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Introduction

Alison Hope Alkon and Julie Guthman

Making good food fair and affordable cannot be achieved without affecting the whole system. These are not just food questions; they are questions of justice and equality and rights, of enhancing rather than restricting democracy, of making a more rational, legitimate economy.

MARK BITTMAN

In a 2014 NEW YORK TIMES OP-ED, noted food writer Mark Bittman described having a negative visceral reaction to the word foodie. Foodies, he argued, are too often “new-style epicures” who enjoy “watching competitive cooking shows, doing ‘anything’ to get a table at the trendy restaurant, scouring the web for single-estate farro, or devoting oneself to finding the best food truck.” If and when these foodies go beyond the pursuit of gastronomic pleasure, they tend to put their energies into consumer support for sustainable food systems, for example by spending money on organic and local foods, community-supported agriculture, and farmers’ markets.

Bittman’s column drew on and amplified a critique that scholars writing under the loosely defined label “critical food studies,” including the editors and authors featured in this volume, had been making for over a decade. We’ve argued that many foodies and food activists focus on a politics of consumption, and that this has limited even the most sustainability-minded among them to relatively apolitical strategies such as patronizing and creating alternative food businesses (Alkon 2012, Guthman 2011). Moreover, these strategies are accessible largely to those with wealth and white skin, both because a politics of consumption is a “pay to play” approach and because the imaginaries put forward by advocates of the sustainable agriculture movement tend to romanticize the histories of whites, while eliding the contributions of people of color who have labored in past and present agricultural systems (Alkon 2012, Allen et al. 2004, Guthman 2008a, 2008b, Slocum 2007).
Moreover, attempts by foodies and food activists to shift the public’s eating habits toward their notion of “good food” have too often been encased in a politics of conversion that attempts to change individuals’ eating habits without understanding the multiple circumstances, pressures, and desires that inform food choices (Johnston and Baumann 2010). This approach is particularly problematic when it is promulgated by predominantly white, class-privileged actors who target low-income communities and communities of color (Alkon 2012, Guthman 2008c). Even more problematically, such efforts scrutinize individuals’ and communities’ everyday food choices while taking for granted the harmful practices of food producers and processors, including the spreading of toxic chemicals and abysmal wages and working conditions (Guthman 2011).

This, however, is beginning to shift. Increasingly, food activists such as those described in this book are looking beyond their plates and taking aim at a variety of injustices throughout the food system. Some, like those profiled by Jill Lindsey Harrison in chapter 2, are members of front-line communities working to restrict the toxic chemicals and pesticides that poison their bodies, families, and communities. Others, like the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative described by Penn Loh and Julian Agyeman in chapter 11, are the product of alliances between activists, policymakers, and planners and work to ensure that the benefits of urban agriculture can be enjoyed by low-income communities. By describing and analyzing the work of activists like these, we hope to inspire foodies and sustainable agriculture advocates to develop more capacious notions of equity and justice, and to build collaborations that are both strategic and political in their efforts to effect changes in the food system and beyond.

When supporters of sustainable agriculture pursue this path, they encounter long-standing struggles for equity. These struggles are often led by farm and other food workers, by marginalized farmers, and by communities lacking geographic and economic access to healthy food. Though at times they make use of the foodies’ politics of consumption, these struggles often seek to hold the state accountable for the regulation of industrial food in the interest of health and social justice or to push corporations and other businesses to cease harmful practices. These struggles tend to be rooted in communities that experience the toxic effects of industrial agriculture, though more privileged groups also play significant roles. What is common to all of them is that they work to change not only the way we eat, but the way we live, work, and govern ourselves.
The goal of this book is to inspire food scholars, students, and activists to engage with projects and campaigns that move beyond the provision of market-based alternatives and toward a fight for just and sustainable food. In these pages, readers will meet farmers, food service workers, and, yes, foodies, all engaged in campaigns and projects that seek to limit the power of the industrial food system to harm bodies, senses of identity, and everyday lives. As the various chapters in this volume will demonstrate, by working with and within these struggles, activists have begun to forge alliances that have the potential to affect the whole food system, from the seed to the restaurant worker who brings food to the table.

**CHALLENGING INDUSTRIAL FOOD**

It is no secret that corporate involvement in food production and consumption has resulted in an array of problems. Environmentally, agribusiness companies have convinced farmers to use an increasing array of chemical pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, which, over the long term, deplete the soil (requiring even more the next year) and pollute waterways as well as the bodies of the workers and nearby communities (Altieri 2000, Harrison 2011). Economically, corporate processors and distributors have the power to set standards and prices that farmers must accept in order to sell their products, and these prices are often so low as to leave farmers in tremendous debt and, eventually, force them out of business. In the case of fruit and vegetable farmers, those who remain often operate on narrow margins, surviving off what agricultural economists call the “immigrant subsidy”—that is, the ability to pay undocumented migrant workers far less than citizens receive (and far less than the value of their work), let alone a living wage (Taylor and Martin 1997). Large-scale commodity farmers, on the other hand, rely more on mechanization than exploited labor. To stay in business, the remaining farms must eschew biodiversity, instead growing genetically identical monocultures of single crops. This farming strategy guarantees that they remain dependent on chemical pesticides, fertilizers, and the like, as it is only with these kinds of inputs that farms can, to paraphrase former Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butts, “get big” rather than “get out.” From the standpoint of consumers, activists point to the lack of fresh produce in low-income areas, the high price of fresh foods compared to processed ones, and the health consequences associated with diets high in salt, sugar, and fat as reasons
why this industrial, corporate food system is not just unethical but dangerous. Exposés uncovering how food is grown and processed have become commonplace in newspapers, magazines, and TV news, ranging from massive coverage of a meat product called “pink slime” to Michael Moss’s (2014) whistle-blowing description of the ways that processed foods are designed to ensnare the taste buds of young users with massive amounts of salt, sugar, and fat.

**Toward a Sustainable Food System**

Those critical of these circumstances have done more than just document them. Together they have worked to create alternatives to the industrial agriculture system that can provide foods produced in more ecologically friendly ways and ensure more stable livelihoods for farmers. Agroecological farming, of course, predates the invention of chemical inputs and has been employed by poor and peasant farmers worldwide. Still, in the United States, the 1960s countercultural movement and the 1970s birth of the environmental movement created a renewed interest, especially among white, young urbanites, in these techniques as a means for human and environmental health (Belasco 1993). Organic production and local and regional sales became the cornerstones of the alternative foods movement, and the movement began to catch on.

Organic foods are now commonplace at health food stores, restaurants, and even supermarkets across the country, at least in affluent areas. Retail sales of organic products in the United States were only $3.6 billion in 1997 but reached $21.1 billion in 2008, and organic acreage more than doubled between 1997 and 2005 (Dimitri and Oberholtzer 2009). Earthbound Farms, a large producer of organic salad mix and other packaged produce, boasted a revenue of roughly $460 million in 2012 (Oran and Kim 2013). As of 1997, natural food stores were the primary distributor of organic foods, but by 2008 nearly half of this food was purchased in chain supermarkets (Dimitri and Oberholtzer 2009). Big-box stores like Walmart and Safeway, which the counterculture once labeled as inherently contrary to organic philosophies, are now major retailers of organic products. Local, decentralized distribution has grown as well. For example, the number of farmers’ markets in the United States quadrupled from less than two thousand in 1994 to more than eight thousand in 2013 (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2013).
Despite the undeniable accomplishments of many producing and advocating for local organic food, and the astounding economic success of the organic food industry, the movement for environmentally sustainable and socially just food systems has quite a ways to go. While sales of organic and local food are on the rise, organic farms were still less than 1 percent of U.S. farm acreage in 2008, and organic sales slowed markedly during the economic recession of 2008–09 (Guthman 2014). Nor has the rise in organics diminished the amount of pesticides used or the sales of highly processed foods. Indeed, the production and sale of organic and local foods does not challenge the corporate food system but merely creates an alternative to it, an alternative that industrial food increasingly incorporates into its supply chains (Guthman 2014, 2011). The farms, factories, and restaurants that produce, package, and serve these foods are often as likely as conventional food purveyors to treat workers poorly, oppose unionization, and fight against progressive legislation (Brown and Getz 2008, Gray 2014, Guthman 2014, Jayaraman 2013).

In an attempt to strengthen food activism, scholars and activists have offered two important and generative critiques of alternative food systems. The first focuses on the importance of food justice—the ways that race, class, gender, and other forms of inequality affect both conventional and alternative food systems. The authors in this volume, as well as many others, have called for a food system that is not only ecologically sustainable, but also responds to racial and economic disparities, and for a food movement that highlights the contributions that low-income communities and communities of color have made to agriculture (Alkon and Agyeman 2011). In this way, food becomes a tool toward broader social justice and antiracist organizing.

The second critique revolves around the complex concept of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is, in the first instance, a political economic philosophy that asserts that human well-being can best be achieved if the so-called “free” market is allowed to function with little or no intervention from the state (Harvey 2005, 2). In practice, much of what goes under the name of “letting markets work” entails developing new regulatory mechanisms and bending the rules so as to shore up corporate profitability (Harvey 2010, Mann 2013). In relation to food activism, prominent social scientists have argued that current modes of food activism may explicitly oppose what market ortho-
doxy has wrought but have nevertheless tended to embrace neoliberal forms of governance, including voluntary regulation and the reliance on markets rather than the state to pursue change (Allen 2008, Allen et al. 2003, Brown and Getz 2008, Guthman 2008c, Harrison 2008). These food justice and neoliberalism critiques are interrelated, because strategies pursued through the market, such as starting a business or buying particular kinds of goods, are by definition less accessible to low-income people, notwithstanding the often economically tenuous efforts within food activism to encourage food entrepreneurialism among low-income people (Alkon 2012, Allen 1999, Guthman 2008b).

In response to both of these lines of inquiry, scholars have called for food activists to intensify their critique of production agriculture, particularly around issues of labor, as well as their attention to inequalities throughout the food system (Alkon and Agyeman 2011, Allen 2008, Brown and Getz 2008, Guthman 2011, 2008c, Harrison 2011, 2008, Levkoe 2011). The remainder of this introduction will lay out these critiques in order to frame the struggles of the activists profiled in this volume, who are both attending to food justice and pushing back against neoliberalism. Their work exists at a cultural moment in which neoliberalism is a dominant feature of our political economy and ecology, and rather than ignore or work around market-based approaches, the activists depicted in this book often make use of them in creative and interesting ways. Thus, these strategies hold the potential to become harbingers of a new shift in food and agricultural movements, one that uses market-based strategies to build toward collective action on inequalities, labor, sustainability, and social justice. They have much to teach, not only to activists, but also to the scholars who have been critical of neoliberal food activism.

THE FOOD JUSTICE CRITIQUE

Perhaps the most thorough definition of food justice comes from Rasheed Hislop (2014, 19), who describes it as “the struggle against racism, exploitation, and oppression taking place within the food system that addresses inequality’s root causes both within and beyond the food chain.” The term was commonly used among activists prior to any scholarly writing on it, particularly by grassroots groups consisting of and working in communities of color to develop sustainable local food systems. This concept, however, has
been broadened and refined through engagement and debate among activists and within the academic literature, which has drawn upon critical race theory to better understand how and to what effect exploitation in the food system has taken and continues to take place. Although the goals of this scholarship are transnational, to date it has focused mainly on U.S.-based projects and sectors and has examined the effects of specific local, state, and national policies while the related concept of food sovereignty is more often associated with the Global South (for an overview, see La Vía Campesina 2007, Wittman et al. 2010).

In some ways, food justice activism grows out of the environmental justice movement, through which low-income communities and communities of color documented their disproportionate proximity to environmental toxins and argued that access to a safe, healthy, and clean environment was an issue of racial and economic justice (Bullard 1990, Gottlieb 2001, Schlosberg 2007, Taylor 1998). Later activists added that marginalized communities were not only more likely to be exposed to environmental bads, but also less likely to have access to environmental benefits such as neighborhood green spaces and healthy food (Agyeman 2005, Park and Pellow 2011, Pellow and Brulle 2005). As it gained momentum, those focused on creating a food system that was both environmentally sustainable and socially equitable came to call their movement food justice (Alkon 2012, Gottlieb and Joshi 2010). In the critical tensions between food justice activists and the broader food movement, this movement mirrors its environmental-justice predecessor and highlights the polyvocality of approaches to food and environmental issues.

Food justice is a necessary corrective to a food activism that largely ignored the needs and desires of low-income consumers, producers, and workers. In the 1990s, activists working under the banner of community food security began to rectify this by combining economic support for local farmers with increased access to their products among low-income residents (Allen 2004, Gottlieb and Fisher 1996, Winne 2008). In practice, however, support for farmers, often in the form of demands for premium prices, tended to trump consumer needs (Allen 2004, Guthman et al. 2006). Moreover, the Community Food Security Coalition, the primary organization advocating this goal, was predominantly composed of privileged white activists who, despite a general desire to “do good,” were often unwilling to confront issues of racism both within their organization and in the food system at large (Bradley and Herrera 2016, Slocum 2007). Food justice, with its focus on food access in low-income communities of color, arose in response to both
the whiteness of community food security and its privileging of producers’ needs.

Often working closely with activists, scholars have highlighted many of the barriers that make it more difficult for those with low incomes and people of color to access local and organic food as both producers and consumers. For example, academic work has illustrated the processes whereby farmers of color have been disenfranchised, ranging from discrimination by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to forced relocation to immigration laws that bar land ownership by particular ethnic groups, all of which have made it difficult for communities of color to produce food for themselves (Gilbert et al. 2002, Minkoff-Zern et al. 2011, Norgaard et al. 2011). Despite these obstacles, agriculture has remained a proud tradition in many communities of color, as highlighted through projects like Natasha Bowens’s (2015) *The Color of Food*, a photo documentary book and interactive website created to “amplify, preserve and celebrate the stories of Black, Latino, Asian and Indigenous farmers and food activists working to revolutionize the food system in our communities.” But perhaps the harshest struggles have been those of farmworkers, who are among the lowest-paid workers in the United States and, ironically, often suffer from hunger and diet-related diseases (Brown and Getz 2011, Gray 2014, Holmes 2013). And yet, as we will see in chapter 7, farmworkers are at the forefront of efforts to create a broader and more confrontational food politics.

Marginalized communities also face difficulties in purchasing local, organic, and fresh foods, and academic researchers have measured this disparity and chronicled efforts to address it (Beaulac et al. 2009). These foods tend to be more expensive than conventional alternatives, especially with regard to canned and packaged items. It is, of course, quite difficult for low-income people to afford these foods, particularly in the context of escalating housing and health-care costs (Alkon et al. 2013, Lea and Worsley 2005). The sustainable agriculture movement has largely privileged the economic needs of producers—small organic farmers—and has therefore argued that the price of their goods should be high. This helps ensure stable livelihoods for sustainable farmers, but it is contrary to the needs of low-income people (Allen 2008, 2004, 1999, Guthman et al. 2006).

A second barrier to marginalized communities’ lack of consumption of fresh food is the relative lack of available produce—let alone locally grown and organic options—in low-income communities and communities of color (Kato 2013, Kato et al. 2014, Morland et al. 2002, Wrigley et al. 2002). These
areas are often referred to as “food deserts,” though activists are critical that the desert imagery naturalizes the political and economic processes that create them. Moreover, too much emphasis on the presence or absence of supermarkets results in the offering of incentives to chain supermarkets rather than addressing root causes such as racism and poverty (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck 2011, Short et al. 2007). Nonetheless, there is a fair amount of agreement that the lack of available fresh produce is one obstacle to its consumption. This lack of availability is the result of long-standing processes of disinvestment in communities of color, including redlining and urban renewal (McClintock 2011, Meyer forthcoming). As we will see with the food hubs depicted in chapter 9, in low-income communities and communities of color, a space to procure high-quality food can become a way to push back against these long-standing processes (see also Bradley and Galt 2013, Cohen and Reynolds 2016, White 2010).

A third barrier can be found in the language of the sustainable agriculture movement itself. Scholars have argued that farmers’ markets and other spaces where sustainable agriculture is practiced are culturally coded as white, not only because they are primarily and disproportionately frequented by whites, but because of the discourses that circulate through them (Alkon and McCullen 2010, Guthman 2008a, Slocum 2007, 2006). For example, Guthman (2008b, 394) argues that phrases common to the sustainable agriculture movement, such as “getting your hands dirty in the soil” and “looking the farmer in the eye,” all point to “an agrarian past that is far more easily romanticized by whites than others.” Given the disenfranchisement of so many African American, Native American, Latino/a, and Asian American farmers (Romm 2001), Guthman suggests that it is likely these phrases do not resonate with communities of color in the ways intended by their primarily white speakers. This cultural barrier can suggest to low-income communities and communities of color that sustainable agriculture is not for them, especially when combined with the lack of available organic and local produce in their neighborhoods (Alkon 2012). Activist chefs and writers such as Bryant Terry (2009), Breeze Harper (2010), and Luz Calvo and Catriona Esquibel (2015) have responded by attempting to recast sustainable food systems in ways they feel are more culturally resonant.

As a whole, food justice scholarship contributes to a vibrant debate among food activists and other movement participants about how sustainable agriculture should best be pursued. Some argue that local and sustainable food systems are inherently more just, and more accessible and democratic, than
global agribusiness (Fairfax et al. 2012). Others have focused on the need to overcome the barriers faced by low-income communities and communities of color. Scholars have profiled organizations that create farmers’ markets, community-supported-agriculture programs, and community gardens in these neighborhoods and have worked to make this food more affordable through subsidies, work exchanges, and a variety of other strategies (Broad 2016, Gottlieb and Joshi 2010). Food banks and other emergency food projects have moved toward offering local and organic food, sometimes creating partnerships with local farmers or nonprofit organizations to do so (Friedman 2007, Kato 2013). Other activists have planned conferences and events to discuss the ways that race and racism are produced and reproduced in both conventional and sustainable food systems, and they have worked to create local food systems that are led by people of color and that function as a form of resistance to racism (Alkon and Agyeman 2011, Cohen and Reynolds 2016, Morales 2011, Sbicca 2012). For example, the Black Land and Liberation Initiative, launched just as this book was going into publication, will train young people in political education in Black liberation, land reform, and ecology as well as agroecological skills and direct action.

More reformist visions of food justice, such as those aiming to ameliorate food deserts and health disparities, have seen support from major foundations such as Kellogg and Robert Wood Johnson, and policymakers in various cities have adjusted zoning ordinances in order to encourage new stores, though white-led organizations continue to receive more funding than those led by people of color (Cohen and Reynolds 2016). There are now thousands of nonprofit organizations and activists across the country working toward “food justice,” and many of them are in direct conversation with scholars who document and analyze their work.

THE NEOLIBERALISM CRITIQUE

Neoliberalism is most widely known as the principle behind free trade and austerity. Some of its most important components include deregulation (the removal of laws restricting the ways that businesses can function, such as environmental or occupational health and safety requirements), trade liberalization (the removal of protectionist tariffs designed to support domestic businesses), and the privatization of state enterprises and public services (Harvey 2005, Peck and Tickell 2002). Each of these practices is designed to
ensure business profitability, with the expectation that any social benefits will somehow trickle down. The term neoliberalism is often associated with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which have spent decades encouraging the free flow of capital and pressuring governments to eliminate taxes and tariffs and remove supports for domestic farmers, workers, and those in need of assistance.

Neoliberal approaches to food and public health are generally framed within a “corporate-driven food enterprise discourse,” rooted in the idea that free-market solutions are superior to those traditionally found in the public sector and civil society (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck 2011, 119). Food crises such as low-income communities’ difficulties accessing fresh produce thus provide an opportunity for increased investment from corporations and/or philanthropists. In the United States, this approach has given rise to incentives encouraging corporate supermarkets like Walmart to establish locations in so-called food deserts (ibid.).

While food activists’ emphasis on local and ecologically sustainable production is quite a departure from solutions reliant on corporate agribusiness, scholars have argued that much of contemporary food and agricultural activism is often quite removed from a politics that names and addresses other existing neoliberalizations in the food system. To the contrary, in their focus on creating alternatives—farmers’ markets, community-supported agriculture, urban farms, and the like—rather than contesting state and corporate power, many food organizations may produce and reproduce neoliberal forms and spaces of governance (Guthman 2008c).

Social movement scholars have noted that this is to be expected. Cox and Nilsen (2014) write that “significant elements of almost all movements in the neoliberal period have been constrained within logics of identity politics, branding, and the politics of opinion, which fit well with the wider world of neoliberalism. It would be strange if matters had been otherwise.” For example, efforts by women and communities of color to highlight economic success stories from their communities, and to create additional ones, can be seen as neoliberal in that they uphold individual wealth as an indicator, if not a method, of social change. The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Development attempts to increase the carbon stored in forests by assigning it economic value as a means to incentivize sustainable development and replanting. And the fight against breast cancer has become a commercial enterprise in and of itself, as pink products become both symbol and strategy toward combatting the disease.
Additionally, though it is not a social movement per se, the rise in social enterprise and social entrepreneurship evidences the degree to which market solutions to social problems have become normalized. It is worth noting, though, that substantial critiques of these strategies have come from more radical feminists, antiracist activists, environmentalists, and scholars, much in the same way that this volume seeks to address neoliberal tendencies in food movements. The central premise of this book is that a more vibrant, diverse food activism depends on understanding the ways that neoliberalism constrains political possibilities, and that this theoretical undertaking can help create space for other forms of food politics to develop.

**Neoliberalism and Food Movements**

Neoliberalism is, first and foremost, an argument for the primacy of the so-called free market, unconstrained by government intervention. Even social goods, the thinking goes, can best be achieved when informed consumers are willing to pay for them. When food activists argue that the best way to create a sustainable food system is to become a producer or consumer of local and organic food, they are working within this neoliberal worldview. Indeed, food activism has become so predominantly market-based that Michael Pollan (2006) refers to it as a “market-as-movement,” in which supporters “vote with our forks” for the kind of food system we want to see. While Pollan believes this to be a positive development, this ideal elides and eclipses long-standing social-movement strategies pursuing state-mandated protections for labor, the environment, and the poor, leaving individual entrepreneurialism and consumer choice as the primary pathways to social change (Lavin 2009). Activists encourage one another to build and support alternative food businesses, and they believe that change will come through shifting market demand (Alkon 2012, Allen et al. 2003, Guthman 2011). Even the few prescient food activists who were raising issues of worker justice as early as the mid-2000s pursued their goals through third-party labeling certification, encouraging consumers to choose products based on this standard as well (Brown and Getz 2008). These strategies articulate with neoliberalism’s claim that state intervention in markets should be minimized in order to allow the latter to allocate goods and services.

Another way that food activists reproduce neoliberalism is through what Peck and Tickell (2002) call “roll-out neoliberalism.” In their widely cited article, these scholars noted that neoliberalism consisted of two phases: a
rolling back of state provisioning, including the social safety net and some regulatory functions, and then a rolling out of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other third-sector actors attempting to take the state's place, usually with significantly less funding and a reliance on volunteerism (see also Agyeman and McEntee 2014, Milligan et al. 2008, Pudup 2008, Wolch 1990). In terms of food activism, one way in which roll-out neoliberalism takes place is the development of nonbinding forms of regulation in which farmers or other employers agree to abide by a set of standards, best practices, or other codes of conduct (Brown and Getz 2008, Guthman 2008c, 2008d). The limitations of this approach are most evident when these standards ought to be legally binding, or already are so but not enforced: for example, paying minimum wage, not working in heat, supplying protective equipment for pesticide use (Besky and Brown 2015, Gray 2014). Closely related and even overlapping are regulatory mechanisms in which consumers can choose foods produced with higher standards (e.g., fair trade, organics). Here, voting with your fork is significant not only because it is a market-based mechanism, but because it devolves regulatory responsibility from publicly accountable experts to consumers who can decide for themselves whether certain practices should be condoned or condemned (Guthman 2003, 2007).

Roll-out neoliberalism is also seen in the increasing array of community groups that have cropped up in attempts to fill the holes in services left by a shrinking state (Guthman 2008c). For instance, food justice organizations have taken responsibility for the provisioning of food in low-income communities and communities of color, inadvertently helping justify the dismantling of food assistance programs. While these groups have often effectively served their communities, when they trumpet their abilities to do so they implicitly argue that it is their role, and not the state's, to provide such services. It is to this dynamic that author and social critic Arundhati Roy (2004) refers when she writes, “It’s almost as though the greater the devastation caused by neoliberalism, the greater the outbreak of NGOs.”

Not only do food activists attempt to do the work abandoned by the neoliberal state, but, in their efforts to secure adherents and funding, they trumpet their own abilities to do it better. For example, supporters of sustainable agriculture highlight the federal government’s inability to protect the public and the environment from pesticides, toxic-though-legal ingredients, and even contamination. They argue that the best and indeed the only way to protect oneself and one’s family is through the purchase of organic food from local farmers one can trust (Szasz 2007). Similarly, food justice advocates call
attention to the decades of institutionally racist development patterns that ensured that urban Black neighborhoods would not prosper (McClintock 2011). But rather than seeking government investment in these areas, they argue that local residents and supporters can create green economic development through farmers’ markets, health food stores, and urban farms. These examples suggest that everyday people can work together to solve social problems through the buying and selling of goods. While this certainly can be empowering, the lack of a role for government policy, and its replacement with NGOs and markets, helps relieve the state of its responsibility to provide environmental protection and a social safety net, a responsibility that is particularly important in light of the state’s role in pursuing or permitting the destruction of communities and environments in the first place. In contrast to the market-based strategies most commonly advocated by food justice activists, the examples provided in part 1 of this volume depict activists attempting to hold the state accountable for the provision of environmental and human health through the regulation of pesticides and genetically modified organisms.

In addition to their overt political work, social movements help shape subjectivities—senses of proper selfhood and citizenship—whether explicitly in trainings or implicitly through modeling particular languages and behaviors. Many food activists unreflectively espouse and perpetuate ideas compatible with neoliberal notions of good citizenship through their emphases on self-responsibility, individualism, and entrepreneurialism (Bondi and Laurie 2005, Dean 1999, Larner and Craig 2005, Rose 1999). For example, many U.S. food justice organizations focus on alleviating food insecurity through the development of support for local food entrepreneurs, such as chef-training programs and small-business incubators. Such an approach, however, while perhaps generative of individual success, concedes decreasing political support for entitlement programs, designed in part to make the food-insecure independent of the charity of others (Allen 1999). Moreover, they neglect that small businesses are competitive and often fail, making them a poor substitute for direct assistance.

Many food organizations also emphasize citizen empowerment in a more generic sense, often in the form of efforts to instill particular values and ways of being. For instance, farm-to-school programs are promoted with the idea of giving children the ability to make right choices, to improve standardized test scores, and to conform to normative body sizes (Allen and Guthman 2006). Garden-oriented projects (in prisons, in schools, and among “at-risk”
populations) are viewed as mechanisms to produce “empowered,” self-sufficient subjects and encourage “citizenship” more broadly (Pudup 2008). While community empowerment is, of course, beneficial in many ways, it also reinforces the notion that individuals and community groups are responsible for addressing problems that were not of their own making. Moreover, in focusing on food and nutritional education—and obesity prevention in particular—many food justice organizations participate in the reconfiguring of health care as an individual rather than a public responsibility and reinforce ideas about normative body sizes (Guthman 2014, 2011).

Finally, in treating the consumption of local and organic food as somewhat of a cure-all, these movements can be depoliticizing. Food justice organizations often proclaim food as an organizing tool to address institutional racism, environmental injustices, and economic inequalities, though in practice there seems to be more emphasis on food than on organizing (Guthman 2011). Indeed, social movement logics become imbued into commodities as these struggles become frames to foster the buying and selling of local and organic foods (Alkon 2012). Together, all these tendencies constrain what Guthman (2008a) refers to as the “politics of the possible,” or our collective imaginaries of what kinds of social changes can be brought about and through what means. In contrast, the projects described in this volume are more politicized, strategic, and confrontational. For example, the pesticide reform activists profiled in chapter 2 make demands that the state protect workers’ bodies, wages, and working conditions, while the food workers’ organizations described in chapter 6 embarrass employers into changing their practices. In addition, the cooperative markets in chapters 8 and 9 and the urban farms in chapters 11 and 12 challenge neoliberal notions of individualism and private ownership. As a whole, the activists we have profiled focus less on training people to be entrepreneurial or more informed consumers and instead work collectively for good jobs, healthy workplaces, affordable healthy food, land, and collective ownership of the means of production. By highlighting examples of politicized struggles for more sustainable and equitable food systems, this volume aims to expand the possibilities of food activism.

**Critiques and Counter-Critiques**

Within scholarly circles, some have objected to the use of neoliberalism to describe both the problems and the solutions that food activists attempt.
One counter-critique is primarily theoretical, arguing that if neoliberalism is simultaneously seen as a political economic project, a mode of citizenship, IMF-imposed austerity, a philosophy, and an era, then the term has become so loose as to mean both everything and nothing, much like what happened to globalization (Castree 2008, Weller and O’Neill 2014). Even in championing the continued use of the term, Brenner et al. (2010, 184) write that neoliberalism has become “a rascal concept—promiscuously pervasive, yet inconsistently defined, empirically imprecise and frequently contested.” While it is too large and tangential a debate to take up here, we will simply note that in writing about food politics, we often see the conflation of neoliberalism with capitalism more generally, as anything that involves markets, consumer choice, or profit making is dismissed (or defended) as neoliberal. We believe that the framing of neoliberalism offered above, as well as in the chapters that follow, is more precise and demonstrates the continued, if more limited, usefulness of this admittedly complex concept.

A second, and more pointed, counter-critique comes from those who share the concern of J. K. Gibson-Graham (2008, 2006, 1996) that seeing neoliberalism everywhere can “dampen and discourage” emergent alternatives and initiatives (2008, 3). Analyses such as those we describe above, they argue, make it more difficult to imagine and cultivate alternative ways of being. These [strategies include] the tendency to represent economy as a space of invariant logics and automatic unfolding that [offers] no field for intervention; the tendency to theorize economy as a stable and self-reproducing structure . . . these tendencies [contribute] to an affect and attitude of entrenched opposition . . . a habit of thinking and feeling that [offers] little emotional space for alternatives. (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxii)

Barnett similarly argues that theories of neoliberalism “have great difficulty accounting for, or indeed even in recognizing, new forms of ‘individualized collective-action’ (Marchetti 2003) that have emerged in tandem with the apparent ascendency of neoliberal hegemony” (Barnett 2005, 10).

With regard to food movement activism and alternative food systems, Harris (2009) paints the critique of alternative food as neoliberal as constituting what Hart (2002) refers to as a “disabling discourse,” totalizing and self-fulfilling, discursively foreclosing possibilities of transforming food systems. Harris argues instead that scholars should adopt the directive of Gibson-Graham to “read for difference” in order to develop “an alternative stance in which place-based activism is not seen as already ‘sold-out’ to neo-
liberalism.” This representational strategy, he continues, “might better acknowledge attempts to imagine and enact a food politics that achieves different socio-environmental justice outcomes to those of conventional food systems, and offer a more constructive academic critique” (Harris 2009, 60).

In response, we argue that the diverse and alternative economies that Gibson-Graham seek to highlight, while potentially generative, exist at the margins of the neoliberal political economy. Moreover, they are all-too-often vulnerable to the food justice critique, failing to include or resonate with those who are most harmed by neoliberalism, namely low-income communities, communities of color, and low-wage and increasingly precarious workers. We also believe that too much emphasis on the merits of these alternatives, and too little focus on the circumstances of those who are not served by them, works to convince a generation of activists that it is impossible to confront the state or corporations in the interest of human and environmental health, fostering the very neoliberal subjectivities we described above.

This volume offers a variety of cases in which critiques of alternative food systems as neoliberal have helped to broaden, rather than limit, food movement activists’ notions of the kinds of socio-environmental activism and change that are possible. Analytically, we argue that in order to fundamentally shift the food system into one that is environmentally sustainable and socially just, activists will need to identify the threads of neoliberalism that inform their own discourses and, even more so, their practices, working within them when appropriate and abandoning them when it serves their larger strategic aims.

While the provision of alternatives remains food activists’ primary strategy, some of the most prominent among them have embraced, at least in part, the broader, more politicized forms of activism described in this volume. Mark Bittman, whose words begin this chapter, is a noteworthy example, and a look back through his New York Times column reveals an increasing awareness of workers’ rights, racial justice, and the need for a politicized food movement. At the same time, however, his recent departure from the Times in order to work for a start-up that will “make it easier for people to eat more plants” demonstrates that the creation of alternatives remains the dominant mode of food politics (though he has since left that position as well). Michael Pollan has been similarly equivocal. Despite a complete ignorance of workers’ issues in his earlier writing, he has more recently called on his readers to support both the Coalition of Immokalee Workers and striking fast-food workers (Dean 2014). While this shift in the writings of movement luminaries is both
noteworthy and influential, the groundwork that makes it possible comes from the farmworkers, food workers, and other activists whose stories populate the pages that follow.

For the authors of this volume, critiques of neoliberalism have not been a disabling discourse, but rather an invitation to highlight collective campaigns for health and justice throughout the food system, as well as projects that push back against the neoliberal primacy of concepts like individual responsibility and private-sector ownership. Indeed, the kinds of alliances between food activists, antipoverty groups, and labor unions described by Joshua Sbicca in chapter 5 only become possible when the former look beyond the provision of alternatives and work strategically and collaboratively to effect social change. In other words, critiques of neoliberalism in food movements have pushed food activists to craft new strategies, subjectivities, and alliances.

The chapters that follow are examples of projects and campaigns that address both the neoliberal and food justice critiques described above. The activist projects documented in these chapters are conscious of the ways that race, class, and gender pervade both industrial agriculture and its alternatives, and they work to increase social equity within the food system. Moreover, each of them recognizes and moves within a political economy dominated by neoliberalism while attempting to push beyond it. While they are imperfect in their abilities to address both hierarchies of oppression and neoliberal modes of thought and action, these campaigns may help strengthen and inspire activists and supporters from many parts of the food movement to see the progressive possibilities beyond neoliberalism, and to create bridges to other forms of social justice activism.

OVERVIEW OF THIS BOOK

Part 1, “Regulatory Campaigns,” explores efforts to constrain the power of industrial agriculture in the interest of the physical and economic health of producers and workers. First, Jill Lindsey Harrison showcases the work of California’s pesticide drift activists who work to hold the state accountable for its responsibility to reduce environmental problems by advocating for regulatory restrictions on the use of the most toxic and unruly pesticides. Emily Eaton’s chapter describes another important, successful campaign, this one of Canadian producers against genetically modified wheat. She argues
that a focus on production, rather than consumer health, made this victory possible. In the final chapter in this section, Julie Guthman and Sandy Brown analyze the campaign to ban the use of the soil fumigant methyl iodide in California’s strawberry production, highlighting how activists played on the strategic weaknesses of the industry they confronted.

Part 2, “Working for Workers,” examines the ways that workers’ rights campaigns across the food system have built alliances with and strengthened alternative food movements. In this section’s opening chapter, Sbicca argues that emphasizing economic inequalities and working conditions and engaging in confrontational politics have been essential to the creation of alliances between food justice activists and food workers in Los Angeles. Next, Joann Lo and Biko Koenig of the Food Chain Workers Alliance describe the rise in campaigns for good jobs, good wages, and good food across the food system, highlighting examples from a New York bakery, a farm in California’s Central Valley, and national worker-organizing at Walmart. Finally, in her analysis of campaigns by the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, Laura-Anne Minkoff-Zern argues that consumer support for farmworker advocacy can push food activists beyond romantic imaginaries of alternative food systems and into multiracial, multiclass, movement-based work.

Part 3, “Collective Practices,” examines the kinds of alternative institutions that, despite their status as alternatives, challenge forms of ownership associated with individual entrepreneurship. First, two chapters on cooperative markets, one by Andrew Zitcer and the other by Meleiza Figueroa and Alison Alkon, highlight examples from Philadelphia, Chicago, and Oakland. While Zitcer’s described organizations are predominantly white and Figueroa and Alkon’s are predominantly Black, both chapters argue that democratic ownership and collective buying practices resist the individualizing tendency of neoliberal subjectivities and promote interest in broader movement activities. Next, Michelle Glowa examines various ways that Bay Area urban gardeners have pursued land sovereignty in a competitive real estate market, recreating and challenging the institutional landscape of land rights and community development and pushing back against the trend toward neoliberal urbanization that has so dominated Bay Area real estate. Loh and Agyeman offer a similar case study of the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative in Boston, a land trust that has developed both low-income housing and urban agriculture. Then Tanya Kerssen and Zoe Brent describe the ways that rural and urban farmers, marginalized populations, and people of color in particular are affected by changes in land tenure
and mechanisms of land access and control. They also discuss forms of land-based resistance and alliances that might enhance the effectiveness of struggles for food justice as well as for food and land sovereignty.

There are two important limitations to these chapters that we believe need to be explicitly discussed at the beginning. First, despite the national and even global nature of food activism, our chapters are disproportionately sited in California. This reflects our own locations and the networks of scholars with whom we work, as well as California’s leading role in alternative food activism and critical food studies. While there are talented scholars doing critical work throughout the United States, those who are explicitly addressing issues of food justice and neoliberalism are disproportionately found in California. A second and more troubling limitation is the lack of attention to gender and sexuality. There have been wonderful studies examining the ways that inequalities of gender and sexuality are reproduced by food and agriculture, as well as the ways that food work contributes to gender identity, family, and community (for an excellent overview, see Allen 2004). However, this scholarship is all-too-rarely in dialogue with work on food justice, neoliberalism, or food movements. We look forward to future studies that correct these imbalances.

Taken together, these chapters highlight a new direction in food activism, or, more accurately, a return to a more collective, social justice–oriented tradition of food activism that never went away but has been overshadowed by the emphasis on the creation of market-oriented alternatives. We hope that by highlighting these examples, we can help foodies and food activists expand our collective vision of what we are fighting for far beyond our own tables. We believe that collective campaigns rooted in the realities of those most harmed by the industrial food system and alternatives that push back against neoliberal strategies and subjectivities can nourish new political possibilities within the world of food activism.

NOTES

1. Although it seems inconsistent, we think it’s important to capitalize Black but not white. The argument in favor of capitalizing Black has a long history, tracing back to W. E. B. Du Bois’s petitioning of the New York Times to capitalize the N in Negro. When they eventually agreed, the editorial staff wrote that “It is not merely a typographical change, it is an act in recognition of racial respect for those who have been generations in the ‘lower case’” (quoted in Tharps 2014). We want to convey
this same respect. *Black*—like *Latino/a, Asian,* or *Arab*—refers to a culture, a community, and an ethnicity, and thus the word should be capitalized. In this sense, *white* is different, because most whites identify with more specific origins like Irish or Jewish (Waters 1996). Thus, we do not believe that *white* deserves the same treatment.
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