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START AUDIO

Male: Good evening everybody, can you all hear me? I am going to stoop down a little bit because I am quite short. I would like to extend a very warm welcome to you all, to the second keynote speaker at the BSA Annual Conference.

Just before I introduce our speaker, I just want to mention very quickly and I will remind you all again at the end of the session that the Philip Abrams Memorial Prize will be presented around about 6:45 and it would be great if you could stick around to share in that and be here for that.

We are already running a little bit over time. I just want to spend a minute to introduce Colin Samson. We are very fortunate to have a plenary speaker whose knowledge and research resonates with the theme of our conference in very direct and nuanced ways today.

Colin is currently a Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex in the Department of Sociology. His background is in sociology, medical anthropology, from the Universities of Arizona, LSE and Berkeley.

Colin’s work, it crosses disciplinary boundaries in very conceptually and empirically interesting ways. His interests span human rights and history of indigenous peoples, colonialism, environmental issues, mental health, arts and literature.

He teaches a number of courses with very interesting and intriguing titles, such as ‘Dangerous Ideas’, ‘Essays and Manifestos as Social Criticism’. As well as ‘The World in Question: Legacies of the Enlightenment.’

Colin’s past and present work addresses big questions with a historically informed sociological eye on ethnographic detail.

In one sense any discussion of societies in transition and social change is a discussion of the transformative consequences of interests and the challenges of describing and explaining those interests in terms of their origins, evolution and changing historical configurations.

Now Colin’s work illustrates how and why ideas of progress, competing interpretations of human nature or natural rights, globalising influences and disputes over land and resources impinge on the lived experience of indigenous peoples. How their ways of life have been vended into a collective persona non grata.

Colin was asked to contribute a plenary lecture to this conference precisely because his award winning work helps scholars and activists to understand how the state mystifies its moral, ethical and legal obligations towards indigenous peoples.

His work raises very important questions about whose interests are being served and preserved in the name of benign progress.

Please join me in welcoming your keynote speaker, Professor Colin Samson.

(Applause)

Colin Samson: Thank you very much. Hi can you all hear me with this rig on? Well thank you very much for inviting me to be a keynote speaker here at the BSA. I was just thinking about it and I can’t really remember the last time I came to the BSA but embarrassingly it must have been about two decades ago. So I am pleased to be back and I am pleased that Rampaul has played a part in bringing me back and getting me in the door.

About 20 something years ago I helped him get in a door as well, when he came for an interview to do an MA at the University of Essex and he was a very successful student.

I would like to thank the organisers. I would also like to thank the City of Glasgow for being here. I have never been here before and I have just spent this afternoon walking around and what a marvellous place it is.

I would also just, before I start, like to say that I dedicated this presentation to one of my former mentors at the University of California, Berkeley, Kenneth Bock, who passed away earlier this year at the age of 98.

He was a gentle and humble and self-effacing scholar who probably would have never come to an event like this and distanced himself from professional academia. But he had a huge influence on me, especially his ideas about human nature and particularly his conception of human nature as something of a social construction.

He was interested in how various sociologists and theorists and enlightenment thinkers had invested particular qualities in what they call human nature. Some of those qualities are connected to the idea of progress, which is what I want to talk about.

By the way I also am aware that you guys have been here all day and you haven’t been walking around Glasgow like I have, and sitting in cafes, and you might be flagging a little, so I forgive any lapses that you may have. But I will try to speak in a way that doesn’t make you lapse too much.

The two main words in the title are indigenous people and the idea of progress. I don’t think either of those have exactly been major concerns or burning issues in the profession of sociology, particularly British sociology.

In fact some years ago I wrote an essay with Damien Short who is here in the audience, and he did a trawl through various sociology textbooks and found very little discussion of indigenous people, even in Australia and North America and sociology textbooks where you might expect at least a mention.

I was educated primarily in the United States and I don’t remember any mention of Native Americans, American Indians, Inuit at all and that was in Arizona, which is a state which has a large Native American population.

That is probably changing now and in fact I have been to one session today and I have already heard mention of indigenous people.

Similarly the idea of progress to me doesn’t seem to be high on the agenda of mainstream sociology. It is not high on the agenda of social theory that I am aware of. People may want to correct me on that.

That is somewhat ironic given that the founders of sociology were so pre-occupied and immersed in the idea of progress. If you think of Auguste Comte, who I was taught was the founder of sociology. The Pope of positivism, someone very, very committed to the idea of progress.

As were people who are now kind of airbrushed out of the scene, such as in the United States, William Graham Sumner and Herbert Spencer.

I think it is in Richard Hofstadter’s book ‘Social Darwinism in American Thought’, where he mentions that Spencer influenced the thought of two generations of American sociologists.

Even if we look at what British sociology often regards as the founding fathers, Marx, Weber and Durkheim, all of them were wedded to some sort of idea of progress and of cultural evolutionism, staged theories of history.

Generally they made distinctions in the stages of history that particular groups were at, based on a non-Western binary. So at the top of the stages, at the apex, tended to be the West or Europe and lower down came other non-European people.

Regarding this history, it seems that these things are now being brought together or there could be ways to bring indigenous people and the idea of progress together in sociology or in interdisciplinary scholarship.

One of the ways in which they are being brought together is through the current preoccupations that we have over global inequalities, poverty, development, climate change, fossil fuel energy and especially, and this is what I want to hone in on, the position of extractive industries.

It seems to me that extractive industries today are being brought forward as one answer, and I would say in many places in the world a very prominent answer to disadvantage and poverty among marginalised communities around the world.

While also these industries supply the fuel that is needed to maintain the fossil fuel dependant lifestyles that people in the West enjoy in particular.

Because much of the raw materials for this standard of living are located and have to be extracted from areas of the world that are less populous now and are not in temperate zones of the world, there is what Michael Klare calls, “A race for what’s left.”

A lot of the race for what’s left is being run on territories inhabited by indigenous peoples. The indigenous peoples that I have in mind are those that were outside of the main corridors of colonisation.

These tend to be groups, not exclusively but these tend to be groups that have maintained greater cultural continuity. That have maintained land based ways of life until fairly recently. These are what a colleague of mine at Essex, called [Stefan Bowen 0:24:40] calls eco-communities or eco-cultures. They have a land based way of life.

But there are also people who, over the last half-century have become deeply traumatised by state and international policies designed to control and assimilate them and confiscate their lands.

These policies have resulted in collective dissents into epidemic diseases, endemic ill health from long term diseases that did not occur prior to colonisation. Poverty displacement and marginalisation.

All of this has been documented and it is very well documented now by a number of NGOs such as IWGIA which is based in Copenhagen. Survival International based in London. Cultural Survival in Boston. There is also the Forest Peoples Programme which is based in Britain.

Typical of the groups that I am thinking of, that fit into this category, that are outside the main corridors, or until recently the main corridors of colonisation and have high degrees of cultural continuity. Are people in the artic regions and the sub-arctic regions, people in the desserts such as the Kalahari in Namibia and Botswana and the Amazon region.

Those kinds of areas, there are other areas too but those are the ones that I have visited and I know a little bit about.

I would like to argue that at present what we are witnessing is an exhortation that these peoples should host or even better, participate in extractive industry or what is called extractivism and that this is a current manifestation of the idea of progress and it is guiding national and international policies.

Extractive industry is being extended as a form of improvement to indigenous peoples, specifically in places like Canada and it is being held out as a form of improvement for all marginalised communities in countries like Brazil.

These peoples are seen to benefit from the confiscation of their lands to use for extractivism.

Let me just rewind a bit and give you a little bit of intellectual architecture.

The enlightenment produced science rationalism, mathematics, the world view of Europeans and it spawned the idea of progress. This occurred at exactly the same time as the expansion of Europe. It occurred at the same time that Europeans were colonising the Americas, huge swathes of Africa and huge swathes of Asia.

It coincided with the take-off of capitalism, of mass cultivation agriculture and the industrial revolution, which was enabled by the European enslavement of African people who produced the raw materials to propel countries like Britain and the US into the industrial revolution and to become the major economic powers that they remain today.

Over the time of the enlightenment, 17th to 19th century, at the same time you have philosophers, thinkers, intellectuals, some politicians, attempting to establish what they regarded as universal principles of society and history.

Most of these in my view were characterised by a singular incuriosity or lack of interest in the world views of other peoples, which is actually encapsulated by the quote there from John Berger.

The idea was that the West provided us with a guide to where history was going. That if we looked at any time in history of where the West was, we could then predict where other places might come and how their history may actually evolve.

I think few in the 19th century demurred from this view, even people like Karl Marx, who in some ways was an apologist for colonialism and regarded it as a positive way of smashing feudalism and dragging countries like India into the modern world.

Many of these thinkers as well in the 19th century, and I include the sociologists, also believed that colonisation was generally a form of modernisation. They believed that there were some distortions perhaps.

For instance Alexis de Tocqueville is quite an interesting figure here, because he studied the colonisation of North America and also the colonisation of Algeria. His view was that there were excesses in North America that should have been remedied by the French in Algeria.

One other figure who I think is very important and I am going to return to him, is John Locke. In the ‘Two Treatises of Government’ which was published in 1689, Locke proclaimed in this very important chapter, which is called ‘On Property’. Locke proclaimed in the beginning all the world was America. In the beginning all the world was America.

What he meant by that, when we look at the American Indians, we are looking at a mirror into our own past. They are not our contemporaries. In the beginning that is what we were like too.

One of the important things about that chapter is that he provided a justification for the English to take the lands of the people they had colonised in the place that they called New England. They left England, they arrived in New England.

Locke believed that they were miserable and savage hunters and that the English had both a divine and a secular mandate to take their land, because the English were improving the soil, the English were farmers, the English were applying labour and by applying labour and improving the soil you then appropriate what is common land to become private property.

Sorry, I heard something about Microsoft.

He also believed that the American Indians in New England could only benefit from being exposed to the British, or the English, the English would raise up their level, they would uplift them. I have just drawn this chart here.

It is interesting to me why Locke might not be regarded as a sociologist. Why does sociology begin in the 19th century, why not a couple of centuries earlier?

You have a whole theory of society in Locke, and this is just my version of it. We have the state of nature. He says that that is where we start. There is war, there is uncertainty, we can’t survive without the protection of something bigger than the family or bigger than the small social unit. So we band together in a political society or a commonwealth as he sometimes calls it, which is based on the consent of the governed.

So that is very familiar to probably a lot of you. That is a social contract theory. Then what follows from that? That is what I am interested in. What follows from that is private property, is one thing, we have private property.

The establishment of private property, that entails a money economy. It needs, it necessitates a money economy and that then also helps with the development of what he called civilisation, of agriculture and industry. What occurs then is that you have, because you can have private property, you can buy and sell land, you can have a money economy, you can develop agriculture and industry and here you have got land to do it.

You have got the territorial expansion of the English and other Europeans who followed them in North America, and you have got the establishment of settler, what is called today settler colonialism.

So that is a little bit of architecture. Another piece of architecture which I am going to skip over or I am not going to say very much about is, the 19th century development in cultural evolutionism or social evolutionism.

You had there also the idea that history unfolds in a pre-determined way and is circulated throughout the 19th century and into the 20th century. One source of it, there are many sources of it, but one source is Charles Lyell’s, ‘Principles of Geology’, which has been described as a bible, ironically to Charles Darwin.

To Charles Darwin’s understanding of evolution. Lyell postulated that species can become extinct not simply due to environmental changes but through competition with better adapted species.

This easily extended itself into an idea about the colonial relations as being a struggle between better and less adapted pieces. I notice that this is the Carnegie Theatre and I think Carnegie, as you might know, was also quite enthusiastic about these ideas and I think funded Herbert Spencer.

Okay, so it is fitting to be here and to talk about these things. So what you have is, I think a very deterministic idea about the future and a very deterministic idea about history and how history moves. We might call it a doctrine of necessity.

What I would like to talk about is what followed from these ideas, these deterministic ideas. Well one was that in the 19th century you had the great land rush. You had the westward expansion in the United States and Canada. You had the scramble for Africa a bit later and the European carving up of Africa.

These were also justified by both secular and divine mandates and a number of people were quite exercised by the way in which this – there was a sort of convenience of views between the actual activities of the Europeans and the theories, they seemed to mesh very well together.

One of the people that spoke about this, when he was writing about the United States was Alexis de Tocqueville, and he refers to this doctrine of necessity that is used by American historians at the time. He said, “To their minds it is not enough to show that events have occurred. They wish to show that events could not have occurred otherwise.” They were inevitable in other words.

“They take a nation, arrived at a certain stage of history and affirm that it could not but follow the track that brought it there. It is easier to make such an assertion than to show how a nation might have adopted a better course.”

So he is noting there that the Americans tended to say, “Well it couldn’t have been any other way.” For instance the dispossession of the Native Americans. It is preordained, there was nothing that could have actually changed that.

The policies that the American government and other governments around the world, which I will mention in a second, adopted, were consistent with this doctrine of necessity. Here are a few examples of those.

Some of you have probably heard of the trail of tears, the forced removal of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Seminole, Creek people from the southern United States from Georgia, across the Mississippi. That occurred under the watch of President Andrew Jackson. Who in the 1829 State of the Union address, referred to the deaths of Indians that would be the consequence of these forced removals as a natural event.

He said, “It is just like one generation giving way to the next. We are sorry but we can’t help it. This is something that will have to occur.”

There were people like the followers of Jefferson, Senator Thomas Hart Benton, who articulated this sort of view very clearly when he talked about civilisation or extinction as the fate of anyone that gets in the way of the advancing whites, as he called them. Civilisation is always the preference of the whites and anyone who objects to that or who does not want to be civilised will have to be swept out of the way.

Just going back, you also had policies like the Dawes Act in the United States which formed the reservations. That was all done for the benefit of Native Americans, so they would learn farming, so they would learn about private property.

I think Henry Dawes said at one point, “The problem with our Indians is that they don’t know greed and greed is at the bottom of civilisation.”

So we get them onto reservations and we make them individually property holders and they can be like us, they can be greedy like us, because greed is at the root of civilisation. Of course that is a familiar premise of economics, of capitalist economics, neoliberal economics.

You have the reserves and the numbered treaty systems in Canada, which basically did the same things. You had mandatory boarding schools in the US and Canada and also in Australia, which were not closed until very recently.

In the 20th century you had a series of termination acts. In the 1950s acts in the United States which terminated the federal status of Native American groups. So they were de-recognised. So the idea was that they should just be like any other American, they should not have any separate land, they should not have any separate identity.

It would be different as someone like me, who was an immigrant to the US, who was an Anglo-English American in the US. They should just be like me or any other American.

You had similar policies in Canada, notably a White Paper in 1969 under Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Also something called the Comprehensive Land Claims, which is going on now, and I am going to talk about later, as a contemporary exercise of the idea of progress.

Then finally you had policies in the far north to relocate and sedentarise mobile peoples. So actually up until the late 1960s and into the ‘70s, you had groups of people in the north of Canada and in some cases Alaska too, who were living a mobile way of life, who were living as nomadic, hunting people.

From the ‘40s onwards the Canadian government had a very aggressive policy of sedentarising those people. Some of whom were moved thousands of miles from their homes to be, in one case, human flagpoles on Ellesmere Island, which is across from Greenland.

The idea was that the Canadians were afraid, and they actually are afraid now with global warming and the melting of the ice, they are afraid about their sovereignty. Because when the ice melts it then raises all sorts of questions about territorial sovereignty.

In those days they were concerned that Denmark would actually claim parts of what they regard as Canada. So they sent Inuit from Hudson Bay, thousands of miles up to Ellesmere Island to be human flagpoles.

To this day there was mayhem, people went mad. It was a real struggle to live in a place where it is dark from the beginning of October until the end of March. But they survived, but they survived at a massive cost.

As far as I am aware there has been no reconciliation for that and no compensation for the victims of that. There are loads of policies and in fact one of them that I… Just to introduce my work.

I have been working with the Innu people, not Inuit but Innu, Algonkian speaking indigenous people of North America. Whose area of land is the Labrador-Quebec Peninsula. It is an area about the size of France.

Until the late ‘60s they were permanent nomadic hunters. In the ‘50s and ‘60s the Canadian government drew them out to these locations here, that you can see in bold, which are villages. They are government built villages. The two that I spent most time in are Natuashish and Sheshatshui which are both in Labrador, but the others are all in Quebec.

This area is boreal forest and tundra and the people there lived, by all accounts, although there were instances of starvation but quite a good life through following the caribou and yearly migrations.

Then they were put into these communities. The first time there was an attempt to put them in a community was in 1948 and that was actually under the auspices of the British, because until 1949 the province of Newfoundland or the territory of Newfoundland was a British home law colony.

In 2013, well between 2009 and 2012 I worked with the film maker Sarah Sandring to record the memories of people who were forcibly relocated to a place called Nutak in 1948. This was above the treeline, it was beyond their normal territories, they had no idea how to live in that area. A lot of people died there and a lot of people died when they walked back.

They walked back on the sea ice, 300 kilometres. Another little episode of North American history, of Canadian history, that not much is known about it.

When I started looking at the documents of that, the government documents, you find the same doctrine of necessities. So one document says, “In order to make white men of these Indians we must undertake a monstrous but necessary act.” It was a monstrous but necessary act. They knew there would be casualties \_\_\_[0:45:50] but it was necessary, this doctrine of necessity.

Then fast forward, not that long, seven years later, after even this fall out, the Canadian government moved very aggressively to sedentarise the Innu in Labrador. In Quebec the movement was made even earlier.

This is another doctrine of necessity by Walter Rockwood, who was in charge of the department of Northern Labrador affairs. He says here, “One fact is clear, civilisation is on the northward march for the Eskimo, meaning Inuit and the Indian, meaning the Innu. There is no escape. The last bridges of isolation were destroyed. The only course now open, for there can be no turning back, there can be no turning back, is to fit him as soon as may be, to take his [fore 0:46:45] place as a citizen in our society. There is no time to lose.”

A sense of urgency there, with no time to lose, we have got to make them like us. Is Rockwood interested in them? Not much, not much curiosity there.

Now going back to extractivism. The idea in the past was that Native Americans, indigenous people should be more like Europeans in different respects.

Today it is they should be more like Europeans, especially in economic respects, especially in regard to the economy. Extractivism or extractive industry has been held out as a means to make that kind of transformation.

There is a whole raft of policies around the world. I haven’t done an inventory of them, but even if we just look at international policies. Some of the international policies are actually making it far easier for corporations to take, to appropriate, to usurp indigenous peoples land.

So for instance, the IMF recently rescinded some of its strictures on free prior and informed consent, with regard to corporations setting up operations on indigenous lands. Just as a lever of economic growth.

Over the last decade there has been quite a few instances where extractivism has been held out very directly to indigenous people as a means to uplift themselves and to get out of poverty and to develop.

In the US for instance, some of you might have heard of this. There is a longstanding problem of what to do with the nuclear waste. There is, I think getting up now for 100,000 tonnes of nuclear waste still unburied in the United States.

The first plan was to entomb it under Yucca Mountain which is sacred to the Western Shoshone and is on the Western Shoshone land in Nevada. There was so much push back from that, mostly from Senator Harry Reid from Nevada, a senior member of Congress, that Obama backed out of that.

But now it looks like that entombment or some of that entombment will occur on the Goshute reservation in Utah. So part of the reservation is now being commandeered for that purpose. The idea is economic growth, this is economic growth.

In the Navajo area of Arizona, Northern Arizona, uranium mining has wreaked havoc on the health of the people and the environment. But recently they have accepted renewed licences from companies to mine uranium on their land.

If you look at the company’s website the company says, “This is good. This is good for the Navajo. This is good job creation and it is a win, win situation for everyone.”

But I want to use as my main example Canada and try to look at how this exhortation to extractivism actually occurs through invoking what could be seen as a human rights measure. So you have got the irony of human rights measures coming in to justify dispossession and environmental degradation.

In North America indigenous peoples land was seen to be under their title, unless it was extinguished by some agreement or some treaty. And as you know there are lots of treaties in the US, all of them I think were broken, and there were lots of treaties in Canada, again many of them were broken or the Canadian government did not fulfil the terms of them.

But there are some groups, such as the Innu who never signed a treaty and groups in British Colombia and other parts of the north. So there is not one shred of paper that Canada can hold up in the air and say, “This belongs to Canada.”

So from the 1970s onwards, this became an issue. Because lots of groups who had underlying aboriginal title to the land, their land had not been extinguished, were going to the courts and saying, “Well wait a minute, you are setting up a mine over here, but we have aboriginal title.”

So the courts then basically instructed the legislator to put into place policy. The policy is called the Comprehensive Land Claim System and this is something that I am working on, something that is exercising me at the moment.

If a group historically, until very, very recently, until about ten years ago, if a group who had underlying aboriginal title did nothing, their land would simply just be commandeered. So in Labrador and in Quebec loads of that land was commandeered for mining. There was a huge nickel find at a place called Voisey’s Bay in 1993. There was a huge hydro project created in a river called the Churchill River. The Innu didn’t have a figure called Churchill, but the Europeans named the river Churchill River, because Winston Churchill was actually one of the first backers of this big hydroelectric project on Mishtashipu as they call it, but it is called Churchill River in English.

In order to stop this process of unfettered usurpation of land, indigenous groups have had to go through a process called Comprehensive Land Claims.

At a basic level, what comprehensive land claims entails, as an exchange of title to the land. So the [synequanon 0:53:29] of these processes, is the indigenous people must forfeit their ownership of the land.

The Canadian government says, “Great, thank you. Now in return we will give you compensation, we will give you certain self-government rights. You can have your own police force, you can have your own educational system.” But all of this will be over a drastically diminished area of land.

One of the first major ones was the Niska. I think the Niska got 14% of their land, of their traditional territory.

The Innu nation in Labrador are currently going through this process themselves. They are also looking at vastly diminished area of land. They basically have two choices, two major choices regarding their rights. The first one is called extinguishment.

Extinguishment means that they agree to seed, release and surrender their pre-existing aboriginal rights and aboriginal title in favour of Canada. So it is a menu with two choices. The second choice is called certainty, which they must agree never to assert whatever aboriginal rights and titles they have.

So they either have to say, “We don’t have them.” Or they have to say, “We do have them but we won’t assert them ever.” The relevant paragraph, and it took me a while to actually understand this. The relevant paragraph in the agreement in principle of the Innu Nation Land Claim Agreement is this one, and it is almost as if it was written by Franz Kafka and ghost written by Donald Rumsfeld.

If the parties reach agreement, so when they reach agreement, Innu will release Canada, the province and all other persons from all claims, demands, actions or proceedings of whatever kind, whether known or unknown, that’s where Rumsfeld obviously had a role. That Innu ever had, now have or may have in the future, relating to or arising from any act or omission occurring before the effective date, that may have interfered with, affected or infringed any aboriginal rights of Innu in Canada.

That is a fairly comprehensive, totalising, forfeiture of any autonomy or any independent rights that they may have from the state. It seals an exit. The Canadian government here have sealed an exit for them.

The other significant part… How much time do I have?

Male: You have got about 20 minutes.

Colin Samson: Okay, good. I am not very good at time.

Male: 15 minutes.

Colin Samson: Okay, that is fine, that is good.

The further stipulation of the agreement in principle, is that there is a sub-agreement which is attached to the main agreement. The sub-agreement is for provision of a huge, massive hydroelectric power generating plant at a place called Muskrat Falls on the lower Churchill River. So they dammed the upper Churchill River, now they are going to dam the lower Churchill River.

In order for the main agreement to kick in they have to agree with this. Interestingly this is not an agreement between an indigenous party and the state alone. It is an agreement between the indigenous party, the state and the power company. So you have got public/private mix there.

Just actually one other thing I meant to say about this. If this was not totalising enough, the next paragraph says that if any sub-group of Innu challenge the agreement and in terms of for instance the quantum of land.

Say a group of hunters, say, “You know what, there is an area of land that should have been incorporated there because our grandmother and great grandmother were born there and lived there and camped there and hunted there, and that should have really been in the agreement.” If that happens and it goes all the way to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court judges rule in favour of the Innu they must immediately seed and release that land to Canada.

Everything is sealed it is hermetically sealed. It is frightening in some ways. Frightening of how totalising it actually is.

The agreement then anticipates the release of land for this mega hydroelectric project. The benefits of that would be that there is money for Innu businesses that is attached to that. There is compensation that will go to the Innu communities and there are other financial packages.

But that has to be balanced against the debt that they incur by going to negotiate with the Canadian government. All the expenses, including the lawyers, the anthropologists that they hire, the other personnel, the running of the Innu Nation office, the services in the community. All that is a loan from Canada which needs to be repaid at the end of the negotiations.

I just got a Facebook message from a friend there today, he said, “It is looking like our debt is 60 million and our compensation will be 100 million.” So 60% of it will go back to Canada.

Just as a slight aside here, some people have done some genealogical research and seen that one particular prominent family of which my friend is a member, have some Scottish origins and he is asking me if I could find any rich Scotch cousins of his, that might be able to help pay the debt. If there is anyone here that is related to the rich or Richard’s family, let me know and my friend there will be very happy to hear from you.

So the idea, there is an expectation that Innu land will be released and privatised. But wait a minute, the place is called Muskrat Falls and there is a sign there. I was there in 2012 with some friends, there is a sign there. There were protests there, they have actually started building it. There it is.

This was taken in 2012 I think or 2013 by a friend of mine called Anthony Jenkinson. In 2013, plastered all over the area are signs saying, ‘No photography’. So this is actually ongoing, it is openly ongoing, even though the document, the agreement, the Land Claim Agreement to permit it has not even been finalised. There has been no final vote for it.

The anticipation is that it will go ahead. Although I should say there are some people who think that it may not go ahead. Partly because of the immense ecological problems that this will cause. Already to date huge clumps of spruce forest have fallen into the river, because the river level has dropped, because the dam is almost complete now. The river level has dropped and so huge clumps of, stands of spruce and willow have fallen into the river.

Of course that deoxygenates the water. You get deaths of a lot of fish, people can’t fish anymore. A lot of people rely on fishing. There is also a link to mercury poisoning, so these things are just bubbling away in the background.

I should say that the Canadian government also seriously holds out extractivism as a remedy for indigenous disability and poverty. I am just quoting here from a couple of very recent policy documents.

In 2014 the Comprehensive Land Claims Policy was re-thought and there was a new document put up on the website. They actually say that extractive industry is a form of reconciliation. It is a human rights measure. That we are offering these kinds of developments as a means to reconcile the injustices that have been perpetrated against indigenous people.

Then it goes on to say, “And also obtain a secure economic and resource development that can benefit all Canadians.” And, “Enable aboriginal peoples to have a fair and ongoing access to land…” Sorry I shouldn’t lax into that accent. “Access to lands and resources to support their traditional economies and share in the wealth generated from those lands and resources as part of the broader Canadian economy.”

There was a government report just last month, a government panel report which recommended more revenue sharing from extractive projects on indigenous land. Importantly it didn’t distinguish between collective lands and private lands either.

At the moment this is collectively owned lands. Nobody has the right in theory to take this land out of the hands of all the Innu.

If you look at the statements of the Minister of Indian Affairs, or Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in Northern Development. Interestingly the title of the Minister is Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, so the two are tied very close together just in the title of the official.

The current official is Bernard Valcourt and he argues that extractive industries are a key component of a bootstrap capitalism project and he maintains that the energy sector is but one industry with development opportunities that we could leverage to assist the growth for aboriginal communities.

He has set aside a $61m budget. If you think of that, that is not very much, because $60m is how much the Innu alone now have to pay back to Canada for the loans to participate in a process that will give this land to Canada. They have to pay in a way for their own dispossession.

If you look on his website you will see a lot more statements that he has made linking indigenous people to extractive industry. He was questioned recently in December in the parliament by Carolyn Bennett a Liberal MP, who pointed out that while there is a lot of money going into this, there is relatively little being devoted to improving the basic infrastructure and hygiene and sanitation of aboriginal communities.

If any of you have ever visited any of these you will know that they are often in a very dire situation. The Innu who are currently in Natuashish only got running water and sanitation in 2003. Many communities have to boil the water before they get it. There is epidemic ill health, a lot of social dysfunction, a lot of petrol sniffing, alcohol abuse, solvent abuse, epidemics now of diabetes.

When I first went to the Innu communities in 1994 no one had diabetes that I was aware of. Today it is well over 50%.

There has not much been said about that and about the basic infrastructure, but a lot being said about all of this.

I want to end with two things. A conclusion and an interpretation.

The conclusion is that the assumptions of bootstrap capitalism and trickle-down economics here in this case, and I am using the Canadian example but I think it applies elsewhere. I have been doing a little bit of work in Brazil and you find similar sorts of exhortations being made there.

First of all, indigenous people will not benefit very much from these extractive industries, for a number of reasons. One is they lack the educational qualifications to enable them to take anything but the lowest level jobs.

A lot of the Innu today who are working there, are cleaning the cabins of the Newfoundland workers, who racially abuse them. There have been several scandals about racial abuse at this site. In November there were massive lay-offs.

We know that extractive industries do not last very long. In this case most of the labour will be in the building of the dam, after that a dam doesn’t need much labour. What it does need is highly technical kinds of jobs which will not be open to the vast majority of indigenous people.

Secondly we know that communities that are dependant on resource extraction face massive public health problems. The disruption of communal and family activities, particularly because of migrant labour. We know that elsewhere in Canada the promises of economic progress made subsequent to Land Claim Agreements, and also made subsequent to huge extractive projects, have not materialised.

The big promise in Nunavut, when they created Nunavut in 1999, in Inuit territory, was that this would lead to economic progress, it has not. There have been several studies that have shown that.

Thirdly, a lot of the benefits of extraction actually occur through corruption. Most of the financial benefits that will go to Innu people in this instance, will go to people who are very well connected through the leadership of the Innu Nation.

I looked at the 2013 registry of Innu businesses and one person has interests in seven different companies. But because I know who he is and I know the extended family, if I were to incorporate all the extended family it is about 30 businesses that this one person alone has interests in.

This is being openly discussed on Facebook. This is my friend who has got Scottish origins, on Facebook. George here is a very articulate man. If he was here he would be incredibly articulate in speech, but his first language is not English. People do not write grammatically correct English.

“I remember the time when the Board of Innu Nation always screaming at us when he was a leader. They were always accusing us of corruption. Why are those same people not doing it, the proof is there. How many contracts does the leader have in her name?”

This is the current President of the Innu Nation. “She should resign now, she has white adviser.” They play a very crucial role by the way, the white advisers. “She paid for accommodation, she recently travels to Toronto to meet with Vale Inco, which is the Brazilian firm which is running the Voisey’s Bay mine, and had numerous meetings with Nalcor which is the power company that is about to benefit from the Muskrat Falls, to secure another contract.”

So the accusation here, I don’t know if it is correct or not, but the feeling is that the President is having all these meetings in order to secure contracts, joint venture contracts with her family.

Finally, I will end on this. This is my interpretation, we will drag John Locke back into the scene again.

We could say that, if we wanted to update Locke, it might look something like this.

So you have a state of nature in the third world or for indigenous people. They suffer poverty, they suffer discrimination, they suffer marginalisation. All of that is a fact, we have got to do something about it. How do we drag them out of that state of nature?

Of course there is an historical amnesia about what got them into that state. We don’t mention colonialism, that is not part of the story anymore. We start with this.

Then we move to what he called political society, which is integration of indigenous people and through the assimilation measures and through terminating their special status, integrate them into national and international order.

Then what follows from there is the privatisation of the world’s remaining collectively used and owned lands. So there are many areas of the world that are under collective…

The lands that you saw in those pictures, all those pictures in theory are collectively owned lands. They are owned by all Innu.

Another benefit, another aspect of progress that comes from that, is the neoliberal fossil fuel economy characterised by explicit state corporate collaboration and this brings civilisation. So you had the de-collectivisation, de-communalisation of people, you have materialism, a consumer society, individualism, extreme inequalities.

This is probably what would pass for civilisation today. Then where is all this going? It is going to the land rush for what is left. So it is no longer territorial expansion across North America, it is a land rush around places like Northern Labrador, the Amazon, the Kalahari, to get what is left, and do it through this sort of framework.

We will stop there, thank you.

(Applause)

Male: Thank you very much Colin. We have a mic available. You can use the mic and we can also speak up. So I would like to ask for any questions or comments. Over there, and over there.

Female: You have painted a fairly bleak picture. Canada has quite a comprehensively bad history with its First Nation peoples, Mets and Inuit. I wonder if you can talk a little bit to some of the protests and the movements in response to that. For me that has been kind of absent. I appreciate the pretty dire situation that a lot of these communities are in and have been in for a long time and will probably continue to be.

 But I wonder if you can speak a little bit to things like the ‘Idle No More’ movement and I appreciate Nunavut maybe hasn’t responded, resulted in economic prosperity in the north, but it is kind of an example of a handing over of some rights to Inuit communities. I wonder if you could comment on that?

Colin Samson: Yes sure, thanks a lot for that question.

Male: Are you happy to take two questions at the same time or would you like to field one at a time?

Colin Samson: Maybe one at a time. I am getting, so my memory lapses.

 I will try to be brief. Yes, thank you for the question, a good question. It is something that I missed out. I didn’t mention there is a huge social movement which actually has kind of declined a bit in the last year or so.

 It began I think in 2012 in Canada called, ‘Idle no More’. The ‘Idle no More’ movement were contesting these kinds of policies and there is a Haudenosaunee, a commentator called Russell Diabo who is actually the person who has coined the term, “This conference of land claims amounts to termination.” It is a termination view.

 All that is there, there is also indigenous scholars, like Taiaiake Alfred and many others. Glen Coulthard, who has written a great book called, ‘Red Skin, White Masks’ about all this. So there is pushback and that is not in here I guess. That is not in here because I don’t think the corporations are paying really much attention to that. I don’t think the state is paying much attention to that.

 But it is there and I think it is important to mention that. There are other forms of pushback which I could mention too.

 Very quickly, the other pushback and it is not just Canada but the US and elsewhere, are cultural revitalisation activities. There are a number of indigenous people that have recognised that modern lifestyle is absolute toxic to them. They are trying to re-claim things that were actually dismissed as backward and anachronistic, etc.

 I anticipated this question. So for instance this is just recently, a group of Innu people walking 550 kilometres. That is a huge feat in minus 40 degree temperatures. If a white person did that they would be punching the air at the end. There was nothing, there was just a makushan at the end, there was a feast at the end.

 But there is a lot of this kind of thing going on. That is a report about it. In the US there is restoration of bison, who would have thought that? The Europeans wanted to kill all the bison. They are bringing them back. There is salmon restoration in Oregon and Washington. I think they are demolishing something like 200 dams, small dams. So there are activities that are pushing back in the other direction.

Male: Thank you, there was a gentleman over at the back.

Male: Thank you for that, I think my question does follow on from the previous one. So a bleak tale of enclosure, \_\_\_[1:18:06] blood and fire.

 But my question really is broader than the one about the protest which I think is important and interesting. But you have been obviously very critical of this, but haven’t you still been telling this story from a very Eurocentric perspective? With Locke and all of these western political philosophers.

 What would this story be like if it was told from the perspective of your friend George Rich or more broadly, the American Indian Cosmovision? How would they tell this story?

 In a sense at the end you talked about how the Innu only get a low paid jobs and unskilled jobs, plus you talked about the lack of sanitation and I think you talked about education as one of the measures that in a sense they won’t get a good education.

 But one of the ways that American Indians have been colonised is through education as much as through violence. So I am wondering what it would be like in that respect?

Colin Samson: I agree with everything you have said there. You said some important things. One, you mentioned enclosure. This is an enclosure movement and it has a lot of similarities with the English enclosures, Scottish enclosures.

 Secondly with regard to Eurocentrism, I think what I was trying to do here is actually show the architecture, try to think through some ideas about the intellectual architecture which justifies the current policies. I think that is the architecture of Locke and social evolutionism, and I think a lot of it is cultural evolutionism. It is still really very, very important.

 Indigenous scholars have also said the same things. Glen Coulthard’s new book refers to lots and lots of European thinkers.

 There is a point to using also indigenous kind of reverse anthropology. There are a number of indigenous people that actually look through this. I anticipated your question too. (Laughter)

 I know I am not going to read all this out, but there is a fantastic new book by Davi Kopenawa who is a Yanomami. You might know him because embarrassingly he was championed by Sting in the 1980s and recently by David Beckham.

 But he has worked with Bruce Albert to produce this amazing book called ‘The Falling Sky’. In there, basically in that paragraph there, he is actually describing the European idea of progress. What he is saying is that this need for merchandise, this attachment to materialism is what is destroying the Europeans. But they keep being driven on to do things faster and faster and more and more.

 So that is just one example, but there are many other examples I think where I think, in fact my book, which is not here, we were going to sell it but… It is called ‘A World You Do Not Know.’ It is framed around a quote from Luther Standing Bear. Luther Standing Bear was a Lakota who went to the boarding school and when he came back he wrote books to educate whites.

 One of the things he said in there, he said, “When the whites came on to our land they laughed at everything. They laughed at our tobacco, our beads, our language, our tents, teepees. Now when we look at the white man, we see many things that are funny but we don’t always laugh because we think there may be something hidden from us that we don’t understand.”

 He said, “If you would take that view of us there would be a whole world you do not know, you would be introduced to this whole word.” I think that is part of the indigenous world and this is what Davi was also talking about.

 This incuriosity of the Europeans. The indigenous people have actually honed in on this kind of inability of the west, inability of Europeans to take seriously other ideas about the world, [regarding our 1:22:40] history. So thank you for that question.

Male: Thank you for that. There is a gentleman on the outside there?

Female: Could people say who they are?

Male: Yes, could you maybe mention your name and your institution affiliation please, followed by your question? Thank you.

Colin Samson: So the NSA can have it. (Laughter)

Male: Thank you very much for your presentation, I think it was both fascinating and horrifying in equal measures. We hear a lot about the concept of corporate social responsibility. Are there opportunities? Are there movements that exist in Canada at the moment that works to directly target and work on shareholders and company executive boards?

 Also what do the Innu want for themselves? You talked about how they exist in pretty dire material living conditions. What do they want for themselves in terms of economic and personal development?

Colin Samson: Yes, good questions. Corporate social responsibility, I don’t know. The simple answer is, to be honest I don’t know. The first questioner may know that, what movements there are to try to hold corporations to account in Canada. I think there is a lot of emphasis on Canadian corporations elsewhere. My sense is there is less on corporations in Canada.

 I have witnessed very little opposition to what is going on here at Muskrat Falls. There are a few nationalist Labradorians who are white, who are settlers that are opposed to it. There are Metis who are opposed to it, because they want a piece of the action.

 A lot of the opposition comes from groups who also want a cut. So there is that that is going on as well. In my view there is very little. I don’t know more, I have done some, but there is not much.

 With the Innu, I don’t know it is hard for me to say what they want. I have been going once a year almost, although I haven’t now been for two years. The last two times I have been working with film makers.

 The younger people will say, “We want jobs. We want to sign this agreement.” 80% of them voted for the agreement in principle. Although I am sure none of them had actually read it. They were told by the advisers that it was a good thing. They want jobs, they want security and they are often all for it.

 Then there is this kind of intermediate generation who are still attached to the hunting world, and some young people are attached to the hunting world, that think this is a disaster. Then there are a huge number of people who undergo periodic serious trauma from drinking. There was a suicide last week in [Sheshatshiu 1:25:42]. A lot of young people try to commit suicide and most of the time people are focusing on these day to day…

 They have got diabetes, they have got to go to hospital. Teenagers are having kids very young, 13, 14 years old. They are dealing with that, how could they possibly understand that Rumsfeldian text, or even have the inclination to want to.

 I think the state and the corporation realise that and they are divided. They are very divided because of the few people that are really creaming off some serious money, and there are others getting nothing.

Male: Okay, thank you. There is a question in that corner, maybe not? Okay. Do you want to wait for the mic?

 If you could mention your name and your affiliation please?

Male: Hi my name is Martin Crook I am from the School of Advanced Study in the University of London.

 Just a couple of points really, I will be as brief as I can. I think this speaks to me, it reminds me a lot of Raphael Lemkin’s understanding of genocide, the Godfather of the sociology of genocide, who understood genocide as the destruction of the social power, of social collective or group.

 Of course in particular when it comes to indigenous groups that is often their culture and their cultural integrity as a viable entity is tied in with their ownership of the land.

 It reminds me of Damien Short’s work on native title rights in Australia and of course the industrial genocide in the Tar Sands Project in Northern Alberta. I wanted you to maybe briefly touch on that.

But also a brief point about Marx, because in my readings of Marx, of course Edward Said’s famous book, ‘Orientalism’ popularised the notion that Marx was also of a colonial mind-set.

Even in that article that Marx wrote, he talked about how colonialism was nevertheless devastating and destructive on the local population.

 But later on in Marx’s career he actually began to change his position and he wrote extensive ethnological notebooks on, I believe it was the Iroquois tribe and also on the Russian peasant commune system.

 He essentially argued that there was not just one linear route to change. He didn’t argue in terms of a teleological sense, but there was a multi linear pathway to change. So actually he argued that to resist the fight for social struggle can be achieved in a multitude of different ways.

 I think there is another reason why it is important to give Marx a second chance, is because of his fantastic work on the anti-ecological nature of the capitalist mode of production.

 It reminds me of the struggles taking place in the reserves in Canada, who are resisting this commodification process. Marx talked about the capitalist mode destroying the twin sources of wealth creation, the soil and labour. How it basically destroyed the metabolic relationship between human beings and nature in his analysis of the soil erosion crisis in 19th century Europe.

 I think there is a lot that Marx can shed on this process. Thank you.

Colin Samson: Thanks for that primer on Marx, refreshing my memory. I agree with you. I used that as an aside but I think you are correct. You are saying exactly what Glen Coulthard says in his book, ‘Red Skin, White Masks’ and he is a big fan of Marx.

 Yes there is both in Marx. There is actually kind of a plaudits for the British in India, but that has to be qualified with other things he said as well.

 The main thing though maybe is that he puts forward this evolutionary account of the development of society. So the Native Americans are at the bottom as primitive accumulation, primitive communism. So again we look at them and we look at our own past, they have that too to a certain extent.

 What was the first one? Lemkin, yes absolutely I think that the Comprehensive Land Claims process and the siding of extractive industry on indigenous lands, no matter where they are forms of genocide, because they prevent people from passing down their way of life. So when you have this mess going on there people are not able to fish, people are not able to hunt. It has gone.

 Actually, I mean global warming is doing the same thing. Global warming is doing exactly the same thing. I agree with that, in fact there is a new book – another plug – called ‘Colonial Genocide in North America.’ It is edited by Alex Hinton and Jeff Benvenuto and Andrew Woolford, and I have got a chapter on that, actually arguing that these processes lead the way to genocidal outcomes.

Male: Great, thank you. We have a question here.

Female: I have really enjoyed your talk, it is really tempting to start telling the Australian story, which is where I am from. But I just wanted to tell one story about my ancestor. A great, great, great grandparent called George Barker Mitchell.

 He was actually an opponent of slavery, he was a Chaplain in Leicester. When he died his children went to all parts of the Empire, and one of them was a General in India. One of them went to Tasmania in Australia. This is my great grandfather.

 He was on the first commission that recommended that aboriginal children should be taken away from their parents, and that was part of a policy to smooth the dying pillow. That same thing, that evolutionary idea that these people are backwards.

 In Australia it was made much more easily because they declared the land terra nullius legal entity, there is a story there as well.

 But I just want to agree with this issue, that it was a genocide, but also just to emphasise, we don’t know the extent of our loss in terms of what that did to us. For example in Australia the characterisation of aboriginal people as a stone age people. Because they didn’t have a written culture, it was a backward culture. Because their religion didn’t look like our religion it wasn’t a proper religion.

 Actually to me what you have to say, it is not about romanticising the life that was there, but in Australia which had a society that lasted for 40,000 years. They had a relationship with the land, they sustained it, they used fire, they had a religion that was about that relationship with the land, it ensured relationships between different people.

That has got to be something that is a tragedy that is lost. I live in the countryside in Scotland, it is terribly polluted, people have no sense of a continuous relationship with the land. People treat the land with contempt and that is what we do, anyhow I won’t go on, \_\_\_[1:33:55].

 (Applause)

Colin Samson: Thanks for your comment. I recognise what you are saying.

Male: We have time for just one last quick question anybody? The lady over there at the back please. Thank you, short question.

Female: Thank you. I am really glad I get to ask my question after all, because of the previous speaker talking about Australia. In the New Zealand context, the law makes a real difference to how these sorts of things would transpire, because of the Treaty of Waitangi between the British Crown and the indigenous peoples, which says that both are equal masters of the land.

 So the law would prevent this sort of thing from fully evolving even though similar processes are taking place, people are trying to make them happen. Could you say something about the law in all of this? Because it sounded a little bit like cowboy stuff going on, as if there was no legal obstacle to any of this.

 I know you talked about the policies that were put in place. But is there no legal obstacle to this sort of development? Was there never a legal struggle, a legal opposition to this?

Colin Samson: Good question. We could talk about that for a long time.

Male: Can you keep it shortish?

Colin Samson: I will keep it short, okay. (Laughter) In a way what happened is with regard to indigenous people I don’t think New Zealand is a model, but I am not going to talk about that. But in regard to indigenous people there are two contradictory legal principles. One is that they have underlying title to the land until that is extinguished by the coloniser.

 The second is the law of sovereignty, the sovereignty of the state. What happens in practice is the sovereignty of the state trumps its own law, constantly.

 The Canadian government will just say, “This is part of the province of Newfoundland, we are sorry.”

 There is this other principle of aboriginal title but it is subsidiary. There has been a number of Supreme Court cases which has eaten away at that with regard to consent.

But if you look at them now, for instance there is this Delgamuukw decision which is very important in 1997. It actually says, “Aboriginal people have full title, it is their land, this cannot be extinguished without free prior informed consent, blah, blah, blah, blah, except for…” And there is a list of infringements.

Even in this land claim there is a list of infringements that are of settlement of populations, minerals. There are about 10 or 15 things. Roads, a huge number of things. So the law creates all these exceptions which enable the dispossession to continue.

Male: Thank you Colin. Time is up, would you please join me in thanking Colin.

 (Applause)

I would just like to mention the Philip Abrams Memorial Prize Presentation which is going to take place now. The President Lynn Jamieson is going to preside over that.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to mention that from seven until eight we have three other events taking place. The Publishers’ Wine Reception, the Presentation for the Poster Prize and also the Presentation for the Pecha Kuchas Prize, so it would be great if you could participate and contribute to those events between seven and eight this evening, thanks very much.

Lynn Jamieson: Just to add to that list also the launch of Sociologists Tales, which is a resource which Early Career sociologists have commissioned and is an excellent resource for all of us.

 So it is my privilege now to talk about the Philip Abrams Prize and to award that prize.

 I want to just briefly remind you that Professor Abrams was an advocate of historical sociology. In fact he said, “History and sociology are the same thing.” He died young and tragically and this prize has been awarded since 1989. It is for the first authored book of a British sociologist.

 There has been over the last few years an incredibly strong field and this year was absolutely no exception. The books are put forward often by publishers or other advocates. So you can see in your programme on pages 23 and 24, all of the nominated books and the short-listed books.

 The prize is judged by the President and the publications members of the Trustees. The two Trustees who are responsible for publication, so the three of us form a judgement about this.

 I have to say that it was one of the first things I had to do as President. It was incredibly rewarding and exciting to see the vibrancy of sociology through these books, that are written by Early Career sociologists. To see the incredible strength that is there, the range of topics, the depth of evidence involved, the amount of effort that has gone into them. They are all worthy of being read and that short-list is a scintillating short-list but actually there are fantastic books that didn’t make it to the short-list. So I want to say that because people are disappointed because there is only one winner.

 I want you to know those books are worth reading, even not the winner. But of course the winner is a stunner and I am now going to tell you that the prize was won by this book, ‘The Good Project’ by Monika Krause.

 I am going to just tell you very quickly a little bit about the argument in that book and what it is about and then I am going to invite Monika to come and take this prize.

 So the book is about humanitarian relief NGOs. Monika interviewed 50 Desk Officers and Directors of Operations in 16 of the main relief NGOs, globally. As well as doing lots of other sorts of documentary and observation work over a five year period.

 She describes very eloquently in this book, how humanitarian relief is not in any way straightforwardly about fulfilling the needs of those who need relief. But how there is a field of practice in which these relief organisations are working and a key practice is the good project.

The definition of a good project is to do with fitting the expectations of donors. It is to do with the capacity of what the organisation can deliver. It is to do with the market positioning and competing between the relief organisations themselves and it is not straightforwardly to do with the needs of those who are relieved.

 It is not a book that is in any sense simplistically blaming NGOs. It is one that is looking at the history and the global social context of how this comes to be, how a good project gets produced in this way.

The social technologies involved in its production, but also the fact that large sectors of the world population lack access to the basic means of living really. As a normal state of affairs, not a state needing relief. It is part of the context of what makes this possible and the way that we all tolerate that.

 So it is a challenging but very well evidenced piece of work, with a strong political punch.

 As I said there are other fantastic books there, they are all fantastic really, but I am now very delighted to award the prize to Monika Krause for ‘The Good Project’ and I would like to ask her to come up and receive it.

 (Applause)

Monika Krause: Well it has been a very long day for everyone. So I just want to briefly thank everyone who was involved in judging and organising the prize. I think it is really wonderful that the BSA has a prize specifically for first books. I think it is going to be more wonderful as we move forwards and maybe books aren’t as taken for granted as a valued product.

 I am also especially honoured and to echo what has been said, because I have enjoyed reading some of the previous winners and I have also enjoyed reading some of the other short-listed ones. Thank you.

 (Applause)

Lynn Jamieson: Okay, so now we can go to the Publishers’ Reception and have a drink, whatever sort, it doesn’t have to be alcohol.
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