. Dr. Devika said that the urban liberal feminists are playing a game in which they will face rout because the state government has the support of the vast self-help groups of women. Dr. Devika referred to the massive mobilizations of women—urban liberal feminists on one side demanding women's rights and the millions of women organized as self-help groups on the other side (opposing women's right of entry into the temple)—on both sides of the debate on women's entry into the Sabarimala temple (a famous Hindu temple in Kerala, where only men were traditionally allowed to enter the temple and worship the deity).

In her comments, Dr. Feldman first laid out the conceptual tools for an analysis of the encounters of feminisms with state authoritarianism in Bangladesh. She explained that as a white feminist academic who has worked for many years on Bangladesh and worked with Bangladeshi colleagues and friends, she has noticed that feminist movements and struggles over the long term build on each other, sometimes in contradictory fashion, in ways that end up strengthening the autocratic regime's definitions of women's rights, social justice

and economic opportunities for women. Dr. Feldman asked: How do we understand what is happening in Bangladesh in response to autocratic regimes? She explained that one of the most barbaric forms of domestic violence in Bangladesh is acid attacks, generally in response to failed love affairs or domestic disputes, sometimes also due to dowry cases and land disputes. The feminist NGO, Nari Pokkho, has made a strong case for struggle against acid attacks and actually sought to change state policy by negotiating with the state to tighten regulations on the purchase of acids. The task for feminist groups and movements is not just to raise awareness about women's rights and domestic abuse, but also to see how policies that benefit women can be systematically integrated into the policy framework of the autocratic regime.

Dr. Feldman also gave a brief perspective on the connections between Bangladesh's liberation struggle and the political party which has created the existing national government in Dhaka. She noted that Bangladesh began in 1971 as one of the poorest countries in the world and would soon become a 'test case of development' and a seat of neoliberal reforms. What you then have is a kind of justification for certain kinds of employment for women and a certain kind of legitimation for the autocratic regime ruling the country: we are providing social justice and economic opportunities for women by a ruling party headed by a woman who is the daughter of the father of the nation, while also meeting the needs of an emerging industrial elite. Opportunities for employment are double-edged, as those familiar with the incredible exploiting circumstances in many workplaces in Bangladesh will know. For example, in the Rana Plaza disaster, hundreds of people were killed when the building collapsed.

In her presentation (of slides) titled Iranian Women and Shifting Subjectivity: Encounters with Authoritarianism in Social Movements and Non-Movements, Ms. Javadi began by acknowledging the "unimaginable courage" of those who were fighting and resisting the state's authoritarianism in the streets or Iran at that time, in the name of zan, zindagi, azadi (women, life, liberty). Ms. Javadi focused on the ordinary Iranian women's claims for rights in the context of state authoritarianism and the Iranian people's uprising of fall 2022. She explained the sociopolitical setting for women's claims for rights from 1905 to 2022 in Iran. In modern Iran, the state has constantly governed women's bodies and movements, as well as challenged women's autonomy and agency. For example, in the Pahlavi era, the state tried to regulate women's bodies through mandatory unveiling in a series of attempts to modernize the country. The Islamic Republic is in the process of Islamization of the society and in a reaction to the Pahlavi era, defined hijab as a symbol of chastity and tried to impose mandatory veiling on women through repressive instruments such as the police. Oppressive patriarchal families also tried to force women to wear the hijab. Ms. Javadi explained how Iranian women have formed social movements as well as non-movements (that is, social action of non-collective actors) to face patriarchal family settings and state authoritarianism in order to protect body autonomy and agency.

SOCIOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT EVENTS AT THE ASA

Development Perspectives from the Global South
Sun, August 20, 8:00 to 9:30am, Pennsylvania Convention Center, Floor: 100 Level, 104A

Sociology of Development Roundtables
Sun, August 20, 10:00 to 11:00am, Pennsylvania Convention Center, Floor: 100 Level, 103B

Section on Sociology of Development Business Meeting
Sun, August 20, 11:00 to 11:30am, Pennsylvania Convention Center, Floor: 100 Level, 103B

Environment and Development
Sun, August 20, 2:00 to 3:30pm, Pennsylvania Convention Center, Floor: 100 Level, 104A

New Frontiers in Sociology of Development
Sun, August 20, 4:00 to 5:30pm, Pennsylvania Convention Center, Floor: 100 Level, 104A

SECTION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sociology of Development Section Mentorship Program 2023

We are pleased to announce that the ASA Sociology of Development Section Mentorship Program continues again this year. If you would like to participate, we would like to solicit applications for mentors and mentees. Click here and fill out your information. Applications are accepted through Monday, July 24th.

Karin Johnson (US Census Bureau at Texas A&M University), Mentorship Coordinator, will pair graduate students and junior faculty with a scholar more advanced in their careers. Pairs will be matched based on their desired areas of mentorship, then by substantive research interests. Mentorships groups will consist of at least one mentor and one or more mentees. You will be notified of your pairing by Friday, July 28th.

Paired mentors and mentees will personally schedule to meet by video call, in-person at the ASA annual meeting, or via whatever means preferred.

Questions? Email Karin Johnson at karin.johnson@census.gov Sign-up link:
https://forms.gle/ZkfKRh6xSQ6TjxT66

Gift Memberships

Our Section has recently experienced a decline in membership, particularly among graduate student members, we appreciate if all our members help us recruit new members. **The ASA deadline for gift memberships is July 31, 2023.** You can gift an ASA membership to students, or a Section membership to existing ASA members of any membership type. However, the sooner you give a gift membership, the sooner the recipient can begin to enjoy the benefits of membership and learn more about the Section.

Purchase a gift ASA membership for students. Once you have accessed the member portal, click "Purchase a gift membership for a student" under **Contribute/Give.** Search for the student by name. You can also create a new contact record if you can't find the student in the database.

Your gift will be redeemable by the recipient for an ASA student membership. The recipient will receive an email with the gift credit immediately after your purchase. Recipients will need to complete a membership form through the ASA member portal in order to redeem their gift membership. Gift memberships are not refundable. Gift memberships are not tax deductible.

Election Results

We congratulate the newly elected section officers.
Chair Elect - Monica Prasad, Northwestern University
Council Members - Heidi E. Rademacher, SUNY Brockport and Holly Reed, CUNY - Queens College
Student Council Member - Ji-won Lee, SUNY - Albany

MISSION STATEMENT

The Sociology of Development Section of ASA promotes work in sociology on the causes and effects of development. We support work in all geographical regions including the United States, other advanced industrial nations and the Global South. We are open to work of all theoretical orientations and all methodological orientations. Both theoretical and applied work is welcome.

SECTION COMMUNICATION PLATFORMS

ASA Sociology of Development Page:
http://www.asanet.org/sections/development.cfm

Sociology of Development Website:
http://sociologyofdevelopment.com/

Sociology of Development Newsletter:
Please send all your ideas, feedback, and submissions to socdevsectors@gmail.com.