Critical Response Episode - Chili Praxical Violence

Fri, Nov 10, 2023 4:33PM • 53:20

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

violence, community, talk, marianne, jony, agents, terms, context, epistemic, part, institutions, reflexivity, intervention, thinking, chile, practice, concept, chris, indonesia, psychology

SPEAKERS

Marianne Daher, Chris, Rejane, Natalie, Jony E. Yulianto, Antonia, Sam Keast, Maria Jose

Natalie 00:00
So I am going to just start off on our introductions, kind of what we would like from everyone. So : name, what part of the world are you calling in from? What do you do in that space? How do you connect to the topic of praxical violence? So I will just start it as I see you all. We'll start with Chris if you want to lead us away with an introduction.

Chris 00:21
All right, my name is Christopher Sonn, I come to you from the south east Australia, just outside of Melbourne, where I live on the land of the Bunurong people but work on my campus, which is on the lands of the Woiwurrung and the Boonwurrong of the Kulin nation. I guess I think praxical violence is a really interesting term to me, because we've been thinking about this maybe in terms of related construct, which is epistemic violence. So the violences produced through particular ways in which you go about constructing and making sense of the world, but and also structural violence in terms of race, racism, and so forth. I guess that the term praxical violence sort of appealed to me because I immediately thought of it, as an extension of praxis, or the theory, theory-practice sort of interaction, which, immediately, I guess, points to something that resonates. What does this look like in the everyday, so whether and whatever the setting, whatever the settings might be? So I think it will be interesting to just think about, or engage in this discussion about praxical violence, and how that term also is relevant to the sort of projects that we do here in Australia, with various communities and various groups that find themselves at the sharp end of inequalities, but also the sorts of ways in which distances between groups of people are being exarcebated in the current and contemporary world and what that looks like in terms of efforts to address those sorts of distances that's being created between them. Thank you.

Natalie 02:11
Thanks, Chris. Jony, can you tell us a little bit about yourself and where you're calling in from?

Jony E. Yulianto 02:16

Hi, Natalie. Thank you. Hello everyone. I'm Jony. I'm currently living in Auckland. I've just completed my PhD last month. I'm here because of doing my PhD. And I'm working with Javanese and Chinese Indonesian community in Indonesia. So my research is looking at inter-ethnic marriages between Javanese, which is native Indonesian, or Indigenous people of Indonesia, and Chinese Indonesian. So yeah, so that's why I'm here. And in part, I'm connected to the issue of praxical violence and interested to joining this discussion, because the case that the Chili team has raised in the discussion is actually resonates strongly with my own country, Indonesia, where we have also a high poverty rate. And that's why in particular, I also reflect on some of the transcript and find so many commonalities with Indonesia. And I'm also affiliated in university in Surabaya, in Indonesia, where I serve as a junior lecturer there. So it's, it's great to connect with not only my fellow senior community psychologists like Monica and Dicky, but also with all friends here. So thank you very much. That's for me.

Natalie 03:45

Sam, over to you. Where are you calling from today?

Sam Keast 03:49

Hi, my name Sam Keast, live on the lands of the Boonwurrung in the southeast Kulin nation, otherwise known as Australia or Melbourne, and work on the lands of the Wurundjeri as a research officer in Victoria University and educator. And I think that I gotta say, I really resonated with this concept in so many ways. And I think mainly for me in some of the work that I've been doing in the past is thinking about how we make visible these things, which are so often normalized and made invisible through policy through, I guess the kind of that the helping professions that were that were involved in, and the ways in which these violences have been trickled down from institutions, policies to people and bodies and communities. And I think it does such a brilliant job of making visible those things, which are often often hidden in terms of praxis, but also in interrelations and the kind of the interlocking way in which those violences then create context in which people manifest all sorts of harms to each other, on each other and a kind of a swirling environment of that and so I really felt. And the focus on policy and those levels I think is really important for something like critical community psychology. And others have written about how it's often sometimes quite neglected because we're so invested in the on the ground practice that we forget necessarily about how those violences have come to us as practitioners. So yeah.

Natalie 05:07

Thanks, Sam. Rejane are you there? Can you hear us?

Rejane 05:11

Hi, I can hear you. I've got a very bad connection, we've got an outage at the moment, an electricity outage, so. And I'm up in the mountains. So it's a little bit unstable.

Natalie 05:21

I'm sorry to hear it. But so glad that you were able to join, we can hear you loud and clear at the moment, would you like to introduce yourself, we're sharing our names, what part of the world we're

coming in from and then a little bit about what we do and how we are kind of resonating with the idea of praxical violence.

Rejane 05:38
I'm Rejane Williams and Garth is my supervisor, my long suffering supervisors. So I transitioned into academia very late in life, but was really an organizational practitioner for the better part of my life, working areas of transformation around race in organizations, and the issue of praxical violence, I think is very important in the work that I do, because of the secondary trauma, that not only people who have been oppressed, but also people who are facilitating this work experience in organizations, doing anti racism work. So yeah, that's what, what interests me about what we're discussing, I think it has a lot of relevance, especially in terms of the trauma of racism.

Natalie 06:29
Thanks Rejane, I'm so glad you were able to join us. And we also have the three kind of contributors to the original episode of praxical violence here with us, calling in from Chile. So maybe I'll ask them briefly as well. I'll go by the order that I can see you. So Maria, would you like to start us off?

Maria Jose 06:48
Yes. So hello, everyone. Thank you for coming here to dialogue with us. We were super excited about this moment, actually. Hearing you all. So my name is Maria Jose Campero. I'm talking to you from Chile. And we are the writers of this concept that, really what we wanted to establish at the beginning is what you were all saying that is like this like name for something that we've seen in so many situations in so many levels. We just tried to put a name on it, so we can dialogue around it. So this is like the best concretization of that happening. So thank you for being here.

Natalie 07:25
Thank you, Maria.

Marianne Daher 07:27
Hi, I am Marianna Daher. I am also here in Chile. I am a professor at the Catholic University. And as you said, I have relate with this concept, or this phenomenon. The principal researcher of our project where we, we wanted to study the implementation process in social intervention. And for us praxical violence was something that happened. We didn't it, it wasn't an explicit objective of our research project. We weren't looking for it, it just appeared. And it was all around. And every time we talk with the intervention agents, or the participants of this social program we were studying, it appears. And so for us, having the opportunity to develop, to think, to discuss about this concept is very important, because it's something very new, very, I think that it is still in construction, for saying it in a way. So we're very happy to be in this in this episode. So thank you, Natalie.

Natalie 08:55
And Antonia, last but not least.

Antonia 08:57

3

Hi, my name is Antonia Rosetti. I am from Chile too and well I am researcher and professor at the Catholic University. And I'm very happy to be here today also, because this is our real interest, I think result about our research and we want to share it and to discuss about it because as Marianne said, it's something that emerged from the results and we are very open to discuss about it, to think about it. And I think it's very important for me and for our research team because we have studied social policy for many years. But I think this is like a critical perspective that we have developed. And it's, I think it's very necessary also to have a critical perspective but also like propose a form to go better in this topic. So thank you for everyone to be here.

Natalie 09:49
And so now we'll kind of move into our broader discussion of what this means and part of the reason we created this structure to our podcast is that we wanted to disrupt some of the colonial notions that the written word is superior to other forms of knowledge mobilization, but also disrupting some of the kind of quote unquote peer review process, right. And so in this in this project, you know, the three of you, Antonia, and Maria and Marianne, from Chile have generated and shared with us a concept, you know, this idea crafted within some of the research that you're doing. And now in this space, we as your peers, as your colleagues, get to think about what that means for us together and process it in ways that hopefully will be really helpful in our own practices. So I want to kind of shift us to, because I think as you were doing your introductions, everyone shared some of their kind of initial reactions to praxical violence and I want to ground us in one of the definitions from the transcript, from your first episode where it says, "we define praxical violence as the exercise of asymmetrical power in symbolic and practical dimensions, by a subject who exercises it, and an object towards which the violence is directed, establishing a relationship that is detrimental to the actors involved, and the aims of public policy." Which I really understand it at its root to be about the ways that we know as professionals or social change actors, or psychologist, or community practitioners, that we engage in ways in our work that reproduce or perpetuate harm and violence in our relationships with community, and that we reproduce the systems of oppression that we're aiming to disrupt in the first. So where we can start then together as you were listening to this and engaging with this material to our kind of four guest panelist here. So Chris, and Jony and Sam, and Rejane, what insights were you able to draw from this? How do you feel like you can kind of pick this up into your own thinking, and if it leaks over into applications and storytelling, that is fine, but that is where we'll go kind of next. But really kind of initial insights that came up for you that can help us either add complexity to what it is that we're talking about, because I think Maria or Antonia said, you know, this is something that is coming to be, it is an unfinished project of developing the concept of praxical violence. So we look to you as kind of experts and colleagues around the world about what are those insights that you're pulling from that, that are helping you to connect into your own work or into the ways that you're thinking about your own practice?

Sam Keast 12:36
Looking at the notes that I scribbled after reading it and the questions I have underlined as a result of thinking about this idea that generates is: Who are we agents of? And who are we agents for ? Really becomes some of the central questions when we think about this idea of praxical violence, doesn't it?Which then I think, encompasses all the ways we talk about relationality in critical community psychology ways, but this is really, really thinking about the politics, the potential for violence within

those relationships very specifically. I also think for me, when we talk about Policy and Social Policy, there's sometimes an inclination to think about it, as very high level, but I would think about policy at all those, all those levels. At both a kind of up, macro level kind of governmental, but also down to much kind of more on the ground policies around it, might be around programs, or any way that a document or a series of documents seeks to govern people, I guess it's how I would broadly think. And that can be an incident in some of the work we've looked at, youth programs, can be in schools, all sorts of levels that these policies can do this, this kind of, I guess, this kind of work. So they were my initial, I guess, thoughts and questions that really raised for me around who we are, and what is our role as agents of something and what is it towards? To whom? Who are we agents for?

Natalie 12:42
Thanks, Sam. And I think that, you know, as that's kind of forming in my own head, it makes me think about, you know, when we look at, let's say community engaged scholarship or community based work, there's an inherent assumption that it's more just, towards something better than maybe traditional research. And this unveils some of the ways that, you know, even kind of the best intended community engaged work inherently can come with these harms, and this violence. So it's not only just you know who we are, but like, yeah, how you're saying how we position ourselves with community. Anyone else want to hop in on either what Sam has provided for us, or from your own insights that came up for you as you were reading.

Jony E. Yulianto 14:38
Hi, Natalie. I want to jump up. So yeah, so when I read this, I feel like the case from Chile is actually resonates strongly with me in Indonesia. And as an academic in Indonesia. We got like institutional policy to work with community as part of service as part of the three main responsibilities to be a lecturer or something like that. And even this is also strongly resonate to us as an academic in Indonesia, because recently government trying to introduce a new policy that even now students have to work with community, to conduct certain projects in the village or something like that, with a very measurable outcomes that they need to contribute to the community. And actually, this transcript from the Chile team, allow me to think more but that taken for granted assumptions from the higher education in Indonesia to situate us as the expert, and then all of the rural communities and rural people is actually as the objects of our service and how it's actually really connected to the issue of praxical violence itself. So that's actually made me think about how we can revise or think rethink about the way we practice our service. And, and not really not merely think about inter partnership institutions, but it's more about the relationality that we have with the community, and that they are human beings with dignity that we need to respect.

Natalie 16:17
Absolutely. Thanks for sharing that Jony. And it's interesting to see the connections across different, very different kind of global contexts where this resonates. Chris?

Chris 16:28
This is a reaction. And I think lots of things happened for me my mind went into all sort of, you know, all sorts of directions around some of this. And I think, I mean, I know that Marianne offered a definition. And I think one important thing that they also talk about is the institutional framework within which this

happens, because part of the praxical violence sort of idea and, and I think, especially the symbolic aspect of it. And I think that symbolic and the practice, the meaning system always goes hand in hand, I think. I'm a bit of a constructionist in that, in that sort of way. And I think Marianne is also. I was thinking about social hierarchies. And I think the the impossibility of getting away from them. And so that, so that we, because our societies are so hierarchic, that any form of relationship in any institution that we have, there's always going to be violence because we live in systems that are so, so horribly hierarchical. So what are these that we do as community psychologists? So what this definition could possibly offer is a way to heighten or have an even deeper awareness of what types of reflexivity that needs to be in our praxis. Right? So it's maybe giving, I think, maybe Scotney talks about, what does it mean to be a critical friend? And I think maybe it even talks a little bit or it gives another concept to the armor of critical reflexivity in a way, because it will get people to think about, well, what does this look like and feel like in the relationships that we aspire to be equal, when in fact, the system dictates them to be unequal all the time. The profession, the society, I think the social status and all of that, whether it's working with poor people, and so forth, so for me, there's always that with praxical violence, there always has to be that epistemic part that comes with it, because that, to some extent, lays the rest. And I think you've talked about the symbolic but I keep on pulling back to that, that other, that other thing. Also, there's always this work that happens in the background, but partly because of the nature of, and I think this is why I like this term coloniality it's because of the nature of how these systems have been set up and continue to be set up so, so coloniality or I guess, epistemic and I know that maybe sometimes we think about epistemic as belonging to research or knowledge production, but I don't think so, I think it's intimately tied to what you talked about the spectacle of violence because it provides the symbolic fuel I think, or the meanings to see what or how we unintentionally reproduce indignities in the way that we implement institutional practices. And, and also the challenges that we face bucking up against institutional practices because you get fired, for not wanting to do the institution's work but anyway, so I think there's there's both of the things have started to come up for me. There's also when I think about this, I think about this work we've been doing with one of our Indigenous students who's been doing work around institutional frameworks and how it performs administrative violence in terms of non recognition or mis recognition of Aboriginal or Indigenous frameworks for knowing, doing and being. And I kept on thinking about how do I take this, how do I take this concept into that work when I think about administrative violence as our western systems and our institution impose ways of knowing, identity, access to things on on Aboriginal people. So their frameworks are not considered. So I think about those sorts of things too, because the very systems that and I think, for me, the institutional framework that you've articulated is so important in thinking about the praxical violence. But so anyway, so I've been thinking about this concept also in relation to that sort of work about administrative violence, the way in which policies and procedures within systems do harm to people and in the context of Aboriginal people who are seeking self determination, sovereignty and so forth, in a system that isn't their system, and the tension that's generated in that very space when you've got systems that are competing with each other. So anyway, so that's where I've gone when, when I thought about these definitions, and some of the themes that you've provided.

Natalie 20:56
Chris, can I just take you back? I feel like you gave enough context that people who aren't familiar with the term epistemic violence might have been able to kind of parse that together. But for our listeners, or

our transcript readers, can you just give a brief definition of epistemic violence so that we can kind of see how you're situating those two things together?

Chris 21:15
Yeah, look, I think I mean, epistemic violence is a really interesting sort of or a really powerful sort of concept. Because I mean, the way that I think about it, often is the way in which we produce knowledge. So whose knowledge systems or whose understandings of race or gender or class and so forth, do we actually use to make sense of things. Or how we come to understand what it means to be human, or how we understand what it means to be non human. So epistemic epistemic violence is the way in which we impose categories, structures and so forth. And I think psychology is one of those disciplines that have been at the forefront of producing categories, imposing categories, without checking the ideologies that that drives them. So race is one of the one of those key things that psychology has participated in, and I think also class, gender. And so forth. So epistemic violence is the way in which particular forms of a particular categories that have become normalized, taken for granted are used in our discipline to produce knowledge about an object. So I always go back to race, because that's the area that I've probably read and studied in mostly is one of those sorts of areas where psychology has been one of the disciplines that continues to produce a normalized categories that actually does harm because of our fixed system, I don't think that explains it, Natalie.

Natalie 22:39
Thanks, Chris. And I appreciate that

Chris 22:41
Or muddies it even more.

Natalie 22:43
Oh, well, the more layers of this we have, I think the easier it is for us to figure out what it means for us. So before I move to how are we applying this? How are you seeing this reflected in your every day? Maybe I'll come to the Chile team. And just ask, you know, in terms of what you're hearing from your, your global peers, colleagues, is there anything coming up for you, or any questions or places you either want to clarify or kind of think through with people?

Rejane 23:09
Natalie, may I ? Just in terms of the South African context and our developing democracy. I think this concept is really important at multiple levels. And I think what it allows one to do is to think about your social intervention in terms of, as Chris and others have pointed out, what's happening institutionally, what's happening to people who are at the receiving end of oppression, and what's happening in terms of agents who are trying or change agents who are trying to intervene, but also those who are still complicit in oppression. So it allows you to unpack several layers of the ways in which social interventions can actually do harm. And I think in our contact with developing democracy, whathappened here in terms of social justice and transformation related programs, they tried this, they just automatically adopted a Northwestern theoretical model, which was completely inappropriate in our conflict, because in our context, the majority of people have experienced racial oppression, but in the North, we talking about marginal group that generally have been oppressed majorities. Whereas here,

7

we've had a majority that was oppressed by a minority. And so that silences the majority, but the models we used also did the same thing. So the models were used in terms of anti racism were directed at consciousness raising for the minorities so that they could change their attitudes and behaviors. And those spaces left very little room for the majority to speak about the experiences or to get some kind of support in terms of dealing with their experiences. It was all about the consciousness raising of the white minorities. And so it gave them power in those situations over a majority that had experienced the racial oppression. So that's just one way at the committee level that this concept sort of resonates. The other big issue around for us has been around the extent to which racial oppression here has been about a system that has been directed at collective. Yet, in our democracy, the ways in which people are having to deal with racial oppression is from an individual perspective, there are very few collective processes or collective ways in which people can respond. And so that also in and of itself feels like like a violence in our context.

Natalie 25:51
Yes, thanks for sharing that, Rejane. I'm glad your connections lasting to keep you here with us, because that was really helpful context. And I think across what everyone's sharing, we're hearing, you know, that I always come back to Michelle Fines' idea of the provocative generalizability because what Marianne and her team have kind of shared with us is touching into a multitude of contexts, but a multitude of levels in our communities. You know, Sam talked about Policy and Program or School and Rejane's talking about, you know, the rebuilding of a nation and the healing journey of rebuilding from a nation, you know, so maybe now I will kind of hand it back over to the three from Chile, if you have any thoughts or responses or what's coming up for you. And then we'll spend the rest of the time on kind of storytelling or applications of this in your in the work of the guests.

Marianne Daher 26:45
I think Christopher wants to say something.

Chris 26:48
No, I was just I was just thinking Marianne, because so much of that, what kind of generalizability is really important, because so much of what everyone has said the context is so important. And I think Chile's context you have to understand Chile's context, I think a little bit because of the class system, like you said, in our previous discussions, Marianne, on how that system is organized. And then of course, who who are the poor and who delivers the work to the poor and how that very system. And that very structure of society provides the dynamics of oppression, I guess, and how that then continues to play. That just becomes so clear with this definition. I think that's what the definition does. It, it sort of, for me, it always, because the definition focuses on some of those, I mean, some people talk of them as microaggressions, or micro interactions, because your definition shows what those sorts of things can look like. But to understand the power of that, you also have to understand that system that produces that in society. That's all that I wanted to add as everyone was talking.

Marianne Daher 28:00
Yeah, I was thinking about three things while you were talking. Well, first of all, thank you for sharing all these thoughts and reflection, it's really interesting to hear this and to see connections around the world. Even though we cannot generalize this concept, as you said, but the first thing is that I think

8

praxical violence as we develop it in our research is a very relational concept. And we like to use the metaphor of the Cascade, like waterfall, or chain in the sense that this is still in develop. But we have this intuition that the institutional framework is violent to the intervention agents and the intervention agents internalize this, and they are violent to the participants, and the participants internalize this, and they are violent towards the intervention agents and also to themselves. So as I said, we have to continue our study to you know, to find more evidence about this, but I think connecting with a system this hierarchical system, and the context where this phenomenon occurs, we can see this, you know, like this network, where violence spread through it, and in a very invisible way, people many times don't, they don't realize they are being violent, or they are reproducing, you know, like something that was given to them from another actor. So that in the first place. Then I was also thinking about what you said, Natalie, about how we can see these in our everyday practices. And I think we have data, we have results where violence is very, you know, like, very evident. You know, like, for example, when an intervention agent told us about a participant that did sexual harassment to her, or when a participant told us that an intervention agent talk bad about her life conditions, or when intervention agents told us about how the institutional framework was violent through the labor conditions, their working conditions, but also many times violence was very, as Christopher said, it was like it were microaggressions, you know, like very small things, but not for being small, they are not violent, they are violent anyway. So I was thinking about that, about the importance of not demonizing violence, because maybe we as a community practitioners do our best effort for not being violent when we do a community intervention, a social intervention. So probably we are not going to denigrate a participant or we're not, we're not going to do sexual harassment, but it is probable that we are going to do micro aggression without knowing we're doing. So for me, if we don't demonize violence, but rather, we think that this is something that is probable to happen, and that we have a sense of critical reflexivity about it in, in our teams, in our interventions teams, we talk about it, I think many of these microaggressions can be avoided, you know, but if we stay only with the evident and big aggressions, and we demonize violence, we will never talk about it, and we will reproduce it. So for me that is like something very critical, very important, and it's a way of being critical friends. And the third, the third thing I was thinking about was the issue of harm that in our study, we wanted to know, we wanted to know, which were the bonds between intervention agents and participants. And what we discover is that this is not like, you know, like white, and black. It's not like we have good bonds and bad bonds, it is a very gray area, there are many, many different types of bonds, you know, like we have technical bonds, affective bonds, partial bonds, and these bonds are, are functional to the intervention regarding the participants needs, and also regarding the intervention agent capacities. And what we see is that sometimes, you can have a strong and positive bond between intervention agent and participant. And even there, you can notice praxical violence, you know, like you can have an intervention that is successful, and where you can have positive effects, or you can have the objectives you can fulfill, thank you, fulfill the objectives of the intervention that even though this is a successful intervention, there is also praxical, we noticed there were also praxical violence issues around that intervention. So because you can, you can be very assistentialist and paternalist and fulfill all the objectives, you know. So I think the issue of harm, it is important, but sometimes you are not harming anyone, maybe you are doing a very good job with the community. But even there, you can exercise praxical violence with these microaggressions.

Natalie 33:36
Thanks, Marianne. Maria, you want to hop in there?

9

Maria Jose 33:38
Yeah, I just wanted to build on that a bit more, because I think Marianne and Antonia have worked more in this line, which is like, there's such broad and vague concepts that you are taught when you study community psychology, like for example, reflexivity, which is like a principle that you are taught to apply. But I think, because I was thinking about what Christopher say, of social hierarchies, and how can you think about non violent situations that are built on that, you know, and how sad that is, and then. Which is, which is true, when you're critical, it's hard not to come down to that super depressive situation where you say, everything is so messed up, that where do we start? Then I started thinking about the concept of reflexivity. And how I think in that particular specific exercise, praxical violence, give us light on where to look at specifically, you know. So if I'm a student and I'm coming out of community psychology, and someone tells me you need to practice critical reflexivity, that is like a whole ocean challenge, you know. But then if someone tells me, one way of looking at this is taking note of this little things that we have identified a name on, which makes a cognitive process easier, is just a clue to avoid easier, more easily the things. So I do think in a broader exercise of trying to articulate why and specified some parts of what do we mean have been critically reflexive, maybe that's the part where praxical violence also help us go through this thing, you know, because it's such a broad concept that is just established as a principle for community psychology but not really like disentangled into specific little things. And I think praxical violence can give clues around this.

Natalie 35:21
Yeah. Rejane, did you want to share your thoughts so that our listeners can hear it? I see you pop some thoughts in the comments there?

Rejane 35:29
Oh, I was just thinking about the fact that as community psychologists, we often position ourselves as the good agents, the do gooders, and we often think that we're doing good on behalf of and for other people. And I think the concept of praxical violence, as Maria Jose was saying right now, forces us to acknowledge how we can be complicit, how we can collude but also how we can just overlook because we attach so much importance and value to what we do and what we bring, the effect of, of what we do in communities. And I think that I've definitely seen that happen in practice, in work situations, in training situation, where we treat participants like victims, and that we act like saviors. I think that's a very crude way of putting it. But I think there is a deep shadow side that we've got to remain aware of.

Sam Keast 36:37
Another really important aspect that I've read from this idea of praxical violence is that we are able to read these manifestations of harm on agents as well as a product of this context that they're being required to work in. And that it necessitates this kind of managing or coping or justifying or covering up of things. And then often what will then do is sort of, I think, like, others have mentioned lurched to a kind of individualized, it's an individualized problem, we need more skills, or we need more capacity building, more coping strategies for agents. But to say that if we look at these as kind of manifestations of a kind of interlocking system of violence that happens to and on agents as well. And I agree, I agree with what everyone is saying around as being having a propensity to be kind of, you know, the saviors of, but we're also in this imperfect system of violence as well. And maybe reading those harms in a

10

critically reflexive way that these are manifestations of trying to cope in this sometimes horribly violent system. And certainly, from my perspective, working in an institution, educational institution, that happens all the time and educators are required just to kind of, I don't know how we would say, suck it up, you know. It's not for you to concern yourself with, you know, this educational or epistemic violence that you are required to do as a part of your job on students just go disregarded in all sorts of ways because it's, it's not seen as irrelevant or part of the job.

Natalie 38:07
Chris, do you want to hop in?

Chris 38:09
Now. Look, I think I just wanted to answer that point, that I guess the point that everyone like, I think the standpoint or the I mean, when we were arriving around the decolonizing standpoint, I think we were trying to say that community psychology has to look at itself also, quite critically, because you can, we can assume that or even when Rappoport wrote about empowerment as a stand. You can't assume that just because you say it. Just because you say it, that it means that you're good doing good, right. So I think this is why I think about praxical violence. And when I think about it as, as maybe Maria I might be misquoting you, but maybe as a principle for practices. These are really, really great, really great tools for thinking about what does it look like in research, in other forms of practice, not just research, but research as practice, right, or practice as a form of practice, not research, just going to conduct an experiment, the very act of doing research, and the very act of having a research identity and the tools and technologies that you take into spaces is also part of bringing different systems yeah? That we assume that our, maybe sometimes we assume that ours is better. I think psychology often assumes that it's got a better way of doing things. So there's always this, there's always the violence, and maybe it is like Rejane and I think, Marianne, I think everyone said that we also have to make sure that we're always attending to, we're never going to be pure. I think this is the myth that we can be pure because we say we're objective and. But community psychology, there's some really neat things in community psychology around the problems that we have about minimizing context and I think community psychology wants to maximize, maximize context. So context has to be in there, power has to be in there. Praxical violence is a way, I think of shining a light on the dynamics of power, but not always power as negative but power as productive also and power as where can be take, where can we shift things to. The fact that institutions are essential, which Martín-Baró says: Look, this is part of the problem, everything that we do is essentialism, that essentialism is in a dependency modality. So, if you want to do critical or other forms of psychologies, then the aspiration is always to say, well, how are we going to move away from dependency modalities? Right? And so where does praxical violence as a generative idea that tries to push us beyond and away from essentialism as the point of departure or as the, as the water, that's the habitat, the thing that we're working for. Anyway, so it makes you think of like, lots of possibilities, I think for how this fits with, and pushes, I think, not just community social psychology in Latin America, but I think the sort of the dominant versions of it also, because I think, as we know, SCRA imploded when we looked at praxical violence, you know, in calling out anti black racism, and all sorts of things, you know. Those are forms of violence to in, you know, sort of an organizational structure that said, Well, we've got good values therefore we are good. But when you look at the practices, and all of those sorts of things, you know. So it is important to look at both the

11

dark side, and also the way you want to get where you want to get to, and I think there's something in this concept that potentially invites us to do more of that.

Natalie 41:43
Thanks, Chris. Antonia?

Antonia 41:45
Yes. Well, I was thinking about something that Chris said before about the relevance of institutions in praxical violence. Because well, the study we did was about the bond between intervention agent and participant and not about the institution itself. But it appears like a very big topic, the institutional violence, that is in praxical violence. So we, I remember when we see that, and we said that like, oh, it's strange that we are studying the bond, like a very micro level type of analysis. And we saw like a big institution there. So we have to include it. And I think it was a good decision. But also I have a reflection about how community psychologists sometimes have like a tense relation with institutions, like we sometimes I think it's the risk to demonize the institutions and forget that the institutions are there for the well being of the people and sometimes is looked like institution is against the well being of the people. So I think it's very important to the community psychologists to remember that institutions are made, by people, and that we can change the institutions too. And I think there is a very challenge to community psychologists in how to dialogue with institutions, and how to introduce some change in this field. And I think the work more directly with users and participants is very, very relevant. But I think also we have a role in the public policy, like in design, like in evaluation of programs, and then to do something in this area to change finally institutions, because they're very relevant, I think, in praxical violence, and also in overcoming praxical violence. I think they have a very important role too. And we can move out of this because we can make some contributions there.

Natalie 43:33
I feel like I should have known coming into this conversation that we could have like a five hour discussion about this, right. Like, it's clear, we could make our entire series about praxical violence. And so I'm just so grateful that the Chilean team has kind of offered this up for such kind of depth of discussion. But before we sign off, I would still love to see if there are a couple of kinds of applications, every day applications of what this looks like for some of our panelists, have you seen praxical violence being useful for you and we've heard I think people have shared some examples, Chris talked about what this means for kind of bringing this into a framework working with Aboriginal network that you're working with in Australia, Rejane talked about this in terms of thinking about kind of the building the nation building project, but in your own work, you think of an example or a time where this played out and how you responded as a you know, quote on quote, professional, expert, community psychologist, intervention agent, however you want to frame that. So I'm looking to our guests on this, if you have things to share, they'll be helpful for listeners to just ground us in your experiences.

Sam Keast 44:40
I can share a practical experience around an evaluation that is a part of a doctoral industry placement, which could easily be reduced down to methodological decisions, but were not. So from the, I guess the outset of when we were engaging in this evaluation of a pilot program we had, with Chris and I, we wanted to ask some pretty, I guess some critical questions about the assumptions that had been made

12

about the young people in the program, prior to the program even having been developed. These young people from the African Australian diaspora as a way of, I guess, thinking about what are the kinds of questions, what are the ways we want to think about doing this thing called an evaluation? What are the you know, how are we going to construct this in ways that are representing a community in ways that perhaps do less harm, are less violent. And so we engaged in quite an ongoing conversation, we did use some of Scotney Evans's idea around critical friendship about this partnership, actually having a whole lot of kind of learning experiences for us and for the community partner in how we might rethink about measuring, and I'm using air quotes, young people in all sorts of ways, and all sorts of ways that that then leads to, I guess, that people would understand using objective measures, because it's a requirement of funders, we need to do all these kinds of harms. Because we need to show impact, and all these kinds of things. And we were really resistant to and tried to develop ways around creative methodologies, you might think of them as to say this, this is not only wrong, but harmful to present these communities and peoples in these kind of, I guess, reductivist kinds of ways that you would traditionally see through mainstream psychology kinds of ways of thinking about impacts of evaluations. So that was a, I guess, an interesting, so there was a lot of conversations, a lot of tooing and froing, between what they needed, what we were willing to do. We were modestly successful, I think I'll leave it at that. It's ongoing. But yeah, it was a really interesting experience of how, at a methodological level, that kind of idea of praxical violence can be manifested, and also the ways in which it's not regarded in terms of certainly community organizations that, they're not thinking about methodologies in those in those harmful ways, they want to, they want to get funding.

Natalie 47:08
Thanks Sam, for grounding some of that for us in your work. Can we maybe get one more example of Rejane or Jony, want to jump back in with an example in your context?

Rejane 47:21
I'm biting at the bit, because I think there are so many ways in which this exposes us as practitioners, definitely in the South African context. But I mean, and I don't want to be flippant about this, but for me, a big bugbear has always been if we look at research that we're doing, and I'm going to talk about the South African context. I don't think that the communities that we work with will even be able to access or read or understand anything that we're writing in Community Psychology at the moment. So the very people that we are writing about, won't be able to access that. And, and that for me is I mean, I think it's unforgivable, because even the practitioners that we work with don't understand what we're writing about and can't access and read what we write about. Nevermind the participants in our research. So that just is a very, very big thing for me at the moment. So that's, that's the one thing. And then the other thing is the extent to which we do emotional work in social interventions, we do it ourselves, but we require participants in the programs also to do emotional work, and how they are then left after the interventions, when they go back into their homes are they left just to cope with that on their own. I mean, there isn't enough structural support in place very often, around the work that we're doing in communities, there isn't enough resources. There aren't enough resources. But we proceed with the work because we believe the work has to be done. But the ripple effects of that work, we don't pay close enough attention to that. And then the other thing that I want to raise is the thing that Chris was talking about, you know, the black on black violence, for example, that we will see as part of, of racism, and anti racism work, the concept of internalized oppression, and we can debate whether it's

13

appropriate to use the term or not, but there are ways in which we have been seriously damaged by racial oppression and how we then damage those around us because of our experiences of that, that we don't easily talk about and help people to deal with. So we want to deal with the oppressor and the impact of the oppressor, but those who have internalized oppression and are acting out in relation to each other that we very often will just sidestep. And so it becomes a system of oppression within a system of oppression. That is really worrying, especially in our context where we have a high levels of violence against women and children who have been racially oppressed. I could go on but I won't.

Natalie 47:44
Thank you for, for sharing that with us Rejane. And I think that every every time we're sharing here, we're really kind of pulling back the many layers that we can keep, keep thinking about. Jony, I want to give you some space here, if you had any last words for us.

Jony E. Yulianto 50:41
Yeah, I would like to thank Chile team, again for raising this discussion, because, like within the context of Indonesia, often like community work are done. Some of our fellow clinical psychologists also doing like macro level community work, also something like that. But sometimes there is an issue with the engagement and also like, I like when the Chili team raise in the transcript that we can't simply impose our knowledge and dismiss or disregard the local knowledge wells. My own experiences in working with Javanese and Chinese Indonesian communities in the rural area in East Java, informed me how this local knowledge is actually very influential in shaping these communities and how our immersion to this community actually foundational in shaping our work with this community. And that's how actually, this relational ethics that inform our epistemology or research practice and not the other way around, and this actually, this discussion actually reminds me again, to the centrality of thinking of our relationality with the community with whom we worked together. So thank you again for this discussion.

Natalie 52:11
Thanks, Jony. And yeah, I will reiterate, thank you, Marianne, and Antonia and Maria for creating and sharing this with us, and giving us some some real fodder to discuss. I think that some really beautiful pieces came out of tonight, this morning, today, wherever in the world we are. And I think a piece is really going to stick with me is this idea of like the ubiquity of it, that it is there. And it is in the reflexivity and the repair of the violence that we really need to continue to think about and not be afraid as practitioners that if we mess up or if we do something we should be demonized, but that we need to be constantly and iteratively aware of, and talking about and kind of navigate co-navigating these processes with the people we work with, so that we do feel like we're creating those safer places to connect and really build that relationality that Jony has talked about. So thank you for joining. And thank you for all that you provided today and for being here. And I look forward to all of the future conversations that will come.

14