

# Feb 16 Book Talk Transcription

00:01

Welcome, everyone. Thank you for coming and joining us for this excellent event sponsored by the sociology of development section of the American Sociological Association. I'm Holly Reed. I'm a professor of sociology and demography at City University of New York. And I am one of the council members on the AASA development sociology section this year. And I want to give a special thank you to Jiwon lee of the University of Albany, who was our graduate student, one of our graduate student representatives this year, and he has done yeoman's work of organizing a lot of events for us, including this one. And we're very excited about starting kicking off a nice season of some webinars and online events. So I'm going to moderate the event. And we have excellent two authors who have some wonderful forthcoming books that we're going to discuss briefly. Each author will take about 15 minutes to talk about their book, and then we will have to, in turn, each book author will have a discussion, who is each of those are PhD candidates. So we're excited about involving our graduate students in the section in this in this event as well, each discussant will will speak for about 10 minutes, and then we'll open it up at the end for q&a and discussion across the whole group. So I hope everyone will be able to participate in that and looking forward to a lively discussion. So I'll do the introductions to begin. And so we'll have after that we can just go right into all the presentations. First I'd like to welcome Emeritus Professor Douglas L. Murray from Colorado State University, Department of Sociology. He is the author of we can change the world tales from a generations quest for peace and justice. And the discussant of Doug's book will be Matthews Inslee, he is a PhD candidate in the Department of Community and environmental sociology and Development Studies at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. And then the second author to speak will be Professor Jennifer key. She is associate professor in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Arizona State University, and the author of decolonizing development, food heritage and trade in post authoritarian environments. And the discussant for Jennifer's book will be with Shahid Hussain, who is a PhD candidate and development sociology at Cornell University. So welcome all and we're going to begin with with Doug's presentation. Thank you. Thank you,

02:55

I'm having a bit of a struggle with technology, but anyone that knows me knows that sort of par for the course. I think I've got it. Thank you I, in our youth, many of my generation were deeply influenced by the social movements of the time and we many became increasingly involved in those movements, movements from the civil rights to the anti Vietnam War to women's liberation. Andrew, can you hear me? Good to international solidarity? Getting the feeling, are we still connected here?

03:56

No, we can hear you fine, Doug, no problem. Okay,

03:59

I'm sorry. So from from those movements through international solidarity, anti apartheid movement and many more, they came to shape how many of my generation understood the world and how we move

through it. But by the latter part of the 1970s, some of us became disillusioned, not so much with the movements themselves. Many others remain committed to many of the goals of those movements today. But more with the strategies and the tactics that we were employing to bring about the changes we hope to see. As a result, many of us started looking around for new paths towards pursuing social change. In my case, I decided to return to graduate school in search of some answers. And once there I quickly gravitated towards the sociology fellow, essentially, because I considered that discipline to be one of the best ways for exploring the nature of social change writ large. And from that developed a career as a development sociologist, while I remained engaged in social activism. Times, particularly in the Global South, I increasingly focus my energies on research and writing about social change. And to do that, I employed a tried and true formula for academic scholarship and when something like one begins with a provocative or counterintuitive hypothesis, or problem solving statement, and then one would move to a historical context for that problem, longer Deray that Professor Katie so nicely develops in her book. And then one would take a deep dive into dissecting a conjunctural phenomenon by case often than not a crisis of political or mental in nature, and then conclude with a proposal for a path forward towards a solution. So, I was trained in a particular form of the sociology of development, tradition of the 1960s. And 70s included a kind of an edict, if you will, and something like there shall be no I in scholar. And essentially, it was a we were taught to remain anonymous, aloof, aloof, and continue in order to convey an air of objectivity, sort of grabbed the task board. And as a consequence, people that worked in this tradition, oftentimes operated on a level of abstraction that was largely structural, then perhaps move down to the level processes. But never would we move down to a level of individual actors. That was the domain of journalists, according to luminaries at the time. There Dan Brown down, Manuel Wallerstein, and others in that tradition, so. So I pursued this academic career for nearly 40 years. Prior tournaments now almost a decade past as well. I finished a couple of writing projects, and then abandoned academia. So I thought, but somewhat to my surprise, I soon found myself writing again. And now I was writing in a form that was free of academic conventions, no more quotations, citations, notations, cetera. And I was writing in a different voice one memoirs. And I was now writing stories all about individuals engaged in moments of social change some of in which I had participated myself. And it led to this book. We can change the world is essentially a collection of standalone memoirs about unknown people engage in remarkable acts. It's an attempt to capture the spirit and the dynamics of pursuit of social change. Duan, could I get the next line? There we go. The first section explores how many of my generation were shaped by the forces of the 1960s and 70s. And it begins with the story of a small town pastor who preached the social gospel to an entirely unreceptive child, we nevertheless grew to embrace the pursuit of social justice in the decades that followed. It's a memoir about my earliest recollections of not only civil rights, but the social act of the call the social activism that moved so many, my generation. The second chapter, is about a group of young boys, pictured here, mine who were part of a small town Cub Scout Troop who, on becoming adults, a decade later, were ravaged by the Vietnam War. So this story is an exploration of how that war set so many of my generation of social way. There's another story about a younger sister, who's who, and how the struggle for women's reproductive rights before and after Roe v. Wade, came to define her life process led her older brother to an appreciation, the power of what came to be known as the second wave of feminism. So this first section of the book is essentially about how one portion of American youth became part of the protest generation. Right, get the next slide, please join. The second section is about a five year immersion in the Nicaraguan Revolution of the 1980s. And in this section, my role as author shifts from one subject to one of witness, and begins with the story of a farming couple who

were not Sandinistas, but embrace the vision of a new Nicaragua. That was such a powerful dynamic of that decade. And they demonstrated that in the ways that they worked with other farmers in the region, and particularly with the landless landless peasants, many of them, some of whom they employed on their farm. It's also the story of a tragedy at the hands of a brutal mercenary band, who was funded and guided by the US government. So this memoir serves as an indictment of the dehumanizing narrative. It's constructed the world over and the pursuit of war, terrible narrative we're all becoming painfully aware of again in the context of current conflicts. Next slide, please. Another story is about an indigenous poet, the 12 wild stories of his people's struggles, in the 16th and early 17th century against the Spanish colonization, and in the 19th and early 20th century, against Latino seizures, dizziness, and then again in the 1970s, alongside the Sandinista revolutionaries. All His stories were told in the first person plural. We, he described what the concrete stories, we brought the roads through our communal lands,

13:55

is tales were vivid and fantastic, and to me, in most cases entirely unbelievable. And yet, decades later, I learned that his stories had become the foundation of an oral history one which is indigenous community was experiencing vibrant and ongoing cultural revival. Several more stories from this period in the Nicaraguan Revolution, labor here.

14:29

Next slide, please. The second section is a series of tales about agents of social change.

14:43

And this section spans the length of the Western Hemisphere and unfolds over more than half a century. The first story pictured here is about an aspiring young diplomat, who in an act of conscience leaked classified documents exposing the cynical role of his government in the Chilean coup 1973. Single Act helped dramatically alter his country's foreign policy virtually overnight, towards chewy, but ended up costing him his career and nearly landed. Yet, in that act, he saved hundreds, perhaps 1000s of Chileans from a terrible fate, a hands up a dictatorship. Next slide, please. Another story is about a young development scholar who was so traumatized by her visit to salvage in 1980, at the beginning of the Civil War, that she dedicated much of the rest of the next 40 years by the bringing the generals and other perpetrators of war crimes to justice. Many more stories in this section as well, are a few. But I would argue that each of these memoirs, somewhat personally nature, or Windows, on bigger processes, social change. Next slide, please. The collection concludes with a complete break with the scholarly template of my academic career. This story is written entirely as a metaphor. And it's a reflection on the nature of our journey as development sociologists, and at our best as agents, social change. So that's the last slide. So I doubt this memoir form, will appeal to everyone in our discipline. But I think nevertheless, it serves as a vehicle for insights into the nature of social change, and perhaps a corrective will, to what is sometimes missing, or at the very least undervalued in the more abstract and higher levels of analysis. That's common to the field of the sociology. The game nearly out of time here. So let me just conclude by by saying that, I hope those of you that do pick up the book, and read the book, enjoy, and it's reading as much as I have, and it's writing. And I invite those of you that, read the book that are that feel, you have observations, objections, whatever, the reach out, because I'm finding in the circulation of these essays that I've that I'm becoming increasingly engaged in

conversations I absolutely, thoroughly enjoy with people who are reflecting on not only agency, but the processes of social change. So let me stop there and turn it back to Professor Reed to Mister,

18:46

thank you so much, Doug. That was, that was great. I think we all need to be more more reflective about the individuals who are affected by the you know, we often focus on structure too much to the exclusion of agency, I think right. So it's nice and to see this in your writing. I'm going to turn to Matt now for his comments. Matt.

19:17

Thank you, Holly. Thank you, Doug. Can everybody hear me all right? Yes. Okay. So I want to start off by thanking Doug for, for writing this wonderful book and sharing it with all of us, especially with me, really a wonderful read, full of a lot of vivid individual stories and some very surprising anecdotes, but but also it does function well as a work of sociology by connecting a lot of those individual stories to the wider social forces that shaped the lives of those the people that Doug writes about and in which they in turn reshaped. So I realized as I was preparing for this event that I was, maybe inadvertently kind of inverting the typical Academic form, rather than asking a question, that's really a comment. I'm offering some comments that are really questions for dog. So, to start off with, I think, you know, I kind of reading the book sites sort of as the story of a moral education. Because Doug, you talked a lot about your childhood and growing up in the Napa Valley, and some of the people and experiences that that shaped your sense of social justice and equity and individual courage, and a lot of that, that shaped your life going forward. Some of that particularly stuck out, stuck out to me, where your your story about the Reverend juvenile in, in the Napa Valley preacher at at at your church that really seemed to offer a different idea of Christian morality and tolerance than what we typically might think of, as you know, associated with kind of that old time, you know, Helen brim fire kind of religious preaching, the other the story of your sister, her social justice work, and how that work in adulthood, kind of, you know, brought you two together in a way that maybe wasn't as strongly felt when you were growing up the story of Bob, the Canadian whistleblower who put his career at risk, to expose the government's complicity with the Pinochet regime, and Chile, I thought was a really beautiful story as well. So I, you talked a little bit about at the top about how different this form, the memoir you're kind of writing from, or the individual members you're writing is from the conventions of academic writing. So so given how different it is, centering individual stories, and centering your own voice, I'd love to hear more from you, Doug, about the experience of writing this book, what was enjoyable for it, about it for you, what was challenging? How did you approach this project, planning it out differently than you would have prepared a more conventional, you know, research based book? Well,

22:12

I think many of you have experiences similar to my own, as you, as you do your work. You by necessity engage bigger or smaller issues of social change. And what I found Once I retired, is that there were so many people that I engaged with, from childhood up to the present. It really embodies some of the bigger stories. I mean, I wrote about the Nicaraguan Revolution. In reflection, there were individuals that really were demonstrated with that both the pros and cons or some stories about not so inspiring people as well. And I never got to tell those stories. So the chance to be a storyteller instead of a sort of a dry, absent analyst of larger forces, just started growing on me at a point that I'd write a story and

then I call up a call a bomb and say, remember that night Matt bar when we spent all night talking about the Chilean coup, and it gave me a vehicle for them, engaging Bob, in a way that I had almost forgotten about. And the same with Reverend juveniles family, I've long conversations about the two, all of us remembering what Andy was about and what he did. So it became a form of writing that I felt like I really enjoyed and never really had the time to do as an academic. Just what, we weren't rewarded for telling stories about characters, at least in my career, hopefully, some of you will get more opportunity to do. Thanks. Yeah. Is that

24:29

That's great. Yeah. I was just going to continue kind of with another question slash comment. So your book kind of challenges this, this popular idea that, you know, the 60s, as we conceive of it, you know, this period of social protests and idealism, you know, there's this popular idea that it died or it failed or whatever we want to say about it. But I think your the stories that you share show real continuities with That era in the idea of the idealism that that a lot of people that were shaped by that period, including yourself, carried forward in their lives and in their work. And the memoir form also lends itself to you, looking back on that kind of personal, personal and social history from the present day. And so I want to ask a question about, you know, something you say, right up at the top of the book, which is your observation that, you know, looking at all the kinds of crises that we face in the world today, you know, the the return of fascism, and intolerance, climate change, violence kind of reemerging or maybe not reemerging. But just being more prominent in our in our sense of what's going on in the world today, you make the comment that we have been here before. So what advice or what, you know, maybe counsel, would you offer us as academics, as activists, as citizens, for confronting some of the challenges that we face today, given that you kind of reflected that, you know, that one of the reasons that the 60s ended was kind of the kind of divisive disillusionment with the tactics of social movements in that era?

26:14

Yeah, I mean, I, I don't want to be so I don't want to be presumptuous about sort of lecturing the younger generations about what should be done, I don't feel I think the one thing I would say is, there are 10s of 1000s of people, perhaps hundreds of 1000s of people that came out of that period, that are still active. And, you know, the young guy like me in the grocery store line that's ahead of you or the person that you meet in the park they have, many of them have long histories of engagement in social change, and continue to be engaged. I think, just since I've been sharing some of these essays, I've encountered so many people from the go, oh, yeah, I remember, you know, the peoples are I was, and then you've come to find out that they're part of the Princeton divestment from fossil fuels campaign, very successful. Initiative. There are just so many people out there, they're still engaged. And I think if I were to, to offer anything to people here is that we're all engaged in some level. And as sociologists development, there are numerous opportunities to to be agents of change. And it comes through not only through our work, but through the people that we engage in. And I just encourage people not to feel like wow, you know, the world has just gone to hell in a handbasket, or we're facing a dark, we may well be a dark period. But that is just a vast amount of people out there that are doing important things. And we should we should draw a certain amount of energy and renewable from recognizing that they're all around us. And we're part of that.

28:27

Thank you. Yeah, I think that's well put. Holly, how am I doing on time? About

28:33

one minute? Yeah. Back and forth. So you know,

28:39

yeah, that's, that's fine. Yeah. I guess just to quickly pose the question. And maybe it's something we can talk about later in the discussion. But, but I do want to flag some kind of, you know, it was something that was really challenging in the book was your personal experiences in Cuba and Nicaragua, in which were these two post revolutionary societies that were grappling not only with, you know, how do we go move forward after overthrowing dictatorships, but also struggling to balance you know, justice with self defense visa vie, the United States. And the one of the really shocking stories in your book is about widow, this Italian kind of ex leftist terrorist who is hiding out in Nicaragua, and who had been involved in a very prominent political assassination in Italy. And so maybe later we can talk a little bit about, you know, how should we take how should we view this relationship between, you know, the perception by some people of the necessity of violently resisting oppression or violently resisting imperialism, and that the damage that we do see that that does to individuals into societies? You may we don't have time to discuss that Now, but just throwing it out there is something we can talk about as well. Wonderful

30:03

question. It's a. It's a long discussion too. So yeah.

30:11

Yeah, maybe we'll we'll leave that one for the General q&a. And, okay, let's move on. But thank you so much, Matt. I think we had some, already some great back and forth. So I'm pleased with the, with the discussion so far. Let's move on. And I'm going to introduce Jennifer.

30:34

Okay, hello, everybody. Let me go ahead and share my screen, hopefully the right one. Okay. All right. Can everybody see my screen and hear me? Yes. Okay, wonderful, everyone. And also, I'd like to request apologists shut me off at 15 minutes. I don't want to take the risk of going over, because I want to make sure there's plenty of time for discussion. Okay, so I'm here to talk about my book decolonizing development, this book just came out in January. So it's now available and Bristol University Press has been pretty generous in terms of offering discounts for people attending book talks. So I have the discount listed here. But if you want that from me later, I'm happy to send you the flyer so that you don't have to pay so much money for the book. Okay. So in this book, I conduct a comparative historical analysis of agrarian development, resistance and social change. To develop my analysis, I actually draw from over two decades of work as a development scholar and practitioner. And during which time I spent four years living in Latvia, and one year in South Africa. So these are both the sites of my comparative historical case study. See here, okay. So Latvia and South Africa are far apart geographically, as you can see, you might think that they have nothing in common different due to the very different environments, ecologies locations that they're placed in in the world. However, they have

a very similar history. And so this makes them an excellent fit for comparative analysis. Both of these countries were colonized by European invaders. Latvia in the 12th century, South Africa in the 17th century, both countries transitioned from being colonies to nation states in the 20th century, albeit in somewhat different circumstances. And both of these societies endured a half a century of authoritarian rule, lobbying by the hands of the Soviet invasion and Soviet occupation of Latvia and South Africa, due to the election in 1948. That began the apartheid system of racial segregation. So they both experienced 50 years about a 50 years of authoritarian rule. They were both the social movements for independence were both really took traction in the 1980s. And they both transitioned to independence in the early 1990s. And then, you know, they both entered into a role the economy in the 19th, the turn of the 21st century, that was riding on the hot wave of free market triumphalism and the collapse of Soviet markets, so that both entered a very competitive, neoliberal global economy at the same at the same time. And by situating, my analysis, my laundry analysis in both the post Soviet and post apartheid contexts, my research findings then interrupted polarized political discourse. What I do is I explain the similar impulses of command and capitalist economies, I suggest that they're not really as different as we might think. And, you know, the Soviet and apartheid regimes might have, you know, espoused oppositional ideologies but in lived experience in real life, these nations modernized in remarkably similar ways. And, you know, they also protested in remarkably similar ways. In terms of the modernization, we could say in psychosocial terms, both states reproduced the violence of earlier waves of colonial rule by rationalizing pathological acts of cruelty as the necessary means for development. But given the inverse ideologies in forming their experiences with oppression, the lobby and resistance extolled, anti communist and nationalist politics. acts while South Africans revolted from a socialist and multicultural position. At the same time in both nations small scale farmers were proclaiming similar values that were grounded in their lived experience and indirect relationship to the land and their desire to return to an agrarian way of life a pre colonial agrarian way of life. While those desires were stymied by the entry into the global market economy, the fact is that both of these cases are compelling because they both did manage to undergo a process of independence and transition to democracy without first going through a period of civil war, which is the case of many revolutions. So these commonalities in these differences provide a critical opportunity for identifying cross current cross cutting currents of power, and indigenous and otherwise counter hegemonic knowledges. And practices that may be used to think about decolonizing development in the 21st century. So I'm not going to linger on theory and methods, because I want to get straight into some of the nitty gritty of my findings. But I will pause here just long enough to say that what I developed was I wanted to fulfill the decolonial and the feminist mandate for very holistic analysis. And so that required me to think very creatively and synthetically. So the multi Thayer the theoretical framework that I described in the book is very much multi paradigmatic. A lot of moving spokes. But then at the same time, if you'll notice these spokes, they're not really like they wouldn't make something move. And that was actually intended because I really wanted to suggest with this image of settling down and looking at something deeply through multiple different lenses of analysis that enabled me to get that kind of holistic understanding. And same with methods research for this book. You know, I began collecting information informally in the 1999. When I first moved to LA, Latvia, I conducted two major field studies in the field, one year in duration each and Latvia with small scale farmers, organic farmers, and then in South Africa with small scale, small scale Fairtrade, where this tea farmers. So I have those two periods of empirical fieldwork. But I also really depart from sociology, by developing a comparative textual analysis, to really unpack the indigenous philosophy, indigenous knowledge systems that I was learning informally in the field.

And I did this because as I was writing the book, it was going to be a more conventional sociological study. But one of our actually, two of the reviewers said, we want to learn more about indigenous Latvia knowledge. And, you know, you talk about a little bit, but it's really fascinating. We think this is important. We want to learn more about, you know, a boon to philosophy and indigenous knowledge in South Africa. And so, could you please expand upon this. And that required me because, you know, I was already writing the book, I didn't have the ability at the time to go and do X amount of, you know, intensive fieldwork. And so I really, you know, came down to how I'm going to teach this, how I learned it myself and I have a humanities background, I have a bachelor's degree in French. And so I returned to textual analysis so that I could share the cultural texts that I learned these ways of thinking from, and I put the textual analysis into dialogue with auto ethnography. So a little bit like Doug here, bringing a bit of memoir into the story, but the auto ethnography is really, really meant to put me into dialogue with the cultural texts, and to let the reader see how I came to learning these knowledges like to situate the learning of these lessons that the cultural texts have taught me. Okay, so broadly speaking, in terms of my research findings at the broadest level of analysis, my long Deray analysis of agrarian development and resistance and change, you know, I, I was able to draw from Vandana Shiva is a real path breaking research that she did on monocultures of the mind. This was a book in 1993. And to advance that thesis of monocultures of the mind by identifying two types of existential development or two types of existential production. And so I first identify authoritarian monocultures, which I define as the colonizing mode of existence. That is grounded in the Imperial logic of categorical separateness, and it is you know, promote singular modes Production through rational means and the reproduction of hierarchical social relations. I then counter that with my

40:11

concept of the egalitarian eco cultures which explicates an emancipatory mode of existence. It's grounded in the indigenous logic of interconnection, which I found in Latvia, which I found in South Africa, and which I also was able to put into dialogue with the broader discourse on indigenous knowledge and global justice. And so, you know, what I find here is that in an egalitarian equal cultures are, you know, totally different organized in terms of their operation and social social relationships. So they promote diverse modes of productions, with situated means of production and reciprocal social relationships. So these really are a counter mode of existence that resists the destructive impulses of authoritarian monocultures. And I want you to know that I, you know, I'm building here on thesis on Vandana Shiva thesis. And like her, I'm a dialectical thinker. So I'm really not proposing these as either or concepts that are in opposition to one another, but rather, in the feminist tradition of both and and certainly the data that I found in the field suggests that both of these forms of existential development coexist in formerly colonized territories such as South Africa and Latvia. Okay, how am I doing on time? How many minutes do I have left?

41:43

Oh, sorry, four and a half minutes, gender four and a half. Okay. So I just wanted to provide a brief summary of lobbyists, organic farming movement, you know, if you're interested, you can read the book. But I conducted mixed qualitative methods, fieldwork over a 10 month period in 2005. And the timing for this may sound old. But it's a comparative historical study. And the timing is actually quite relevant, because this was the year that Latvia was integrating into the European Union and the common market. So I meant to capture the dynamic shaping this movement, then at the end of the first



decade of democratic transition, and during that period of EU accession. And I found that the land reforms that were enacted right at the moment of independence that was done in Latvia, not South Africa. But in that moment of independence, the lobby and state took all of these Soviet lands and gave them back to the descendants of the peasants from whom the lands was stolen. And so those those land reforms enable the generation of farmers to return to small scale production during that first decade of democratization. These farms reinvented the matriarchal quarter cultural model of ancient Latvian tradition by combining organic and biodynamic production technologies, with the gathering of seasonal forest foods. So farm economy is dependent on a link, or sorry, on a mix of commercial sells barter food exchanges with other farms, and the reciprocal lobbying customer food gifts, which means that urban relatives will come and help with the farm, provide financial assistance, if needed, help with the harvest, but then in return, they have this flow of goods back to the city that they don't have to go to the store and buy, they get their fresh food direct from the countryside from their family. Eu entry actually sparked a nationwide search shift. So you know, that first decade it was the real independent small scale farmers like I VARs onsens, who's pictured here, who had gone back to the land, but then when Latvia joined the European Union, the whole nation really rapidly translated trance transition to organic farming, because suddenly there were subsidies for doing this. And what resulted in this was a market glut that was exacerbated by an influx of organic goods from Western Europe under the common market, and the under development of a national processing sector that no longer has Soviet markets. And so we had to rebuild itself entirely. So the organic farmers didn't really, you know, of that first generation were struggling in that second decade, because suddenly their markets were lost, and they had to transition from an organic farming movement to a slow food movement. That involves marketing lobbying in food ways to draw attention to this nation's rich, equal cultural heritage.

44:42

Two more minutes, Jennifer, okay,

44:43

so I'm just gonna then summarize with what happened in Reuters and then I'm not going to go into the indigenous knowledge portion, but you can ask questions on that. So um, so the study of rightist tea in South Africa um, This drew from 10 months of participatory action research that I lead with a team of small scale where does tea farmers in 2010 So this was right after a market clash, crash and a loss of Fairtrade certification. So I was in the communities at a time of crisis. And most of the communities that I was involved with relocated in the remote Cedarburg region of Wooper tall this for this study, I employed a critical parentage lens to develop a broader analysis of the racialized.

46:02

And state, the state bar, organic and Fairtrade certified markets, but they experienced market volatility. And after the loss of Fairtrade certification, which they eventually did get back in 2011, but for a period of time that was lost. So they realized we really need we can't just depend on one cash crop, we really need to diversify income and establish a mixed world economy. So they began diversifying while I was there into related heritage enterprises that ranged from eco tourism, to the artisanal production of grievous body care products, and the selling of you know, that local ash bread, which is considered to be a taste or real taste of super tall, so the startup of several small bakeries, and so on and so forth. So ultimately, me my analysis here, confronts an idealized or sorry, my analysis of where this terroir and

coloured identity confronts a both an idealized food and heritage discourse that fails to acknowledge the reality of racial mixing in cultural fusion. And so of course, then that also has ramifications for rethinking indigenous knowledge. I'm not going to go ahead and talk more about these indigenous knowledge just today, because I don't have the time. But I would like to just conclude, I'm going to skip ahead really quickly here by, you know, saying that one of the key contributions of this book is bringing these very obscure, Latvian and somewhat less obscure South African cultural philosophies and knowledge is into dialogue with a broader body of research on indigenous knowledge and global justice. And I'm happy to take any questions about that at the end. Thank you for your time.

47:50

Thank you so much, Jennifer. Let's turn now to Misha he and his comments and questions for you.

47:59

Thank you, Holly. Thanks, Jiwan, for organizing the event. And thank you, Jennifer, for writing the book. It's wonderful. I've learned a great deal from it. And it was very thought provoking. So what I have for us today is basically a set of prepared comments that's a little formal, mainly focuses on the conceptual structure of the book a bit. So forgive me if it's a little dense at times, but I'll take about the next eight to 10 minutes to go through these comments. And hopefully, that's helpful to kind of think about and move forward with the discussion in q&a. So here goes. Let me just open this up. Yes. So the book as Professor key mentions, it argues that despite the juggernaut of a new liberal market economy, and the global corporate food regime, the organic farming movement in Latvia, and the heritage rivers, farming and subsistence in South Africa, have been resilient in pursuing alternative practices. Just as important and I'm glad that Jennifer mentioned this at the end is that the books attempt to formulate a deeper philosophical basis for how and why organic and subsistence farmers have engaged in these efforts. Through detailed studies of the long historical sweep of social change and contemporary societal dynamics. The book illuminates the material and symbolic resources that small landowners and subsistence farmers Slow Food heritage and organic advocates have used to negotiate dominant state and market practices in production and trade. It gives us a sense of the contradictions that are built into the corporate food regime, the push and pull involved in securing entrance that are often but not always, tending to work towards, you know, cross purposes. The funeral for the study was conducted in the aftermath of crucial political moments in both national contexts. That is the politics around the 2004. Eu extension in Latvia, and the 2007. Eight protests among the urban poor, for example, against food insecurity in South Africa. It was important for me to keep this in mind while reading the substantive chapters, and to draw connections to the wider conjuncture. The enthusiastic and rapid expansion of the organic food movement in Latvia, arrived on the back of EU subsidies. In contrast, smallholders, engaged in the South African Wuppertal region had already been through a decade of organizational conflicts, indebtedness, and a looming subsistence crisis post 2008. By bringing these cases together, the book offers an important reminder to sociologists, development studies scholars, and a broader public in taking subsistence and alternative farming practices seriously. They eliminate possible pathways out of the overlapping crises of food, energy, ecology and health. Consequently, I read the book as a work of advocacy, where greater public and state support in the interest of primary producers rather than large corporate and trading lobbies, unnecessary on socio economic, environmental, and ultimately moral grounds. However, I did find it hard to reconcile this adversary advocacy work with the basic conceptual structure that organizes the book. This appears sometimes to distract from the third

thrust of its advocacy. Since the book spends considerable energy in developing its framework. I will share some thoughts on it for further discussion. I think some parts of the book addresses these concerns implicitly, more than more so than others. So what I'm really hoping is to develop here some sort of productive misunderstandings to which Professor key he might offer some rejoinders. So first, the discussions on Dana and we're going to philosophies. Clearly these philosophies are invented traditions, which all good cultural nationalists have resorted to in their struggles over anti Soviet and anti apartheid hegemony. Central here is the relationship to the Vogue philosophies between the Vogue philosophies and the contemporary context of the organic movement in Latvia, and the regional politics of subsistence in the South African repertoire. For instance, the real question is not about the role of diner philosophy. At least, that's what I think interest Professor key here is not about the role of diner philosophy in structuring a National Biography in Latvia. But whether it provides the kind of political ideological resources that small holders and subsistence farmers need to organize around collective interest as primary producers. Now, the right wing nationalism of the Latvian greens is bad news. Yeah. Especially when financialization and corporate control of our trademarks, media practices, practices, property relations, and so on continue apace. The same question can be posed in the South African context. And I would love for Jennifer to develop this line of questioning further. I think the substantive chapters of the book highlight this point that invented traditions, including discourses like Dinah and Boonton, are not bearers of an emancipatory, or representative essence in themselves. Rather, it is about how they are invented or reinvented, which contains clues as to whether or not they can be resourceful in keeping the corporate food regime and check. However, it is easy to lose sight of this point while reading the book at times, and amorphous and transhistorical ties to the land ethos appears to shape an emancipatory essence in both these traditions. Now, I found myself interrogating the lucky and trace of this inventory taking chapters, the cultural, political and regional identities that these traditions shaped, however profound and transcendent in their meaning are embodied by historical subjects. So this is to say that place attachment can work in different ways, and not necessarily in favor of those in Perth impoverished by neoliberal market practices. The sense of dispossession and loss can be overwhelming precisely because of such assignment attachments to the point of foreclosing possibilities altogether, when ties to the land as severed through debt, loss of ownership and so on. And thinking here of the now decades long epidemic of farmer suicides in India, following market liberalisation in the 1990s. Again, while I admire Professor key his discussion on positionality and identification with place attachment, there is some merit here in seeing detachment as a part of the analogic especially when IT admins can entrench exploitative practices. The upside to place attachment of course, is brought out wonderfully in discussions in the substantive chapters that In the context of the work natal region, buried in that chapter is a segment where women's concerns with physical safety, combined with state support for education and modern healthcare are identified as important reasons for why subsistence and heritage farmers state back or return to the region. The politics of cementing historical ties to place and regional identities play no small part in securing such Korean code old fashioned with distributive claims and the welfare state. As the substantive chapters suggest. However, the conceptual structure of the book tends to distract us from this point at times. The dominant food regime appears ultimately as an outcome of quote unquote psychosocial pathology rooted in quote, modern rationalist knowledge, whereas folk philosophies offer potential cures for the self and the soul. The discussion of the quote unquote, inner freedom that Dinah philosophy nurturers, for example, might benefit from a quick comparison to the Calvinist ethicist to develop this point further, for Max Weber's, whose critique of modern disenchantment shapes the book's guiding spirit, the inner

freedom of the Protestant Ethic cannot be taken on its own terms, that is without resorting to the structural or social historical conditions that made this ethic appear such we know that emerging gurus is found ideas like predestination useful for circumventing the mediation of the church and the Federal classes in legitimizing their practices, eventually secularizing the instrumental instrumentality of the idea itself. In short, this suggests the importance of paying attention to the political ideological form of social practices in question. With Professor key he seems to get hit with a notion of a world sense, historical subjects need a world sense to interpret and act upon the inter subjective operation of objective processes. That is the uneven and combined development of capitalist commodity relations. Hence deline, delineating the form of such relations are crucial for any humanistic social science inquiry. The problem in the book is that while juxtapose in posing the binaryism of Western thinking against the seemingly rational epistemic of Voc philosophies, it draws in some insurmountable barriers of its own between ideology and practice, modern scientific knowledge in situated wisdom and so on. This tends to obscure the historical from that world census take. The troubling juxtaposition reappears in the final chapter when Professor key has given the failure and this is a code given the failure of modern rational logic to solve the problems it has caused, what other knowledge is may help us find our way as we seek to heal our fractured selves, societies and planet.

57:51

Now, Amos Azhar in France found on our side of favourably, but it's hard to make the case that they were deploying anything other than modern rational logic in their trenchant criticisms of colonial capitalism. For example, I cannot emphasize this more. The problem is not about the search for ideas as such, but the form that ideas take eliminating or obscuring relations of power and domination. Of course, the book is well aware of this issue. Professor key hints at this to her qualifications against doing away with rationalist Western epistemologies. Part of the problem lies I think, is an effort to place the scholarship within post developmental and pro reversal literature's which tend to elevate a certain liberal multiculturalism to an epistemic stance. In doing so, we get to a place where shared understanding of structural constraints and possibilities become increasingly difficult. So by the end of the book, the reader might notice that capitalism itself becomes just another ideology, which exercise which exercises in inner freedom and self care can overcome in the practices of daily living, ruthless self questioning as Professor kibbutz it may indeed, be useful in getting rid of Iran us assumptions under certain conditions, but in other conditions, it can also lead to unmoored skepticism. Now, I don't need to press this point further to this audience since we live in the age of Q anon and all that.

59:20

So. Yeah, about one more minute. Sure,

59:24

sure. So I'll just conclude by saying that if Professor key revisits the book for a second edition, I think its strengths can benefit from rethinking the concluding chapter in light of these broader conceptual issues. So I'll just end there. Sorry for speaking 10 minutes straight, but hopefully, we'll have q&a now. So thank you.

59:46

Thank you so much. I'm going to allow Jennifer to respond a bit. And then we'll open for q&a.

59:57

Thank you, and thank you so much Miss Shahid for your comments and your critique, I definitely will take your comments into strong consideration if and when I get the chance to do a second edition of the book, I consider this work to be very much a work in progress. You know, what I'm trying to do is, you know, I'm dealing with so much complexity, it's sometimes hard to pull all the strands back together again. And I realized definitely that I fall short in that in that final chapter. At the same time, I'm also really happy to hear your critique because that, in some ways, was my intention to really produce some a body of work that asks us to question everything, and to rethink everything. And so while I was writing the book, I also knew that what I was writing was controversial. And I decided to lean into that discomfort and uncomfortableness to really get us to start thinking more deeply about this juncture between idealism and materialism. So I'm also really glad that you brought up mock labor because I do feel like I am, to some degree working in that tradition that he did when he identified the Protestant Ethic. So yeah, so So there are, you know, it's, as I said, in my preface, right, like, you know, that, that we're dealing with so many contradictions here, right, like, we can come up with a broad typology at the end, just thinking about the broad patterns that I, you know, find in my historical analysis, and in the long Deray literature, right, and we can come up with a very broad pattern to say, Okay, well, there was the, you know, these colonizing movements that began in the ancient world, and they, you know, have engulfed more and more of the world as we've gone on. And there have been these counter hegemonic traditions. And this is what these two kind of look like in terms of when we're thinking about existential exists, you know, development or existential modes of production, you know, but then at the same time, when we start looking at the micro level, or at the contemporary or current level, then those patterns kind of fall away, don't they? Right. And I think that's one of the interesting things about moving between levels of analysis, because at the end of the day, you know, you can, you know, find all of the, you know, complexities at the smaller level of analysis are completely disappeared at the bigger level of analysis. And so I wanted to kind of juxtapose those two things in an uncomfortable way, and to not fully resolve it, at least for now. But I suppose I don't want to go on and on about this. So I'm going to just go ahead and stop now and say thank you for that feedback. And I would appreciate further feedback from other people who have read this book so that I can have an opportunity, if not to do another edition of this book, but to continue this work into the future.

1:03:03

Thank you so much. Let's open it up. I think all of us on the panel here have talked enough for the moment. So let's open it up to some questions for from the audience and discussion. And if you have a question you feel free to raise your hand and unmute yourself or you can put it in the chat and you want and I will monitor the chat and read those out if you're unable to speak Okay.