Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2350-0530
ISSN (Print): 2394-3629

International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH
June 2025 13(6), 132–143

PLANTS, POSTCOLONIALISM, AND GLOBALIZATION: ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS OF BOTANICAL EXCHANGE IN CONTEMPORARY MARKETS

Dr. Sheetal Rakesh Bhai Mali [1], Dr. Mamta Bhakkad [2]

[1] Temporary Assistant Professor, Department of Rural Studies, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat, Gujrat, India
[2] Temporary Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat, Gujrat, India

Received 13 April 2025
Accepted 15 May 2025
Published 10 July 2025

Corresponding Author

Dr. Sheetal Rakesh Bhai Mali,
malisheetal8667@gmail.com

DOI
10.29121/granthaalayah.v13.i6.2025.6234

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

This research examines the complex intersections between plant commodification, postcolonial economic structures, and contemporary globalisation processes. Through critical analysis of botanical exploitation patterns from colonial periods to present-day trading networks, this study demonstrates how plants continue to function as significant economic and cultural capital across global markets. Using a political ecology framework, the research analyses three illustrative case studies—coffee, rubber, and quinoa—to reveal how historical extraction patterns persist in modified forms while simultaneously creating spaces for resistance and economic reclamation. The study contributes to emerging scholarship by documenting how botanical economies both perpetuate historical inequities and generate opportunities for indigenous communities to assert economic sovereignty over plant resources. This work furthers understanding of plant-human relationships within global economic systems while highlighting pathways toward more equitable botanical exchange.

Keywords: Botanical Economics, Postcolonial Studies, Globalization, Biopiracy, Indigenous Knowledge, Commodity Chains, Political Ecology

1. INTRODUCTION

The global movement of plants has fundamentally shaped economic systems, power structures, and cultural landscapes throughout human history. From colonial botanical gardens that facilitated imperial resource extraction to contemporary bioprospecting ventures by pharmaceutical corporations, plants have consistently functioned as contested sites of economic and cultural value Schiebinger (2004), Brockway (2002). This research investigates how historical patterns of botanical

exchange continue to influence modern global economic relationships while simultaneously creating opportunities for resistance and reclamation.

The relationship between plants, postcolonialism, and globalization represents a critical nexus for understanding contemporary economic power structures. As Crosby (2004) established in his analysis of ecological imperialism, the movement of plants across colonial boundaries served as a foundation for empire-building and economic domination. These historical botanical exchanges continue to shape global economic hierarchies through commodity chains, intellectual property disputes, and biocultural heritage debates Kloppenburg (2004), Sheridan (2016).

This research addresses several interconnected questions: How do contemporary global economic relationships around plants perpetuate or challenge postcolonial power structures? In what ways do current botanical economies both extend colonial extraction models and create possibilities for economic justice? What strategies are emerging to reconfigure unequal botanical exchange relationships in the twenty-first century? By examining these questions, this paper contributes to emerging scholarship at the intersection of political ecology, postcolonial studies, and economic botany.

2. METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1) Methodological Approach

This study employs a mixed-methods approach combining historical analysis, contemporary case studies, and political economic theory. Primary data includes economic statistics from international trade databases (UN COMTRADE, FAOSTAT), industry reports, and policy documents from 2015-2023. Secondary data encompasses academic literature across multiple disciplines, focusing particularly on works that bridge economic botany, political ecology, and postcolonial studies. The research uses qualitative content analysis to identify thematic patterns within botanical economies and applies comparative analysis across different geographical and temporal contexts.

2) Postcolonial Theory and Political Ecology

This research integrates postcolonial theory with political ecology to examine botanical exchange relationships. Postcolonial theory provides analytical tools for understanding how colonial relationships around plants persist in modified forms within globalized economic systems. While acknowledging foundational concepts from Spivak (1999) regarding epistemic violence and Bhabha (1994) on hybridity, this research also incorporates perspectives from scholars of the Global South who have theorized botanical economies from non-Western perspectives. For example, Escobar (2018) concept of "pluriversal worlds" helps explain how indigenous communities maintain alternative botanical economic systems that exist alongside dominant capitalist frameworks.

Political ecology provides methodological tools for analyzing how power relations shape environmental resource use across scales Robbins (2012). The work of Peet and Watts (2004) on liberation ecology informs this study's approach to understanding resistance strategies within botanical economies. This research employs what Tsing (2015) terms "friction" – the productive tensions between global economic forces and local realities – to understand how botanical commodities move through uneven economic landscapes. As plants and their derivatives traverse global supply chains, they accumulate different values and meanings that reflect ongoing postcolonial negotiations.

3) Economic Botany in Global Markets

Economic botany provides the disciplinary foundation for analysing plant commodification processes. Building on Brockway (2002) analysis of botanical gardens as imperial infrastructure, this paper conceptualises plants as both material and symbolic economic resources. The contemporary global marketplace transforms plants into various forms of capital, not only financial but also cultural, intellectual, and social Bourdieu (1986), Sheridan (2016).

This theoretical approach situates botanical economies within broader systems of accumulation and dispossession Harvey (2003), Li (2014). The concept of "green grabbing" Fairhead et al. (2012) – the appropriation of land and resources for environmental ends – offers particular relevance for understanding how sustainability and conservation discourses sometimes mask new forms of botanical extraction.

3. HISTORICAL CONTEXT: COLONIAL BOTANICAL ECONOMIES

1) Botanical Imperialism and Knowledge Networks

The systematic exploitation of plant resources formed a central pillar of colonial economic structures. European powers established botanical gardens and research stations that functioned as crucial nodes in networks of economic intelligence gathering Brockway (2002), Schiebinger (2004). Kew Gardens in Britain and similar institutions across Europe served as collection points where economically valuable plants from colonies were catalogued, studied, and strategically redistributed to optimise imperial profit Schiebinger and Swan (2005).

The global transfer of economically valuable plants—including rubber from Brazil, cinchona (the source of quinine) from Peru, and tea from China—exemplifies how colonial powers deliberately circumvented local control over botanical resources. This appropriation represents what contemporary scholars term biopiracy—the unauthorised extraction of botanical materials and indigenous knowledge Shiva (2016), Robinson, 2015). The economic consequences of these botanical transfers were profound, often devastating local economies while enriching colonial centres Mukherjee (2010), Rangarajan (2018).

2) Plantation Economies and Botanical Monocultures

Colonial powers transformed diverse ecological landscapes into plantation monocultures optimized for export crops, creating economic dependencies that persist in modified forms today. Sugar plantations in the Caribbean, rubber in Malaysia (transferred from Brazil), and tea in India illustrate how botanical resources were systematically exploited through enslaved and indentured labor Mintz, (1985), Besky (2014).

These plantation systems established economic patterns characterized by:

- Export-oriented production prioritizing metropole markets
- External control of botanical resources through property regimes
- Suppression of local food sovereignty and agriculture
- Exploitation of racialized labor
- Ecological simplification and increased vulnerability

As Beckford (2000) and Thompson (2019) argue, these historical patterns provide essential context for understanding contemporary botanical economies, demonstrating how current global plant commodification often follows channels carved by colonial extraction while adapting to new market conditions.

4. CASE STUDIES: CONTEMPORARY BOTANICAL ECONOMIES

1) Coffee: Global Commodity Chains and Value Distribution

Coffee exemplifies how colonial botanical appropriation evolved into contemporary global value chains that perpetuate economic inequities. Originally from Ethiopia, coffee became a plantation crop in European colonies and later developed into one of the world's most valuable agricultural commodities. Today's coffee economy demonstrates what Daviron and Ponte (2015) identify as "buyer-driven" commodity chains, where value accrues disproportionately to actors in consumer countries rather than producer regions.

Economic analysis reveals stark disparities: while the global coffee market exceeded $192 billion in 2022, coffee-producing countries collectively received approximately $28 billion, with individual farmers capturing only 5-9% of the final retail value International Coffee Organization (2023), Samper et al. (2017). This economic structure, characterised by Talbot (2016) as the "coffee paradox," demonstrates how botanical commodification continues to extract value from formerly colonised regions.

Alternative trade initiatives like fair trade and direct trade models represent resistance strategies that attempt to reconfigure these economic relationships. Research by Raynolds and Bennett (2020) shows that fair trade-certified coffee producers receive 10-40% higher prices compared to conventional markets. However, these initiatives remain limited in scale, accounting for less than 15% of global trade. These alternative models, despite limitations, illustrate how producers leverage consumer ethics to challenge postcolonial economic structures (Lyon, 2015, Fischer and Victor (2023).

2) Rubber: Strategic Resources and Economic Vulnerability

The economic history of rubber demonstrates how botanical appropriation fundamentally reshaped global economic geographies. When Henry Wickham transported rubber seeds from Brazil to Kew Gardens in 1876, he initiated a botanical transfer that would devastate the Amazonian rubber economy while creating new centres of production in British colonial territories Dean (1987), Dove (2021).

Contemporary rubber economics continue to reflect postcolonial power structures. Southeast Asian countries (particularly Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia) now dominate production, but remain vulnerable to price volatility and market control exerted by multinational corporations and consuming countries. According to the International Rubber Study Group (2022), producer countries capture approximately 17% of the value in finished rubber products, while manufacturing and retail sectors—predominantly located in former colonial powers and newly industrialised economies—capture the remaining 83%.

This pattern reinforces what dependency theorists identify as persistent core-periphery economic relationships Kay (2019). Recent studies by Besky and Blanchette (2021) document how rubber tappers across Southeast Asia experience economic precarity despite the strategic importance of their labour, highlighting how botanical commodification continues to produce uneven development.

3) Quinoa: Globalization and the Commodification of Indigenous Foods

Quinoa's transformation from a local Andean staple to a global superfood illustrates the complex economic dynamics of plant commodification in the

globalisation era. As international demand surged in the early 2000s, quinoa prices increased dramatically, rising over 600% between 2000 and 2014 before declining after 2015 as production expanded globally FAOSTAT (2023).

Economic data reveals contradictory outcomes: Bolivian quinoa exports increased from $2 million in 2003 to $153 million in 2022, significantly increasing producer incomes during the boom period IBCE (2023). However, this market integration simultaneously threatened food sovereignty as local consumption patterns shifted while prices fluctuated Jacobsen (2015), Winkel et al. (2022).

Quinoa demonstrates how globalisation creates what Tsing (2015) calls "zones of awkward engagement"—spaces where global market forces interact unpredictably with local economic systems. Recent research by Walsh-Dilley (2020) documents how Andean farmers developed collective strategies to maintain control over quinoa production while engaging with global markets, illustrating both the economic vulnerabilities and adaptive capacities of indigenous communities within global botanical economies.

5. BIOPROSPECTING AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: NEW FRONTIERS OF BOTANICAL APPROPRIATION

1) Biopiracy and the Economics of Traditional Knowledge

Modern bioprospecting initiatives have transformed how botanical resources are economically exploited, as pharmaceutical companies, agricultural corporations, and biotech enterprises systematically search for valuable chemical compounds and genetic materials in regions known for their biological diversity. These commercial ventures frequently focus on plant species that have long histories of medicinal or agricultural applications within indigenous societies, generating complex disputes regarding resource ownership, fair compensation, and the protection of intellectual property.

The commercial value derived from traditional plant-based knowledge systems is substantial. Research indicates that traditional plant medicines serve as the foundation for roughly one-quarter to one-half of all contemporary pharmaceutical products, supporting an industry worth billions of dollars globally. However, the indigenous and local communities responsible for developing, testing, and maintaining this botanical knowledge across generations rarely receive proportional financial returns from the resulting commercial products.

Notable disputes have emerged around several high-profile cases, including legal battles over patent applications for compounds derived from the neem tree, turmeric, and ayahuasca plants. These controversies demonstrate how existing intellectual property frameworks can enable the commercial exploitation of traditional botanical wisdom through established global trade mechanisms. Such appropriation persists even though international frameworks like the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol specifically aim to safeguard traditional knowledge systems and mandate fair distribution of benefits arising from their commercial use.

2) Resistance Strategies and Alternative Economic Models

Indigenous communities and supportive organisations have developed multiple strategies to challenge biocolonial economic structures. The revocation of the turmeric patent granted to the University of Mississippi Medical Centre represents a significant success in contesting inappropriate appropriation of traditional knowledge Agrawal (2002). More recent examples include the Ethiopian

government's successful trademarking of speciality coffee varieties, securing licensing revenues from international distributors Oguamanam (2018).

Alternative economic models documented in recent research include:

- Benefit-sharing agreements that ensure communities receive a portion of profits from commercialised traditional knowledge Wynberg et al. (2021)
- Community-controlled enterprises that market botanical products while maintaining local ownership Coomes et al. (2021)
- Defensive publication strategies that prevent corporate patenting of traditional knowledge Jefferson (2020)
- Geographical indications that protect regional botanical products Marie-Vivien and Biénabe (2017)

These approaches demonstrate the emergence of what Gibson-Graham (2008) terms "diverse economies"—alternative economic practices that challenge dominant capitalist structures. Recent work by Inoue and Moreira (2023) documents how Brazilian Amazon communities have developed community protocols governing access to botanical resources, asserting economic sovereignty while engaging with global markets on more equitable terms.

6. GLOBAL AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

1) Seed Sovereignty and Corporate Control

The transformation of seeds into commercial commodities exemplifies how colonial-era resource extraction has evolved into contemporary economic structures. The worldwide seed industry generated revenues of $63 billion in 2022, with market dominance concentrated among four multinational corporations controlling roughly 60% of global sales ETC Group (2022). This level of corporate concentration creates what Kloppenburg (2004) describes as a modern form of enclosure, where plant genetic materials previously considered shared resources become privatized assets within commercial frameworks.

Such market consolidation generates significant economic pressures for agricultural producers globally, with particularly severe impacts in post-colonial nations. Studies by Howard (2023) and Montenegro de Wit (2021) demonstrate that corporate seed systems have systematically displaced traditional seed preservation and exchange networks throughout developing regions, establishing new forms of economic dependence that echo historical colonial relationships. Agricultural producers have experienced seed price inflation averaging 140% since 2000 across many areas, while farm revenues have failed to match this rate of increase according to FAO (2023) data.

Concurrently, emerging legislation governing seed use and international commercial agreements have progressively limited farmers' customary practices of seed preservation, sharing, and local sales—activities that have underpinned agricultural societies for thousands of years. Borowiak (2019) examines how these regulatory restrictions operate within broader patterns of structural inequality in global food systems, with their most severe consequences falling upon small-scale agricultural producers in formerly colonized territories.

2) Food Sovereignty Movements as Economic Resistance

Modern bioprospecting initiatives have transformed how botanical resources are economically exploited, as pharmaceutical companies, agricultural corporations, and biotech enterprises systematically search for valuable chemical compounds and genetic materials in regions known for their biological diversity. These commercial ventures frequently focus on plant species that have long histories of medicinal or agricultural applications within indigenous societies, generating complex disputes regarding resource ownership, fair compensation, and the protection of intellectual property.

The commercial value derived from traditional plant-based knowledge systems is substantial. Analyses by Oldham et al. (2013) and Mgbeoji (2021) indicate that traditional plant medicines serve as the foundation for roughly one-quarter to one-half of all contemporary pharmaceutical products, supporting an industry worth billions of dollars globally. However, the indigenous and local communities responsible for developing, testing, and maintaining this botanical knowledge across generations rarely receive proportional financial returns from the resulting commercial products.

Notable disputes have emerged around several high-profile cases, including legal battles over patent applications for compounds derived from the neem tree, turmeric, and ayahuasca plants. As Robinson (2015) discusses, these controversies demonstrate how existing intellectual property frameworks can enable the commercial exploitation of traditional botanical wisdom through established global trade mechanisms. Such appropriation persists even though international frameworks like the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol specifically aim to safeguard traditional knowledge systems and mandate fair distribution of benefits arising from their commercial use Coolsaet (2020).

7. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON MARKETS, AND GREEN NEOCOLONIALISM

1) Botanical Resources in Carbon Economies

Climate change mitigation strategies have created new forms of botanical commodification through carbon offset markets, REDD+ programs (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), and similar initiatives. These emerging economic systems assign monetary value to plants' carbon sequestration capabilities, creating what Fairhead et al. (2012) term "new enclosures"—the appropriation of land and botanical resources justified by environmental objectives.

Economic analysis reveals complex power dynamics within carbon markets. The global carbon offset market reached approximately $1.2 trillion in 2022 World Bank (2023), with forest-based projects accounting for approximately 25% of voluntary carbon transactions. Research by Asiyanbi and Lund (2020) documents how these markets increasingly concentrate land control in corporate and state entities while often displacing indigenous communities from traditional territories. This process represents what Bachram (2004) identifies as "carbon colonialism"—the appropriation of Southern ecological resources to offset Northern emissions while reproducing colonial power dynamics.

Research from Uganda, Indonesia, and Brazil demonstrates how carbon offset projects often replicate colonial economic structures by:

- Transferring control of botanical resources from local communities to external entities

- Prioritizing international market demands over local economic needs
- Creating dependencies on foreign technical expertise and financing
- Restricting traditional economic activities in favor of carbon sequestration

The COVID-19 pandemic further exposed vulnerabilities in these systems, as carbon prices fluctuated dramatically while project implementation halted in many regions Meyerhardt and Turner (2022).

2) Alternative Green Economies and Indigenous Stewardship

Despite these troubling patterns, climate mitigation initiatives also create opportunities for indigenous communities to assert economic sovereignty over botanical resources. Community-managed forests, indigenous conservation areas, and locally controlled carbon projects represent what Doolittle (2021) terms "vernacular environmental governance"—alternative economic arrangements that challenge neocolonial appropriation of botanical resources.

The Aboriginal Carbon Foundation in Australia and similar programs in Brazil, Mexico, and Canada demonstrate how communities leverage carbon markets while maintaining territorial control and economic sovereignty. These initiatives represent what Bargh (2018) identifies as "resistance economics"—the strategic engagement with market systems to advance indigenous economic objectives while challenging underlying colonial structures.

Recent research by Schroeder and González (2023) documents how indigenous communities in the Amazon basin have successfully established carbon projects that maintain local control while generating revenue for community development. These projects explicitly integrate traditional ecological knowledge into forest management, challenging the separation of economic and cultural values that characterizes colonial approaches to botanical resources Duchelle et al. (2022).

8. DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW BOTANICAL ECONOMIES

1) Blockchain, Traceability, and Value Distribution

Emerging digital technologies are reconfiguring botanical economies in ways that both reinforce and challenge postcolonial power structures. Blockchain technologies, in particular, are being deployed to create transparent supply chains for botanical commodities, including coffee, cacao, and medicinal plants. These systems promise greater traceability and potentially more equitable value distribution Miatton and D'haese (2021).

Research by Gardner et al. (2021) examining blockchain implementation in Colombian coffee supply chains finds mixed results: while participating farmers received price premiums averaging 15% above conventional markets, the technological infrastructure created new dependencies on external expertise. This exemplifies what Mann and Iazzolino (2019) identify as "digital colonialism"—the extension of unequal power relationships into technological domains.

Simultaneously, e-commerce platforms have created new market opportunities for botanical products, potentially allowing producer communities to bypass traditional intermediaries. Studies by Tura et al. (2021) document how smallholder farmers in Kenya and Ethiopia have utilised digital platforms to market speciality botanical products directly to consumers, capturing greater value. However, these

opportunities remain unevenly distributed, with digital divides reflecting and reinforcing historical inequities Graham (2022).

2) Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Digital Commons

Indigenous communities are increasingly asserting sovereignty over botanical knowledge in digital domains. The concept of "indigenous data sovereignty" articulated by Kukutai and Taylor (2020) provides a framework for understanding these efforts. Digital databases like Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) in India and Local Contexts labels developed by Aboriginal communities in Australia represent strategies for protecting botanical knowledge while selectively engaging with global markets Hirsch (2023).

Open-source initiatives like the Open Source Seed Initiative (OSSI) and digital commons platforms create alternative spaces for botanical exchange outside proprietary systems. Research by Kloppenburg and Solstice (2021) documents how these initiatives challenge corporate control of plant genetic resources while creating opportunities for collaborative innovation. These digital commons represent what Bollier and Helfrich (2019) term "commoning"—the collective management of resources outside market and state systems.

Recent work by Chan et al. (2023) analyses how indigenous communities utilise digital technologies to document botanical knowledge while maintaining control over access and use. These initiatives represent emerging forms of economic agency within botanical economies, demonstrating how communities strategically engage with technological systems while asserting sovereignty over cultural and biological resources.

9. CONCLUSION

This analysis demonstrates how global botanical economies continue to reflect postcolonial power structures while simultaneously creating spaces for resistance and reclamation. The historical patterns of botanical extraction established during colonial periods persist in modified forms through contemporary economic mechanisms, including intellectual property regimes, agricultural input markets, carbon economies, and digital platforms. The research reveals several key findings:

1) Colonial botanical extraction patterns continue to structure global commodity chains, with value predominantly flowing from producer regions (often former colonies) to consumer countries (often former colonial powers), as demonstrated through analyses of coffee, rubber, and quinoa economies.
2) New mechanisms of botanical appropriation, particularly bioprospecting and intellectual property regimes, extend colonial extraction logics into genetic and knowledge dimensions, though indigenous communities increasingly contest these appropriations through legal challenges and alternative governance systems.
3) Corporate concentration in seed and agricultural input markets reproduces economic dependencies that echo colonial plantation systems, while food sovereignty movements create alternative spaces for botanical exchange and agricultural autonomy.
4) Climate change initiatives create both risks of new botanical enclosures through carbon markets and opportunities for indigenous economic sovereignty through community-managed conservation initiatives.

5) Digital technologies introduce new dynamics within botanical economies, potentially reinforcing existing inequities while also creating opportunities for producer communities to assert greater control over botanical resources and associated knowledge.
6) Multiple resistance strategies challenge postcolonial botanical economies, creating alternative economic arrangements that prioritize local control and equitable value distribution while engaging strategically with global markets.

This research contributes to understanding how botanical resources function within contemporary global economics while illuminating pathways toward more equitable systems. Future research should investigate emerging legal frameworks for protecting traditional botanical knowledge, quantify the economic impacts of alternative trading systems, and analyse how digital technologies might either reinforce or challenge postcolonial botanical economies. Particular attention should be paid to the intersections of climate change, biodiversity conservation, and botanical economies as these will shape plant-human economic relationships in the coming decades.

As plants continue to move through global economic systems, they remain both products of historical colonial relationships and active agents in ongoing decolonial struggles. Understanding these complex dynamics is essential for creating more just and sustainable botanical economies in an increasingly interconnected world.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, A. (2002). Indigenous Knowledge and the Politics of Classification. International Social Science Journal, 54(173), 287–297. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2451.00382

Asiyanbi, A. P., & Lund, J. F. (2020). Policy Persistence: REDD+ Between Stabilization and Contestation. Journal of Political Ecology, 27(1), 378–400. https://doi.org/10.2458/v27i1.23493

Bachram, H. (2004). Climate Fraud and Carbon Colonialism: The New Trade in Greenhouse Gases. Capitalism Nature Socialism, 15(4), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045575042000287299

Bargh, M. (2018). Indigenous Peoples' Energy Projects: Mapping a New Terrain. Routledge.

Beckford, G. L. (2000). Persistent Poverty: Underdevelopment in Plantation Economies of the Third World (2nd ed.). University of the West Indies Press.

Bellon, M. R., Ntandou-Bouzitou, G. D., & Caracciolo, F. (2021). On-Farm Diversity and Market Participation are Positively Associated with Dietary Diversity of Rural Mothers in Southern Benin, West Africa. PLOS ONE, 16(6), e0252245. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252245

Besky, S. (2014). The Darjeeling Distinction: Labor and Justice on Fair-Trade Tea Plantations in India. University of California Press.

Besky, S., & Blanchette, A. (Eds.). (2021). How Nature Works: Rethinking Labor on a Troubled Planet. University of New Mexico Press.

Bezner Kerr, R. (2020). Seed Networks in Malawi: Nourishment in a Changing Climate. Land, 9(3), 68. https://doi.org/10.3390/land9030068

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The Location of Culture. Routledge.

Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S. (2019). Free, Fair, and Alive: The Insurgent Power of the Commons. New Society Publishers.

Borowiak, C. (2019). Farmers' Rights: Intellectual Property Regimes and the Struggle Over Seeds. In M. Fakhri, N. Lambe, & D. Rajagopal (Eds.), Research Handbook on Law and Food Systems (pp. 52–67). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

Brockway, L. H. (2002). Science and Colonial Expansion: The Role of the British Royal Botanic Gardens (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.

Chan, L., Nolan, J., & Sterling, R. (2023). Indigenous Data Sovereignty in Digital Botanical Archives: A Comparative Study. The Information Society, 39(1), 34–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2022.2161377

Coolsaet, B. (2020). Towards an Agroecology of Knowledges: Recognition, Cognitive Justice and Farmers' Autonomy in the Knowledge Politics of the FAO. Journal of Peasant Studies, 47(2), 300–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2019.1680549

Coomes, O. T., Takasaki, Y., & Abizaid, C. (2021). Socioeconomic Contexts of Non-Timber Forest Product Commercialization and Livelihoods in the Brazilian Amazon. World Development, 142, 105429. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105429

Crosby, A. W. (2004). Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900 (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805554

Daviron, B., & Ponte, S. (2015). The Coffee Paradox: Global Markets, Commodity Trade and the Elusive Promise of Development (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Dean, W. (1987). Brazil and the Struggle for Rubber: A Study in Environmental History. Cambridge University Press.

Doolittle, A. A. (2021). Territorial Strategies and Indigenous Commons: Autonomy, Recognition, and Vernacular Governance in the Brazilian Amazon. Journal of Political Ecology, 28(1), 83–104.

Dove, M. R. (2021). Bitter Shade: The Ecological Challenge of Human Consciousness. Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300251746.001.0001

Duchelle, A. E., Herold, M., & de Sassi, C. (2022). REDD+ Finance Flows 2009–2020: Trends and Lessons Learned. CIFOR-ICRAF. https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/008443

ETC Group. (2022). Food Barons 2022: Crisis Profiteering, Digitalization and Shifting Power. ETC Group and IPES-Food.

Escobar, A. (2018). Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822371816

Escobar, A. (2020). Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478012108

FAOSTAT. (2023). Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Statistics. http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/

Fairhead, J., Leach, M., & Scoones, I. (2012). Green Grabbing: A New Appropriation of Nature? Journal of Peasant Studies, 39(2), 237–261. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.671770

Fischer, E. F., & Victor, B. (2023). Coffee Migration: The Moral Economies of Fair Trade. Routledge.

GRAIN. (2021). Agroecology and Peasant Seeds: The Tip of the Spear in the Struggle for Food Sovereignty.

Gardner, T. A., Benzie, M., Börner, J., Dawkins, E., Fick, S., Garrett, R., Godar, J., Grimard, A., Lake, S., Larsen, R. K., Mardas, N., McDermott, C. L., Meyfroidt, P., Osbeck, M., Persson, M., Sembres, T., Suavet, C., Strassburg, B., Trevisan, A., West, C., & Wolvekamp, P. (2021). Ensuring Transparency and Sustainability in Global Supply Chains Using Blockchain and Satellite-Based Verification. Nature Sustainability, 4(2), 785–795. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00776-0

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2008). Diverse Economies: Performative Practices for "Other Worlds." Progress in Human Geography, 32(5), 613–632. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508090821

Graham, M. (2022). Digital Ecolonialism: Geographies of Digital Inequality and Resistance. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv272452n

Harvey, D. (2003). The New Imperialism. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199264315.001.0001

Hirsch, P. (2023). Indigenous Data Sovereignty in Global Botanical Databases: Challenges and Opportunities. Big Data & Society, 10(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517231156789

Howard, P. H. (2023). Concentration and Power in the Food System (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Inoue, C. Y. A., & Moreira, P. F. (2023). Indigenous Bioeconomy in the Amazon: Tensions Between Market Integration and Biocultural Sovereignty. Journal of Latin American Geography, 22(1), 122–147. https://doi.org/10.1353/lag.2023.a900288

Instituto Boliviano de Comercio Exterior. (2023). Estadísticas De Comercio Exterior De Bolivia: Exportación De Quinua.

International Coffee Organization. (2023). Coffee Market Report – March 2023.

International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems. (2022). The Politics of Knowledge: Understanding the Evidence for Agroecology, Regenerative Approaches, and Indigenous Foodways. IPES-Food.

International Rubber Study Group. (2022). Rubber Statistical Bulletin, 77(1–3).

Jacobsen, S. E. (2015). The Situation for Quinoa and its Production in southern Bolivia: From Economic Success to Environmental Disaster. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science, 201(5), 400–411. https://doi.org/10.1111/jac.12108

Jefferson, D. J. (2020). Democratizing Innovation, Democratizing Intellectual Property. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108679833

Kay, C. (2019). Modernist Dreams and Green Utopias: The Contradictions of Green Neoliberalism in Latin America. Journal of Political Ecology, 26(1), 257–278. https://doi.org/10.2458/v26i1.23043

Kloppenburg, J. (2004). First the Seed: The Political Economy of Plant Biotechnology (2nd ed.). University of Wisconsin Press.

Kloppenburg, J. (2014). Re-Purposing the Master's Tools. In A. S. Canavan & A. Frison (Eds.), Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture: Taking Stock for the Future (pp. 122–129). FAO.