ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY: A NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS APPROACH
Dustin Mabry

This thesis explores a burgeoning social movement aimed at shaping the processes of food production and distribution, the Alternative Agrifood Movement. As a collection of initiatives, this movement seeks to mitigate environmental and social injustices perpetuated by the conventional agrifood system. An investigation of the movement is contextualized in social theory surrounding New Social Movements and Whiteness.

Research for this thesis focused on Alternative Agrifood Movement as experienced in the Humboldt Bay Region in Northern California. This research revealed tension between the two most prominent concepts of the alternative agrifood movement, sustainable agriculture and food security. In response to this tension, I promote the concept of community food security as a mediator. I illustrate how the community food security concept partners efforts of sustainable agriculture and food security. I stress that combining sustainable agriculture and food security work is fundamental for the success of the alternative agrifood movement. I conclude by stressing the importance of approaching food issues from a human rights framework while highlighting the role of race and whiteness throughout alternative agrifood efforts.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis focuses on the processes of food production and distribution, with an emphasis placed upon a burgeoning social movement aimed at actively shaping these processes (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982). The processes of food production and distribution are jointly understood as a food system (Allen 2004; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and Fisher 1998). The present-day food system in the United States is referred to as the Conventional Agrifood System and is associated with an array of problems (Anderson and Cook 1999; Fisher 2002; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982). Essentially, the conventional agrifood system is characterized by centralized control, market and technological dependence, competition-orientation, domination over nature, specialization of crops and livestock, and exploitation of natural resources and human beings (Allen 2004; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and Fisher 1998). Collectively, these characteristics promote and maintain environmental and social injustices (Allen 2004; Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999).

As a collection of initiatives which seek an alternative to the conventional agrifood system, alternative food initiatives (AFIs) comprise the social movement largely referred to as the Alternative Agrifood Movement (Allen 2004; Carroll 2006; Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003). This thesis delves into various theories surrounding New Social Movements (NSM), while illustrating the way in which the alternative agrifood movement acts as a
New Social Movement (Buechler 1995; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Cohen 1985; Edelman 2001; Eyerman and Jamison 1996).

This thesis explores the Alternative Agrifood Movement as experienced in the Humboldt Bay Region of Humboldt County. Hence, this research investigates a vast array of AFIs within the Humboldt Bay Region which collectively seek to establish a food system characterized by environmental sustainability and equitable accessibility. Establishing an understanding of these AFIs which comprise the local Alternative Agrifood Movement contributes to understanding efforts aimed at mitigating the environmental and social injustices perpetuated by the Conventional Agrifood System (Allen 2004, 1994; Allen et al. 2003a; Community Food Security Coalition N.d.; Fisher 2002; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998).

To understand the way in which the Alternative Agrifood Movement occurs in the Humboldt Bay Region, my research focuses on the knowledges and practices associated with the AFIs in the Humboldt Bay region. This task required inquiry into the knowledge-practices in which participants engaged (Allen 2004; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). In this thesis, I expand upon how knowledge-practices function in social movements and investigate the knowledge-practices in which actors of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region engage. In capturing these knowledge-practices, I employ the methods of participant observation (Babbie 2008; Bogdewic 1999; Jorgensen 1989; Lofland et al. 1995), key-informant interviews (Marshall 1996; Steinberg et

This research prompted discovery of tension between two prominent knowledges and practices within the AAM in the region: sustainable agriculture (Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Pollan 2006; Rigby and Caceres 2001) and food security (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004; Fisher 2002; Lappe and Collins 1982). In response to this tension, this thesis explores and promotes the concept of Community Food Security (CFS) as a potential mediator of tension in the movement (Allen 2004; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1998). I argue that the CFS concept seeks collaboration between the ideals of sustainable agriculture and food security, and that collaboration between them is pertinent to the success of the local and national AAM. In exploration of community food security, I highlight the way that CFS functions as a New Social Movement (Allen 2004; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Maxwell 1996; Winne et al. 1998).

I conclude by asserting that an understanding of the community food security concept is valuable in the struggle to realize an equitable distribution of healthy, nutritious and affordable food throughout communities in the United States. I assert that the potential of the community food security concept is, however, dependent upon the incorporation of the role of race as an issue which must be addressed throughout the work of the AAM.
STUDY SITE BACKGROUND

Physical Characteristics of Humboldt County

Humboldt County in the North Coast region of California which is physically isolated from other regions of California by mountains, rivers and the Pacific Ocean (See Figure 6) (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Parry 1963; Zalarvis-Chase 2010). The physical landscape of the county is made up by coastal redwood forests, expansive rugged coastlines, rivers and farm or ranch lands (Carroll 2006; Evelyn 1992; United States Bureau of the Census 2010). The Humboldt Bay Region is situated within a considerable distance from major metropolitan areas located approximately 275 miles north of San Francisco and 400 miles south of Portland, Oregon. The rural nature of the region fosters a lifestyle which actively engages with agriculture and natural systems (Betty 2008; Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Yeo, Trauth and Wong 2004; Zalarvis-Chase 2010).

The climatic conditions throughout Humboldt County foster the growth of an array of agricultural products (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010; Zalarvis-Chase 2010). Temperatures along the coastal areas are moderate, varying roughly 10 degrees between summer and winter, while inland areas experience more extreme deviation (National Weather Service 2011; Yeo et al. 2004; Stubblefield et al. 2010). Along the coastal regions, maximum temperatures will rarely exceed 80 degrees while inland areas experience temperatures exceeding 100 degrees every summer (National Weather Service 2011; Stubblefield et al. 2010). Total annual rainfall ranges from 40 inches in the
driest areas to over 100 inches in those which experience more moisture (National Weather Service 2011; Stubblefield et al. 2010). The array of temperature and rainfall variation throughout Humboldt County fosters the production of diverse crops and livestock which serve as a means of economic development for the region (Buckley 2009; Eschker et al. 2011; Yeo et al. 2004).

Humboldt County consists of roughly 130,000 residents (United States Bureau of the Census 2010), has experienced fleeting industries and high rates of poverty for the last several decades (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Eschker, Kirsch and Tescher 2011; Yeo et al. 2004). Humboldt County has undergone marked economic decline akin to rural communities through the Pacific Northwest region of the United States and experienced large decline in major natural resource industries of timber and fishing, (Burton and Alpert 1981; Eschker et al. 2011; Hackett 1999).

Carroll (2006) notes that the per capita income levels throughout Humboldt County where low, at $17,203, in context of California,$22,711, and the nation,$21,587 (United States Bureau of the Census 2010). This places 19.5% of the County’s population in poverty, high in context of California, 14.2%, and the nation, 12.4% (United States Bureau of the Census 2010). Economic growth in the county has largely resided in the service industry and government (Eschker et al. 2011; Hackett 1999; Yeo et al. 2004). However, organic niche-market agricultural production is viewed as a source of potential economic development for the region, and example of this in Humboldt County is organic wines, cheeses and Humboldt Grassfed Beef (Buckley 2009; Eschker et al. 2011). Along with niche-market organic agriculture production is a thriving cottage industry of mariju-
ana production which is widely recognized as a source of economic stability for the region (Buckley 2009; Trujillo 2011; Quinones 2010).

This research focuses on a small geographic area within Humboldt County in the, hereafter described as the “Humboldt Bay Region” (See Figure 7). In context of the various social and physical characteristics described below, this region exhibits characteristics which make it a unique setting for research on the alternative agrifood movement.

The Humboldt Bay Region largely consists of two towns, Eureka and Arcata, which lie on either sides of Humboldt Bay. As the county seat, Eureka is the largest city in Humboldt County, boasting a population of roughly 26,000 (United States Bureau of the Census 2010). Just 7 miles north of Eureka lies Arcata, a town of roughly 17,000 residents with a student population of at least 7,800 (Buckley 2009; Yeo et al. 2004; Zalarvis-Chase 2010). Taken together, Eureka and Arcata compose over 35% of the population for the county and are expected to remain as chief cites of population growth and economic development in the region (Eschker et al. 2011; Zalarvis-Chase 2010). In addition to being the population and economic centers of Humboldt County, the sociopolitical characteristics of the region assist in a further contextualization of this research.

Sociopolitical Climate of the Humboldt Bay Region

The Humboldt Bay Region is known as a leader in progressive environmental issues, which dominate much of the social and political landscape of the region (Betty 2008; Binkley 2002; Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Utne Reader 2005). Carroll (2006) evidences this political stance by citing Ralph Nader’s 13% vote in the 2000 presidential
election, a notable figure when compared with California’s average of 4% and less than 3% for the nation. Specifically, the town of Arcata maintains a reputation as one of America’s most progressive towns (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Utne Reader 2005). For example, The Utne Reader (2005) highlights Arcata as America’s “Top Ten Most Enlightened Towns,” for its election of a Green Party majority to city council. Arcata is also noted in the documentary film The Corporation (2003) for the establishment of a “Committee on Democracy and Corporations” to the city council which regulates corporate power within the municipality (City of Arcata 2011). In context of food production and efforts toward sustainable agriculture, The Arcata City Council passed successfully banned the growing and exchange of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) within city limits (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; North Coast Journal 2004). The progressive political atmosphere of the Humboldt Bay Region renders the area unique in context of the social and political climate of United States at large.

Food Production in Humboldt County

With regard to agricultural production, the North Coast region of California and Humboldt County in particular has historically served as a hub for the sustainable agriculture movement (Allen 2004; Buck, Getz and Guthman 1997; Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010). As the number of food producers converting to organic production techniques and new organic farming enterprise is on the rise, northern California continues to support sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Bramble 2009; Buck, Getz and Guthman 1997; Guthman 2003).
Food production throughout Humboldt County largely consists of small-scale farms which distribute the majority of their goods through direct marketing ventures such as farmers markets (Bramble 2009; Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006). The majority of farms, roughly 250, located in Humboldt County extend for 10-49 acres while the next largest portion of farms, roughly 190, range from just 1 to 9 acres (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010). The presence of small-scale, largely organic, farms engaged in direct marketing deems food production regions engaged with the sustainable agriculture movement (Allen 2004; Conford 2001; Hassanein 2003).

In addition to small-scale organic farms participating in direct marketing, Humboldt County’s food production is supplemented by an array of community gardens, cheese, dairy and ranching establishments which produce a substantial portion of food in the region (Bramble 2009; Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010). With approximately 50% of schools maintaining community gardens, strong food assistance programs and an increasing interest in local food distribution and processing, Humboldt County’s food production boasts a multitude of strengths and possibilities in light of the Alternative Agrifood Movement (Allen 2004; Bramble 2009; Stubblefield et al. 2010). However, the strengths and possibilities stemming from the food production in Humboldt County are met with a high level of food insecurity for the region (Buckley 2009; Carroll 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010).
Food Insecurity in Humboldt County

The presence of food insecurity in any region highlights the ways in which the area’s food system fails to serve certain community members (Bramble 2009; Buckley 2009; Maretzki and Tuckerman 2007; Stubblefield et al. 2010). Within Humboldt County, food insecurity rates are most prominent among low-income households headed by unmarried women with children and people of color (Arsdale 2008; Arsdale and Barry 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010). The presence of food insecurity within these populations highlights three variables that largely account for food insecurity throughout the United States (Allen 2004; Lappe and Collins 1982; Maretzki and Tuckerman 2007).

As evidenced in the United States, poverty is the most responsible variable for food insecurity throughout Humboldt County (Allen 2004; Bramble 2009; Buckley 2009; Stubblefield et al. 2010). In addition to income, family structure dictates food insecurity rates throughout the county wherein single mothers with children under the age of 18 are overrepresented (Arsdale 2008; Arsdale and Barry 2006; Stubblefield et al. 2010). Also, race has proven to be an indicating variable of food insecurity, with people of color experiencing high rates of food insecurity (Guthman 2008; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999; Slocum 2006; Nord et al. 2005). The similarities of food insecurity in Humboldt County and those of the United States supports the notion that food insecurity within the county may be approached in a similar manner as that in other regions of the country. Much of the work aimed at decreasing levels of food insecurity is subsumed in social movement as promoted in the Alternative Agrifood Movement (Allen 2004; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and Fisher 1998).
LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents of relevant literature related to the topic of sustainable agriculture, food security and the social movement associated with these efforts. The literature that focuses on food production and consumption is an established arena of inquiry that focuses on how individuals and organizations actively strive to better understand the way that food is produced, consumed, and distributed. (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004, 1994; Allen et al. 2003a; Community Food Security Coalition N.d.; Fisher 2002; Friedmann 1993; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982; Lang 2003; Maretzki and Tuckerman 2007; Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999; Slocum 2006; Winne and Fisher 1998). This chapter examines the literature related to understanding the food production and distribution processes within the context of the social movement concerned with these processes, the Alternative Agrifood Movement (Allen 2004; Anderson and Cook 1999; Carroll 2006; Joseph 1999).

As noted in the introduction, this thesis focuses on the Alternative Agrifood Movement (AAM). In delineating the way in which the AAM operates as a social movement, this section provides a general account of social movement literature while centering upon a “New Social Movement” approach (Buechler 1995; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Cohen 1985; Edelman 2001; Eyerman and Jamison 1996; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Habermas 1981; Hassanein, 2003; Inglehart 1990; Johnston et al. 1994; Melluci 1980, 1994; Offe 1985; Touraine 1988). The culmination of scholarship surrounding food and social movements highlights the way in which the AAM and the
concept of community food security in particular, comprise a new social movement

Alternative Agrifood Movement

When discussing the social movement surrounding agrifood issues, it is important to
investigate the nature of food systems. The production and distribution processes related
to food are jointly understood as a food system (Allen 2004; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and
Fisher 1998). While there are multiple ways of conceptualizing the predominant food
system of the United States, present-day food system is largely referred to as the
Conventional Agrifood System and is associated with an array of problems (Allen 2004;
Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999). Essentially, the
conventional agrifood system is characterized by centralized control, market and
technological dependence, competition-orientation, domination over nature,
specialization of crops and livestock, and exploitation of natural resources and human
beings (Allen 2004; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and Fisher 1998). Collectively, these
characteristics promote and maintain environmental and social injustices (Allen 2004;
Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999). The collection of
initiatives which seek an alternative to the conventional agrifood system is largely
referred to as the Alternative Agrifood Movement (Allen 2004; Carroll 2006; Friedmann
1993; Lang 2003).

The Alternative Agrifood Movement seeks a food system which is characterized by
decentralization, independence from markets and technology, a cooperative orientation,
harmonic relationship with nature, diversity of crops and livestock, restraint in resource consumption and dedication to social justice (Allen 2004). A massive assemblage of alternative food initiatives (AFIs), such as food policy councils, food banks, community gardens and community supported agriculture, the Alternative Agrifood Movement is a sweeping phenomenon worthy of recognition and exploration (Allen 2004; Allen et. al 2003; Gottlieb 2001; Winne and Fisher 1998). As there are multiple ways in which food issues are articulated, there are two prominent movements: the movement for sustainable agriculture and the movement for food security (Allen 2004; Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003). As these movements are not mutually exclusive, they offer a distinct analysis which differs in focus (Allen 2004, 1994).

Sustainable Agriculture

As this thesis maintains a larger focus upon food security and the concept of community food security, it is pertinent to define the central concept of sustainable agriculture. This examination will assist in the analysis of data due to the fact that much of the knowledge practices surrounding AFIs in Humboldt County resonate with the principles of sustainable agriculture.

The sustainable agriculture movement largely addresses food production processes (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Fisher 2002). This concept has charged the conventional agrifood system with marked environmental injustices while highlighting the way in which this system undermines small organic farmers throughout the world (Allen 2004). As the movement does address the social relations that farmers maintain with
communities, it is primarily focused on the way in which the conventional agrifood system contributes to environmental degradation, loss of biodiversity, implications of neoliberal agricultural policies and the introduction of toxic chemicals and genetically modified organisms (GMO’s) in nature (Carroll 2006; Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999). As a move away from the conventional agrifood system, sustainable agriculture holds the viability of small organic farming enterprise as its central effort (Carroll 2006; Rigby and Caceres 2001).

Organic Agriculture

Efforts for sustainable agriculture are often associated with organic agricultural production (Rigby and Caceres 2001). As organic food production has dominated production processes for millennia, the movement toward organic produce has only become an “alternative” since the mid-19th century move toward the conventional agrifood system (Conford 2001). As there is a multitude of definitions of organic farming, it is a practice which generally seeks food production processes that refrain from usage of toxic chemicals and procedures which deplete or otherwise destroy environmental systems (Allen 2004; Rigby and Caceres 2001; Carroll 2006; Oelhaf 1978). As market opportunities have increasingly opened for organic produce largely in recognition of the sustainable agriculture movement, regulations and industry motives have come to dominate much of the discourse surrounding organic foods (Carroll 2006; Rigby and Caceres 2001).
Food Security

Shifting focus away from food production, food security addresses food distribution (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Fisher 2002). The level of a community’s food security is understood in context of the community members’ ability to attain a consistent, healthy, and culturally appropriate diet (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Fisher 2002; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982). Known as “food deserts,” there are areas throughout the United States wherein individuals experience such high levels of food insecurity that they are unable to attain nutritious foods (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Fisher 2002). The food security concept addresses inequalities in food distribution and is responsible for revealing the social injustices stemming from a systematic lack of adequate access to nutritious and culturally appropriate foods for certain groups (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Fisher 2002; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982; Maretzki and Tuckerman 2007; Slocum 2006; Winne and Fisher 1998).

Historic Analysis of Food Security

To understand the contemporary efforts for food security, it is important to consider the way in which food security has been historically conceptualized in the United States. An investigation of the history of Food Security in the United States reveals the way in which the concept has been applied to varying efforts throughout time, aiding researchers in understanding its contemporary concerns in light of history. The historic variation in the conceptualization of food security has lead to a wide array of definitions, resulting in
over 200 descriptions over time (Maxwell 1996). Overall, the progression of the concept has narrowed in scope, moving from a global to a local perspective (Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996).

The Green Revolution and Food Security

An understanding of the way in which the concept of food security has narrowed in scope is fostered by a historic review of food security. Food security was first instituted in international development work during the 1960’s-1970’s (Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996; Sen 1981; von Braun 1992). During this period, food security initiatives sought to act in a manner that provides food aid to hunger-stricken regions throughout the world, particularly in Africa. The conceptualization of food security which assumed that the world was solely in need of a higher level of food production lead to place priority on producing food in food security efforts. This prioritization of food production processes legitimated an increase in mechanization in food production (Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999).

Aiming to produce as much food as possible, the “Green Revolution” shaped the conceptualization of food security during the 1970’s (Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999). An increase in petroleum inputs and mechanization in food production processes expanded yields throughout the United States in a way never seen before (Patel 2008). However, many scholars (Allen 2004; Lappe and Collins 1982; Patel 2008; Pollan 2006; Shiva 1999) illustrate how this idea has failed to render the world more food secure. Conversely, the Green Revolution has motivated extreme environmental and social
injustices and in no way increases equitable access to nutritious food (Allen 2004; Lappe and Collins 1982; Patel 2008; Shiva 1999).

The Green Revolution relied upon the notion that hunger is simply solved by providing immediate food aid to those in need (Allen 2004; Lappe and Collins 1982; Patel 2008; Shiva 1999). The emphasis on providing immediate food aid failed to focus on the ability to sustain food aid over time. The prioritization of short-term nutritional intake became known as the “food first” model and dominated food security efforts for two decades (von Braun 1992; Maxwell 1996). However, this notion of food security as measurable by immediate caloric intake for individuals negates several factors such as an individual’s age, health, workload, behavior, culture, etc. (Maxwell 1996).

It was during the early 1980’s when the variable of access to food was introduced, focusing on viable and consistent access to food by individuals or households (Anderson and Cook 1999; Sen 1981). The focus on access motivated a shift which emphasized food aid that would reach beyond short-term nutritional intake. This shift was still largely applied to the Global South from the United States, however it drastically altered the way in which food security was understood and had major domestic implications.

**Access to Food**

The notion of access opened the doors to an understanding of food security which centered upon a “livelihood” perspective (Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996). The livelihood perspective of food security sought to discredit claims to objectivity as hailed by the calorie-counting food security researchers of the past (Maxwell 1996). Instead,
the livelihood perspective emphasized the importance of a secure and stable livelihood as a necessary condition of food security (Maxwell 1996). First, this framework was larger in scope and required food security initiatives to incorporate a longer time-frame planning horizon than the food-first framework. Second, the livelihood perspective de-centered daily caloric intake as the prominent point of measurement, bringing more subjective dimensions into focus. These subjective measures include the quality of food, appropriateness of food in varied diets, and quelling the anxiety promoted by unreliable food accessibility (Anderson and Cook 1999).

Narrowing the scope of food security further, concern over issues of domestic hunger in the United States arouse during the 1990’s (Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996; Pothukucki et al. 2002). This was largely motivated by a discovery of great food insecurity in the U.S., the wealthiest and most plentiful nation on Earth (Anderson and Cook 1999). During this time, domestic food security efforts employed a medical model of food security (Maxwell 1996). This medical model addressed the issue of food security by striving to identify the presence of clearly observable and quantifiable factors of food insecurity at the individual and household level (Maxwell 1996; Pothukucki et al. 2002). The subjective dimensions were once again unaccounted for. However, during the late 1980’s and 1990’s several organizations and individuals addressed domestic food security in a manner applicable to Maxwell’s (1996) livelihood perspective of food security. It is from these organizations and individuals, described below, that the concept of community food security was born (Allen 2004; Anderson and Cook 1999).
Community Food Security

In contrast to the international and individualized model of food security proposed prior to the 1990’s, the concept of community food security (CFS) maintains its level of analysis at the community level and promotes self-reliance and preventative measures toward community-level health (Allen 2004; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998). Scholars stress that a key development in CFS work was the initiation of the Community Food Security Coalition, incorporated in 1997 (Allen 2004). With approximately 700 members, over 120 of which are organizations, the Community Food Security Coalition is the front running organization promoting the CFS concept (Allen 2004; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998). The definition of “food security” provided by the Community Food Security Coalition (N.d.) stresses that food security is the ability of “all persons to obtain at all times a culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through local non-emergency sources.” According to the Coalition, CFS maintains six basic principles (Community Food Security Coalition N.d.).

First, community food security must focus its efforts on those who experience the most need, the most food-insecure populations. Second, community food security must address a wide range of issues within the food system, including farmland, pollution and transportation. Third, community food security maintains a community-level focus by developing community resources such as farmers markets and community-based food processing venues. Fourth, community food security promotes self-reliance and empowerment which stresses a democratization of decision making. Fifth, community food security asserts that a localized small scale organic agricultural base is essential.
This principle stresses that strong ties between the producers and consumers of foods fosters relationship building, education, and improved livelihoods. Finally, the sixth principle of CFS emphasizes a collaborative approach that necessarily includes participants from an array of disciplines, professions, and organizations (Community Food Security Coalition N.d.).

These six principles collectively seek environmental and social justice, while building a reliable local food production system in order to promote food security for the long-term (Allen 2004, 1999; Gottlieb 2001; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998). While the emphasis on the localization of decision making highlights the role of CFS in the democratization of the food system. In order to achieve its diverse mission and to solidify its characterization as a social movement, CFS advocates actively seek to redress communities’ lack of control over their food production and distribution systems (Poppendieck 1998). Evidence in CFS activities is found in the empirical establishment and support of localized alternative food institutions (Allen 2004). As an avenue which may breach the differences in Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security (see below), these venues serve both consumers and producers, rendering the acquisition of nutritious foods and small-scale farming more viable.

Researchers have identified three primary contributors to the development and implementation of CFS (Allen 2004; Anderson and Cook 1999; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998). First, there are an array of community nutritionists and educators who focus on providing nutritional education (Campbell 1989). These
contributors stress that issues of food access are inherently tied to community-level nutrition and health, with a focus on community involvement in decision-making processes (Anderson and Cook 1999). Second, progressive agricultural researchers and grass-roots activists focus on food production and distribution with a goal of promoting environmentally-sound and just food practices (Allen 1994; Gliessman 1998). Third, anti-hunger and community development researchers and activists focus on hunger and poverty reduction (Fisher and Gottlieb 1995; Poppendieck 1998). Anti-hunger and community development actors are dedicated to efforts such as establishing food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens. Additionally, community development workers are actively working within food-system planning organizations such as food policy councils (Anderson and Cook 1999). Taken together, scholars associate the contributions of actors listed above as pivotal in the application of the community food security concept (Fisher and Gottlieb 1995; Poppendieck 1998). An analysis of social movements, New Social Movements in particular, is essential in order to highlight the way in which the alternative agrifood movement serves as a new social movement which challenges the prevailing discourse of the conventional agrifood system (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Hassanein 2003; Winne and Fisher 1998).

New Social Movements

The body of scholarship on NSMs is immense, with authors vigorously discussing the formation, transformation, and implications of new social movements (Buechler 1995; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Cohen 1985; Edelman 2001; Eyerman and Jamison 1996;
Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Habermas 1981; Hassanein, 2003; Inglehart 1990; Johnston et al. 1994; Melluci 1980, 1994; Offe 1985; Touraine 1988). The “newness” of new social movements is in regard to their difference from more traditional social movements. An example of a traditional or “old” social movement is found in the Labor Movement, in which Marxist ideology drives the collective struggle over material gains (Tilly 2004). NSM scholars assert that a shift in social movement phenomena, animated in the late 1960’s and largely studied since the mid 1980’s, motivated a change in the ideological and symbolic characteristics of social movements (Beuchler 1995; Edelman 2001; Johnston et al. 1994; Melucci 1994; Habermas 1981).

The birth of NSM is cited as a reaction to the shift in social organization from “industrial” to a “postindustrial” society (Edelman 2001; McMichael 2000; Touraine 1971, 1988). Characterized by “modernity,” industrial society featured concrete relationships wherein members organized around rationality, a manufacturing-based economy, and physically engaging relationships (Touraine 1971). The shift to postindustrial society is accompanied by a social structure which is largely organized around the transmission of information, services and surveillance (Touraine 1971). Postindustrial society is more than ever imbued with symbolic, informational, and cultural resources (Edelman 2001; Touraine 1971). Some scholars even stress that society is now so characteristic of symbolic representation that the distinction between what is real and what is not is at times impossible to make (Baudrillard 1981). The abundance of abstraction and transition characteristic of postindustrial society serves as a source of alienation and disempowerment among its members, sentiments which have motivated a
crisis in modernity (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Melucci 1994; Touraine 1971). This crisis prompts individuals and organizations to mitigate the sense of isolation and disempowerment rooted in postindustrial life (Edelman 2001).

Rather than seek material change as a body of collective actors, NSMs seek to exercise their power in search for a fulfilling way of life (Edelman 2001). This shift places them in a qualitatively different arena than that of traditional working-class movements (Cohen 1985; Johnston et al. 1994; Offe 1985). Traditional social movements often rest their ideological stance within all-encompassing narratives such as Marxism, while NSMs such as the alternative agrifood movement exhibit a pluralism of ideas, values, organizational forms, identities and goals (Johnston et al. 1994). Also, the social position of NSM actors is often not of a shared economic class but that of a shared social status such as gender, sexual orientation, or lifestyle (Klandermans and Oegema 1987). Hence, the work of NSMs involves personal aspects of life. The struggles of these movements entail the lived experience of their members regarding issues such as identity construction, consumptive practices and emotional attachments. The relation between the individual and the collective is often blurred in NSMs, wherein the work of movements is often acted out by individuals rather than by mobilized groups (Johnston et al. 1994). Through individual daily experience and as collective groups, NSMs seek to affect political structures by seeking democratization of decision making processes and a legitimation of their critiques of status quo social organization (Offe 1985; Cohen 1985).
Knowledge Production in New Social Movements

The valuation of knowledge is a key component of postindustrial society, wherein knowledge becomes a valued commodity that shapes political and cultural processes (Touraine 1971). Therefore, a key factor in maintaining control in postindustrial society lies in the power to define situations (Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Fairclough 2001). Scholars of NSMs stress the importance of understanding the way in which knowledge is treated in context of social movements, arguing that NSMs operate as networks which produce and act upon an array of critical understandings of the world (Allen 2004; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). This understanding of social movements as producers of knowledge allows scholars and activists to approach movements as bodies which affect political and cultural processes particular to postindustrial societies (Casas-Cortes et al. 2008).

Knowledge-Practices

The knowledge production capacity of NSMs is evident in what scholars have termed knowledge-practices (Allen 2004; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). Knowledge-practices compose the epistemological stance in which movement actors engage and act upon (Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). Taking the form of narratives, ideologies, theories and expertise, knowledge-practices are fundamental components of social movements and the actors that comprise them (Casas-Cortes et al. 2008). Scholars argue that knowledge-practices makeup a movement’s discursive influence, where movements find their central activity and power (Allen 2004;
Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). The discursive influence, as a culmination of knowledge-practices may indeed actively work to undermine dominate ideologies against which social movements fight (Allen 2004; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996).

Alternative Agrifood Movement as a New Social Movement

An application of the NSM literature to that of the alternative agrifood movement (AAM) highlights the way in which the movement operates as a NSM. The traits which discern certain social movements as NSMs maintain a large presence in the AAM literature (Allen 2004, 1994; Hassanein 2003).

The way in which this movement interacts with the crisis in modernity is evident in the knowledge-practices found in AAM activity (Allen 2004). A sense of alienation, stemming from a disconnection between production and consumption of food, is extensively cited throughout the AAM literature (Allen 2004; McMichael 2000; Shiva 1999). The alienation is coupled with the abundant information which critiques the conventional agrifood system. As people are introduced to the environmental and social injustices of this system, they begin to question their role and often seek action (Allen 2004). As individuals, organizations and institutions seek a more environmentally and socially just food system, they also work to create networks which mitigate the alienating nature of conventional food system (Allen 2004; Hassanein 2003; McMichael 2000).
Moreover, the way in which the AAM is attached to the personal lived experience of actors is of particular significance. The notion that CFS promotes culturally appropriate and desirable foods supports the idea that this movement is inherently engaged in cultural production (Hassanein 2003; McMichael 2000). Additionally, the movement creates a space wherein people develop meaningful interpersonal relationships (Doherty 2006; Gottlieb 2001). These subjective elements, among others (see Community Food Security), represent the cultural and ideological knowledge-practices of the AAM which renders a new social movement approach appropriate.

Additionally, a feature of NSMs that distinguishes them from other movements is the multiplicity of ideological frameworks within individual movements. This diversity of ideological frameworks is found in the AAM, a movement exhibiting a vast array of ideals, values, organizational forms, identities and goals (Allen 2004; Doherty 2006; Gottlieb 2001). The diversity of ideological frameworks highlights the notion that actors within this movement participate for a wide range of reasons and they seek to affect change in a number of ways. For instance, a populist agrarian ideology which largely permeates American farming culture generally ascribes to conservative values whereas urban food security work is generally motivated by progressive principles (Allen 2004). This difference in ideological stance does not, however, render these two groups unable to collectively participate in the AAM (Allen 2004). The efforts of small-scale farmers often driven by conservative values are an indispensable element of the AAM movement. This is a far different ideological approach than that taken by urban community
organizers who fight to establish nutritional food outlets for low income neighborhoods. Yet, the two diverse actors and actions are complementary in achieving the goals of AAM and community food security (Allen 2004).

The diverse efforts of the AAM collectively act as a knowledge producing agent with notable discursive power (Allen 2004, 1994). These efforts shape the values and knowledges which drive our understandings and actions surrounding food issues. By articulating an understanding of an agrifood system which seeks to undermine the conventional system, the CFS movement actively influences producers and consumers of food around the world (Allen 2004).
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework presented in Figure 1 delineates the key concepts used in this thesis and highlights the relationships between them. By exploring the concepts and demonstrating the way in which they interact, the conceptual framework is a guide for interpretation of the data presented in this thesis. The model entitled “A Model for Community Food Security,” in Figure 1 is a visual illustration of my conceptual framework. The model highlights the way in which the Alternative Agrifood Movement is compartmentalized into efforts toward sustainable agriculture and food security. Additionally, this conceptual model illustrates the way in which a culmination of the two efforts toward sustainable agriculture and food security serve to realize the goal of community food security as explored in this thesis.
Alternative Agrifood Movement

The Alternative Agrifood Movement (AAM) encompasses efforts toward a more socially and environmentally just food system (Allen 1999, 2004; Doherty 2006; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998). The movement is a composition of Alternative Food Initiatives (AFIs) which collectively seek the realization of a food system characterized by decentralization, independence from markets and technology, a cooperative orientation, harmonic relationship with nature, diversity of crops and livestock, restraint in resource consumption and dedication to social justice (Allen 1999, 2004; Doherty 2006). As an applied concept, the AAM is a burgeoning social movement with vast implications for policy and action throughout the United States (Allen 1999, 2004; Doherty 2006; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998). As an intellectual concept, the Alternative Agrifood Movement allows scholars to assess and critique the salient knowledge-practices associated with the rather disparate array or groups and individuals comprising the movement (Anderson and Cook 1999; Gottlieb and Fisher 1996; Maxwell 1996;). As discussed above, a central element of the AAM lies in efforts toward sustainable agriculture.

Sustainable Agriculture

Efforts for sustainable agriculture are primarily centered on mitigating the environmental degradation stemming from the conventional agrifood system and reinstating the economic viability of small-scale organic farming (Allen 2004; Carroll 2006; Conford 2001; Hassanein 2003). To accomplish this goal, proponents of sustainable agriculture largely seek to reinstate viability in small-scale organic farming
enterprise (Allen 2004; Hassanein 2003; Carroll 2006). By highlighting the environmental implications of conventional agrifood practices and the need to promote small scale organic agriculture, sustainable agriculture is primarily involved in food production processes (Allen 2004; Carroll 2006; Conford 2001; Hassanein 2003). Evidence of efforts toward sustainable agriculture can be readily seen in the promotion of organic foods and within the recently accelerated growth of direct marketing ventures such as farmers markets (Carroll 2006; Conford 2001; Hassanein 2003).

Food Security

This research has revealed the importance of establishing a concrete definition of food security during instances of discussion surrounding the topic. As Maxwell (1996) noted, the concept of food security revealed nearly two hundred definitions at the time of his publication. There were two predominant definitions arising from this research. One definition of food security details the concept as solely concerned with the ability of a community to feed itself (Allen et al. 2003; Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996). This conceptualization of food security looks to factors of food production and consumption, analyzing whether or not a certain area can produce an appropriate amount of food to sustain that area’s population. When acted upon, this notion of food security may or may not address inequalities of food distribution (Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996). It is the second definition of food security employed throughout this research.
The concept of food security as employed in this research drives the work of numerous AFIs within the AAM. This definition of food security largely refers to efforts toward insuring the consistent availability of healthy, culturally appropriate foods to all people (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003; Anderson and Cook 1999; Winne et al. 1995; Winne and Fisher 1998). The Community Food Security Coalition defines food security as “all persons obtaining, at all times, a culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through local, non-emergency sources” (Gottlieb 2001:183). This definition renders food security chiefly involved with issues of food distribution (Allen 2004). Within this definition is attention toward the goal of food security, to make available acceptable foods at all times, as well as toward the method, through non-emergency sources (Gottlieb 2001). By attending to the inequalities in food distribution, the concept of food security reveals the social injustices stemming from a systematic lack of access to healthy and culturally appropriate foods for certain groups (Anderson and Cook 1999; Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003; Fisher 2002; Joseph 1999; Lappe and Collins 1982; Maretzki and Tuckerman 2007; Slocum 2006; Winne and Fisher 1998).

Community Food Security

As a culmination of efforts which seek to align those of sustainable agriculture and those of food security, the concept of community food security encompasses an array of efforts to achieve environmentally and socially just food systems (Allen 2004; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Winne and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1998). In the promotion of connecting sustainable agriculture with food security, the Community Food Security
Coalition actively promotes local small-scale organic farming while adding that the food produced through such means must be accessible to low-income individuals:

CFS promotes regional agriculture as a counterpoint to the increasingly global and corporate food system. Local food systems principles include the consumer as a vital part of the equation. CFS supports efforts to link low-income consumers with local farmers, using vehicles such as direct farmer-to-consumer marketing (Winne et al. 1998: 8).

The insistence of linking “low-income consumers with local farmers” through “vehicles such as direct farmer-to-consumer marketing” highlights a predominant goal of community food security (Allen 2004; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1998). As articulated above, such linkages between low-income consumers and food producers may realize themselves in efforts to promote the establishment of farmers markets in low-income neighborhoods (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004).

Efforts aimed at connecting sustainable agriculture with food security reveal the way in which the community food security concept asserts that mutually beneficial partnerships between food producers and consumers lie at the heart of an alternative agrifood system (Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1998). By seeking to establish a relationship between low-income consumers and local farmers, community food security reveals itself as a culmination of efforts toward sustainable agriculture and food security.

Discussion of Conceptual Model

Within the Model for Community Food Security (See Figure 1), the bi-directional arrows connecting Alternative Agrifood Movement with Sustainable Agriculture and
Food Security highlight the reciprocal relationship between the three concepts. These relationships suggest the Alternative Agrifood Movement is largely comprised of efforts for Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security (Allen 1999, 2004; Doherty 2006; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998; Maxwell 1996). Hence, the reciprocal relationships established in my conceptual model render the three concepts, alternative agrifood movement, sustainable agriculture and food security contingent on the actions and conceptualizations of each other.

An example of the reciprocal relationship between the alternative agrifood movement and sustainable agriculture is found in the history of the California Agrarian Action Project (Allen et al. 2003a; Allen et al2003b; Community Alliance with Family Farmers 2011; Campbell 2000). The California Agrarian Action Project (CAAP) began as activist efforts aimed at protecting farm workers from the pesticide poisoning and job losses due to the mechanized tomato harvester developed at the University of California, Davis (Allen et al2003b; Community Alliance with Family Farmers 2011). Such action sought to subvert the conventional agrifood system, and it aligned this organization with the alternative agrifood movement (Allen et al. 2003a; Allen et al2003b; Campbell 2000). Over time, CAAP moved to spearhead many campaigns surrounding pesticide poisoning, worker’s rights and the ecological impacts of industrialized agriculture (Allen et al. 2003a; Campbell 2000). In 1993, CAPP experienced a transformation which officially wedded the organization with the California Association of Family Farmers (CAFF), a move which narrowed CAPP’s efforts to issues of sustainable agriculture (Allen et al. 2003a; Allen et al2003b). CAFF now promotes the variability of the family farm and
organic agriculture through the organizing of farmers markets, spearheading conferences and publications surrounding organic agriculture and supporting research on localized food systems (Allen et al. 2003b; Community Alliance with Family Farmers 2011). In fact, Campbell (2000) asserts:

CAFF represents a narrow slice of the sustainable agriculture movement in California […]. Nevertheless, […] it is the largest (in terms of staff and budget) nonprofit sustainable agriculture organization in the state and its five guiding principles reflect a broad conception of the movement and its mission (355).

The way in which CAFF has formed and transformed throughout history illustrates the relationship between the alternative agrifood movement (AAM) and sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003b; Campbell 2000). As a key organization of sustainable agriculture, CAFF serves as an influential body which affects the AAM’s conceptualization of sustainable agriculture, while the AAM serves to influence the efforts of CAFF (Campbell 2000).

The conceptual model (Figure 1) also highlights the relationship between the AAM and food security. An example which illustrates the reciprocal relationship between the alternative agrifood movement and food security is found in the People’s Grocery in West Oakland, CA (Allen 2004; Allen and Melcarek 2009; Haletky et al. 2006). The People’s Grocery is an organization which provides food, oversees community gardens and holds various workshops on nutrition, food production and community organizing throughout their community (Allen and Melcarek 2009; People’s Grocery 2011). The
organization asserts that access to healthy food is a basic human right, and they actively seek to improve the health and economy of West Oakland (Allen and Melcarek 2009; People’s Grocery 2011). As an organization which overtly seeks to increase food access for a low-income community, the People’s Grocery aligns itself with the goals of food security (Allen 2004; Haletky et al. 2006). Additionally, the way in which this organization interacts with the alternative agrifood movement is illustrated through its philosophy, “We want to change the way the food system works” (People’s Grocery 2011). As an entity which seeks food security through the means of altering the conventional agrifood system, the People’s Grocery serves as an empirical example of reciprocity between the concepts of food security and the alternative agrifood movement (Allen and Melcarek 2009; Haletky et al. 2006).

Additionally, the unidirectional arrows connecting food security and sustainable agriculture with the concept of Community Food Security illustrate the way in which community food security is seen as an assemblage of efforts for sustainable agriculture and food security. This relationship is promoted through the work of the Community Food Security Coalition (Winne, Joseph and Fisher 1997), which seeks to:

synthesize many disparate fields, including community economic development, environmentalism, community gardening, sustainable agriculture, nutrition/public health, and anti-hunger into a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts (7).

An example of this model in its entirety can be found in San Francisco, California. The Community Food Security Coalition cites St. Mary’s Youth Farm as an established AFI
which represents the community food security concept (Norman and Sempik 2001; Winne, Joseph and Fisher 1997). The San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG) developed and continues to maintain an urban youth farm which provides fresh organic produce to residents of a food insecure community (Thompson and Sorvig 2008; Ferris, Norman and Sempik 2001; Winne, Joseph and Fisher 1997). As an initiative which specifically strives to harness sustainable agricultural practices in order to alleviate food insecurity, this project highlights the way in which community food security combines efforts for sustainable agriculture with those of food security (Ferris, Norman and Sempik 2001; Winne, Joseph and Fisher 1997). The success and support for this project highlights the way in which sustainable agriculture and food security compose of a larger social movement surrounding agrifood issues (Thompson and Sorvig 2008; Ferris et al. 2001; Winne, Joseph and Fisher 1997).

The linear nature of the conceptual model (Figure 1) illustrates a key argument in this thesis which asserts that the AAM is largely composed of efforts toward sustainable agriculture and food security and that a coalescence of these efforts are promoted by the concept of community food security. The conceptual model presents the alternative agrifood movement as simultaneously shaping and being shaped by the concepts of sustainable agriculture and food security. The culmination of the relationships between the alternative agrifood movement, sustainable agriculture and food security serves to craft the concept of community food security. The model developed in this thesis clarifies the way in which community food security works to align the often disparate efforts of
sustainable agriculture and food security to seek equality of access to healthy, culturally appropriate foods as produced through small-scale organic agriculture.
METHODS

Introduction

As a set of guidelines and prescriptions, a research method acts as a tool with which researchers approach any object of inquiry (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003). This thesis employs a mixed methods approach (Creswell 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003; Mason 2006). The mixed methods approach harnesses a number of methods when capturing and analyzing an object of inquiry (Berg 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003; Mason 2006). By using a variety of methods, the researcher is able to capture differing sets of data which will ultimately provide a more holistic understanding of the researched phenomenon than would a single data set (Creswell 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003; Mason 2006). The availability of differing data sets allows the researcher to check one set of data against another, an act which strengthens the findings (Creswell 2009; Lofland et al. 1995; Mason 2006). Additionally, the employment of a mixed method approach allows researchers to address issues in a way that interacts with differing knowledges and understandings as they are presented within a single researched object (Creswell 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003; Mason 2006). Thus, the mixed methods approach to this research allowed me to capture and analyze data in a manner superior to the employment of a single method.

The methods employed in this research included: participant observation (Bogdewic 1999; Jorgensen 1989; Lofland et al. 1995), Key-Informant interviews (Marshall 1996; Steinberg et al. 2008; Tremblay 2009) and content analysis (Babbie
2008; Berg 2009; Neuendorf 2002; Weber 1990). This research employs three differing methods in order to create multiple bodies of data regarding a particular phenomenon, an approach referred to as a “triangulation of data” (Denzin 1970; Berg 2009; Yin 2009). This process of triangulating data requires that the researcher must compare her/his data as gathered across methods, a process that renders a more holistic understanding of the topic (Berg 2009; Creswell 2009; Denzin 1970; Mason 2006; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003; Yin 2009). Rather than assuming a theoretical framework prior to data collection, the data generated through a mixed methods approach served as the premier guide to the theoretical analysis.

Grounded Theory

In an attempt to capture the knowledge-practices in which actors of local AFIs engage, this thesis was guided by grounded theory (Dey 1999; Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1997). As many sociologists typically work within established theoretical perspectives in hopes of verifying its applicability and veracity, grounded theory seeks to generate a theoretical framework directly from the data (Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1997). The emphasis on generating theory from the data asserts that the gathering of information precedes and informs the creation of a theoretical understanding of the object of inquiry (Glaser and Strauss 1967). A grounded theory approach consists of simultaneously gathering and analyzing data, a process enabling researchers to develop research questions and theoretical understandings concurrently (Dey 1999; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1997).
By incorporating a grounded theory approach and through using mixed methods, I was able to formulate an understanding of the researched phenomena through a direct engagement with data. Rather than striving to align the findings from this research with a previously established theoretical framework, the grounded theory approach promotes a direct link between the data and subsequent analysis. The grounded theory approach renders this research more applicable to current and future issues surrounding the alternative agrifood movement and community food security.

Participant Observation

My grounded theory approach began by directly attending and participating in events and organizations related to the work of alternative food initiatives (AFIs) in the Humboldt Bay Region. This method, termed participant observation, demands that the researcher move beyond passive observation to assume a participatory role within the situation of interest (Babbie 2008; Bogdewic 1999; Jorgensen 1989; Lofland et al. 1995; Yin 2009). Participant observation allows the researcher to cover events as they occur while gaining insight into the more nuanced phenomenon at hand (Yin 2009). My direct participation with AFIs throughout the Humboldt Bay Region illuminated and contextualized the knowledge-practices in which actors of local AFIs were engaged.

Initially, I sought to connect myself with local AFIs through the act of growing my own food in a community garden. I was introduced to this community garden group by chance. When I first re-located to Humboldt County, I moved into a house of young people whom where active in a local community garden project. I built off of these social
connections to establish myself as a participant in the local garden group. My extensive experience with the particular community garden project placed me in unique situations wherein I was able to network and learn from people with extensive experience in growing and preparing food. The networking proved vital in informing my understanding of various AFIs throughout the Humboldt Bay Region.

My field research period ranged from 2009-2010 during which time I attended twelve meetings, seven work days, three workshops, four film showings, two conferences and eleven post-event gatherings (See Table 1) during which I was able to revel in the knowledge-practices of local AFIs. These conversations and meetings served to establish a solid understanding of the issues, topics and context related to the work of AFIs in the local region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Observation Event</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
<th>Participant Observation Event Explored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>An organized space wherein individuals involved in AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region gather to discuss a topic and accomplish goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Day</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>An event in which actors of AFIs collectively engage in work surrounding food issues. These typically involved labor aimed at food production such as building a green house or preparing garden beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Workshops aimed at transferring skills regarding food production and community organizing around food issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Showing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The screening of films dealing with food issues. The film showings typically involved pre and post discussions around issues presented in the featured film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organized gatherings wherein representatives of AFIs in the Region present their work in order to promote and receive comment upon their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Event Gathering</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Post-event gatherings of individuals from AFIs. Located in houses or in public spaces such as bars and coffee shops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Participant Observation Events Explored
The numerous events surrounding the work of AFI's in the Region spanned a multitude of topics and activities (See Table 1). The events also featured a range of formality and structure. For instance, a conference regarding food security maintained a formal structure with agendas, presentations, organized workshops and panel discussions. The structure of a differing event, such as a workday, may have no true structure other than a set of tasks from which an individual may chose.

Throughout my participant observation I was able to interact with an array of individuals and organizations addressing a number of issues regarding the work of AFI's in the Region (See Table 1). These individuals represented a wide range of social and occupational statuses, from high-profile policy makers to farmers. The status of those in attendance was generally determined in the topical nature of the event. For instance, a conference focused on sustainable agriculture would generally draw a different crowd than a workshop on the role of food in social activism. Within this example, a conference on sustainable agriculture may draw farmers and policy makers whereas a social activism workshop may draw activists and students. This, however, is a largely general observation that would be strengthened through further research regarding patterns of attendance in AFI events.

My experience as a participant in this movement proved pivotal in my understanding of AFI's in the region. As spaces wherein actors discussed the work of AFI's in the region and beyond, the events served to actively create and sustain my understanding of the alternative agrifood movement. Whether I was shoveling manure in the rain, engaging with policymakers or participating in a post-film discussion, the
participatory interactions with local AFIs cultivated an in-depth understanding of knowledge-practices in which actors engage. This in-depth understanding was furthered through an engagement with actors of AFIs in an interview setting.

Key-Informant Interview

Subsequent to the majority of my participant observation experience was the employment of key-informant interviews (Marshall 1996; Steinberg et al. 2008; Tremblay 2009). The key-informant interview seeks to gather information from individuals who are recognized as local experts on a particular object of inquiry (Steinberg et al. 2008). These local experts may maintain their positions due to a particular status as well as an interest and aptitude for guided observation of their surroundings (Marshall 1996; Tremblay 2009). As embedded within a particular social context, key-informants may be in a chief position to reveal knowledge-practices in which actors of local AFIs engage.

Researchers have identified numerous ways in which an interview may be conducted (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970). Among the various interview structures lie three prominent techniques: the standardized, semistandardized and unstandardized (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009). These interview structures differ in their adherence to formality, in which one structure may be more formalized than another. Formality of an interview refers to the manner that an interviewer approaches the situation. For instance, a standardized form consists of predetermined questions addressed in a particular order with little to no allowance for deviation (Babbie 2008;
Berg 2009; Denzin 1970). Contrarily, the unstandardized form consists of little to no predetermined questions or order, allowing the interview to be shaped by the particular interview situation (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970). Spread along a continuum of formality, the standardized interview involves a rigid dedication to form, the unstandardized imposes no form and the semistandardized follows a flexible form (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970).

The semistandardized interview was chosen due to its flexible form that proved to maintain consistent guidance while allowing for fluidity throughout the interview process (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009). Interviews were conducted with 15 key-informants at various locations throughout the Humboldt Bay Region with a mean duration of 49 minutes. Through the employment of a semistandardized form, I approached each interview with a small set of topical questions that could be addressed at any point of the interview process. This form of interviewing proved able in capturing knowledge-practices in which actors engage.

Interview Question Development

The process of developing interview questions was guided by grounded theory and NSM literature. My initial question development was inspired by the basic grounded theory question, “What is happening here?” (Glaser 1978). By approaching any phenomenon in this manner, the researcher is required to start with “what” questions which lead to “who” and “why” questions (Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1997). I sought to develop topical questions which would lead to an
understanding of “what is happening” with regard to food and community gardens in the Humboldt Bay region. This involved identifying and examining the knowledge-practices in which actors of local AFIs were engaged.

I developed open-ended topical questions regarding the actor’s motivations, understandings and concerns regarding their involvement in local AFIs. I composed the topical questions in a way that would entice participants to elaborate on the issues most important to them. I actively probed participants, asking them to elaborate on certain issues of importance in order to acquire in-depth information. For instance, if an interviewee stated that she was “concerned over low-income folks’ access to healthy food,” I would probe her by asking questions such as “can you tell me more about that?” or “what do you mean by ‘access to healthy food?’” The use of probing techniques throughout the semi-structured interview process allowed me to capture rich data surrounding the knowledge-practices in which actors were engaged.

Sampling

In this study I used a purposive sampling technique to develop a sample of interviewees; I intentionally chose which individuals and data to analyze due to relevance to the topic (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009). This sampling technique entails “Theoretical Sampling,” wherein the researcher specifically seeks to develop theory grounded in a particular population or event (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Charmaz 2002). In order to strengthen the findings from interviews, I asked each interviewee to recommend a person that they may know who is engaged in local AFIs. This process is referred to as
“snowball sampling” (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009). Snowball sampling allows the researcher to identify groups and individuals with whom they may have otherwise been unaware or uninvited (Berg 2009).

Throughout my sampling, I sought to interview visible actors of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region. My role as a participant in various efforts involving local AFIs fostered an awareness of the individuals and organizations that played key roles in the Region. I contacted these key-informants and requested interviews from them. Upon agreement to an interview, we scheduled a meeting that best suited both parties. Through the use of snowball sampling (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Yin 2009), I discussed with the interviewees whether or not they could recommend another person for an interview. Most interviewees were able to quickly mention others which could potentially inform my research. Through the use of snowball sampling I was able to speak with actors who undoubtedly strengthened the results of this research. Specifically, the technique connected me to actors that I otherwise would have been unable to speak with or unaware of their participation in AFIs. After of the interviews were conducted and transcribed I poured over the narratives in search of salient themes, a method known as content analysis (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970).

Content Analysis

To analyze the content of any body of material is to systematically identify patterns, themes and meanings (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970). The assessment of any document, be it a brochure or interview, guides the researcher toward a coherent
understanding of the object of inquiry. This assessment process is undertaken through the employment of a technique referred to as coding (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970). Coding involves the usage of labels to categorize and give meaning to pieces of information in any document or situation (Berg 2009). This is a first step which moves the researcher from simple description toward a conceptual understanding of the data (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Denzin 1970).

I began the content analysis by coding the 15 interview transcriptions. I initially coded the interview transcriptions by identifying salient themes and points of particular interest with the use of the computer program Atlas ti Version5.2. This process entailed a detailed reading of the interview transcription. Throughout the reading of transcriptions I sought out recurrent themes, as illustrated through repeated phrases or ideas. These themes were then explored and rendered into a mutually exclusive list which cumulated into the results and discussion in this thesis. The coding process highlighted knowledge-practices in which actors of AFIs engage as they emerged out of the interview process.

Supplementary Documents

In addition to the content analysis of interview transcriptions, I sought to identify and code additional materials related to AFIs throughout the Humboldt Bay Region. In this effort I gathered publicly available materials from websites which highlight knowledge-practices in which local AFIs engage. This sampling process took the form of identifying the prominent statements projected by the AFIs with which the interviewees where affiliated. All of these documents were available via the internet at the respective
AFIs website. These documents took various forms while all of them served a similar purpose. Whether titled “Mission Statement” or “Our Values,” these narratives served to express to the public a central concern and goal of the organization or group. By highlighting an organization or group’s mission or values, the supplementary documents revealed the direction of effort for the group.

In analyzing the 12 text-based documents from the organizational websites collected via the internet, I applied the themes as generated through content analysis of interview transcriptions to the supplementary documents presented by local AFIs. After this initial coding, I traced back through the documents in order to clarify and consolidate the most salient codes while disregarding some which stood alone.

Discussion of Methods

The utilization of three methods; participant observation (Bogdewic 1999; Jorgensen 1989; Lofland et al. 1995), key-informant interviews (Marshall 1996; Steinberg et al. 2008; Tremblay 2009) and content analysis (Babbie 2008; Berg 2009; Neuendorf 2002; Weber 1990) of supplementary documents served to reveal the knowledge-practices in which actors of local AFIs engage. By employing three methods, I was able to gather three sets of data. This multiplicity of data collection and analysis strengthened my understanding of local alternative agrifood efforts due to the fact that I evaluated the findings from one method in context of those from another. This mixed method approach (Creswell 2009; Tashakkori and Teddie 2003) fostered a more in-depth understanding of the topic of inquiry than would the employment of a single method.
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

To capture knowledge practices of the Alternative Agrifood Movement within the Humboldt Bay Region, this research sought to capture data from people involved in various alternative food initiatives (AFIs) throughout the region (see Table 2). The employment of theoretical sampling enabled me to identify and interview individuals from various AFIs in the region. As actors within AFIs, participants encompassed a breadth of experience and knowledge regarding their work and the work of others around similar issues. This section provides a description of the individuals interviewed which assists in furthering the contextualization of the results and subsequent discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Food Initiative</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
<th>Alternative Food Initiative Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Designated spaces wherein multiple food producers erect impermanent stands for direct exchange with consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm to School / Child Nutrition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Programs and organizations dedicated to establishing commerce between local farms and schools while integrating food production and nutrition into curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anti-hunger organizations that distribute free food throughout communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spaces wherein multiple parties garden within established physical and social strictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Supported Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>An arrangement of food distribution and production. Typically, small organic farms collect initial payments from consumers who then receive a portion of the farm’s harvest throughout a growing season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organizations or networks which seek to influence policy regarding food production and distribution as proposed by the Alternative Agrifood Movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Alternative Food Initiatives Explored

Sample Demographics

During each interview, participants were requested to provide basic demographic information. This information includes participants’ self-identified gender (See figure 2), race (See figure 3), year of birth and length of residency in the region. The mean age of participants (N=15) was 37 years and the mean length of residency in the region was 13 years. With regard to gender, I interviewed 11 females and 4 males. Also, 13 participants identified as White, one as Chicana and one as Black.

Figure 2: Sample Demographics: Gender
Figure 3: Sample Demographics: Race
RESULTS

This section presents the major findings of this research. The results highlight the themes as generated from each methodological approach while discussing the way in which each method functioned in generating new or substantiating established themes.

Participant Observation

The method of participant observation fostered in me an understanding of the alternative agrifood movement (AAM) as experienced in the Humboldt Bay Region. From professional forums to breweries, the multitude of fascinating conversations over the span of 1 ½ years served to highlight the knowledge-practices associated with the work of AFIs in a substantial way. Since this method served as my initial approach to alternative agrifood issues, I was introduced to a number of concepts and knowledges regarding domestic and international food issues. Every theme generated by the interviews was certainly brought to my attention by participating in this movement. Beyond highlighting the issues also generated by interviews (see below), the method of participant observation revealed a more nuanced understanding of the AAM and the actors within it. The following themes provide insight into the lived experiences of actors of local AFIs.
Passion

One of the most visible themes generated from the participant observation experiences was that of passion surrounding the AAM and the work with witch actors were involved. On almost every occasion passion emanated from individuals in an undeniable and contagious manner. It became evident that the issues of food security and sustainable agriculture become a lived experience, one that becomes a lifestyle. This lifestyle renders individuals perpetually engaged in the alternative agrifood movement. Not only do the actors of AFIs work within these issues on a professional level during the day, they also live them every night. For instance, when visiting the houses of friends within this movement, I was moved by the attention to alternative agrifood issues throughout their lived environments. The numerous meetings, potlucks, books, films, art, etc. surrounding food issues serve to dominate the spaces and perpetuate the passion of actors within this movement.

Frustration

The great passion surrounding the alternative agrifood movement interacts with a considerable frustration over the injustices stemming from the conventional agrifood system and perceived shortcomings of the AAM. My time as a participant in this movement revealed the complexities of coping with such frustration. I have been part of numerous teary-eyed conversations and witness to a self-identified “nervous breakdown” attributed to the environmental and social injustices perpetuated by the conventional
agrifood system. In order to extend their energy in a “productive” manner, this frustration is something with which actors of local AFIs must constantly maneuver.

Inter-Movement Tension

As a movement which ascribes to numerous activities and goals, the AAM is difficult to assess and navigate (See below). My participant observation experiences highlighted the notion that a portion of the frustration mentioned above is associated with conflict between the works of various AFIs within the region. This tension seems to stem from the disparate ideas and organizations involved in the AAM throughout the Humboldt Bay Region.

Optimism

The frustration and tension mentioned above do not render actors of local AFIs without optimism. As experienced throughout my time as a participant, a sense of optimism radiated from the individuals and spaces which make up this movement. The numerous gatherings I attended maintained a critical yet celebratory sense that the work of AFIs is good, even if it is not “good enough.” Actors often reveled in the work of others, citing the role of certain organizations throughout the U.S. and the world. Even in conversations laden with frustration, actors often go back to an optimistic knowledge that “there are great people doing great things” and that fatalism is not an option.
Key-Informant Interviews

The employment of key-informant interviews greatly informed this thesis regarding the knowledge-practices as evidenced in the work of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region. The eight themes generated from this research (Table 2) highlight the way in which actors know and act upon issues addressed throughout their work in AFIs. The capturing of these knowledge-practices fosters an understanding of the Alternative Agrifood Movement in the Humboldt Bay Region while highlighting possible avenues toward which the movement may proceed. This method proved to generate data fundamental to the discussion and conclusion presented in this thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Themes Explored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Agrifood Movement (AAM)</td>
<td>The acknowledgement that issues surrounding food production and distribution comprise a contemporary social movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Movement Tension</td>
<td>Discussion of tension or conflict between differing groups and efforts within the AAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Movement Collaborative Potential</td>
<td>Discussion surrounding the potential of collaboration among differing groups and efforts within the AAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>Discussion regarding inequalities in food access and distribution. Includes attention toward efforts to mitigate these inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>Discussion of food production, the viability of small-scale farming, organic agriculture and genetically modified foods. Includes attention toward efforts to mitigate environmental degradation of the Conventional Agrifood System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Consumption</td>
<td>Discussion of a strategized set of consumptive practices as a mechanism of social change. Particularly places value on consuming locally-produced and distributed foods. Includes the establishing of causation between prioritization of “spending dollars” and food insecurity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Human Right to Food</td>
<td>Discussion establishing access to food as a fundamental right of every human being. Includes critique of capitalist models of food production and distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Discussion surrounding the role of race in the AAM and in the issues which this movement addresses. Includes critique of the lack of racial analysis within the AAM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Key-Informant Themes Explored
Figure 4: Frequency of Interview Themes

Content Analysis

The interviews served as the primary means of data collection and analysis for this research. In order to substantiate themes generated through my experiences as a participant and as presented in the key-informant interviews, I employed the method of content analysis to examine the content of documents from the AFIs explored in this research (See Table 3).

I was able to substantiate the key-informant interview results through an application of themes as generated through content analysis of interview transcriptions to
documents presented by local AFIs. This method involved an investigation of AFI website materials, identifying documents which presented the AFIs mission, history and or values. Although I only identified 50% of the interview themes within the documents at a considerable rate (See Figure 3), this method revealed the way in which AFIs overtly attach themselves to these themes.

Figure 6: Frequency of Supplemental Document Themes
Alternative Agrifood Movement

With a strong presence throughout my experience as a participant in the movement and as presented in 13 interviews, the acknowledgement that there is indeed a social movement surrounding agrifood issues served as the most salient theme in this research. This theme includes a general acknowledgement of a social movement surrounding food, discussion around specific AFIs as movements such as a “community gardens movement,” or a movement against the conventional agrifood system (See Table 3). The theme presented itself in various forms, ranging from a brief mentioning to a fully explored topic. The acknowledgement of a social movement appeared as a knowledge in which movement actors engaged throughout their involvement with AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region. This theme is reflected in the selected narratives below:

I think we’re sort of on the fringes of part of a larger social movement around democratizing food.

This whole food movement is somewhat new but, if it’s done right I think it could potentially, really kind of benefit all people […] not going from the top down but starting, getting support from the bottom.

It’s really a social movement but it’s also a lifestyle movement because we’re trying to get people to change their whole lifestyle, their whole way of thinking.

I do get the sense that there’s a huge movement underfoot. It is starting in small communities, and it’s even now in the radar of the president of the United States […]. Even though it’s a community movement it’s also a top down movement that’s happening so I’m hoping that they will meet in the middle somewhere and some really great things can come from it. It’s already happening; we’re already seeing the changes.
I think it could continue to just be great for the people who are involved, the movement seems to be growing, it doesn’t seem to be just a fad […] I think we’re here to stay.

One thing I really respect about sustainable agriculture, it supports its own research in a way because, big companies haven’t wanted it to be successful, really small communities and farmers are making the movement grow. It’s successful. You can’t argue with that, I have admiration for the fact that this stuff is positive.

Sustainable Agriculture

Appearing in 11 interviews, 8 supplementary documents and throughout my experience as participant the theme of sustainable agriculture revealed itself as a knowledge in which actors of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region engage. This theme largely addresses the environmental implications of food production processes, promoting viability of small-scale organic farming and critique of the conventional agrifood system’s shortcomings on these issues (See Table 3). This theme is explored throughout the narratives below:

I first learned about sustainable agriculture when I was a freshman in college. But I was more interested in the environment and international issues. But then I had a job teaching outdoor school and I realized that I came to feel that the large impact we have on the environment is through our production of food. So that made me interested in food production practices.

With sustainability, workers get paid livable wages and have good working conditions and are respected, environmentally the Earth is taken care of, there’s not poisons being spewed and economics, that farmers can make a living doing it.

Sustainable agriculture cares about the land and the productivity of it, they don’t necessarily care that everybody gets to eat it, they don’t necessarily care that it gets distributed evenly.
In a community, having farmers be able to be economically sustained, especially a lot of our farmers are older, we are losing farms, farms are getting bigger, the family farmer is struggling. Creating markets for that farmer, being able to have that farmer have better access to places to sell their food, we have plenty of mechanisms to make sure that the farmers participate in the community.

I believe in sustainable agriculture but at the same time I have a hard time with the dogma, because we live in one of the richest, most fertile places in the entire world where we have no excuses, where we can say that we believe in sustainable agriculture blah blah blah. If we lived in Eastern African, half of what we talk about here would be embarrassing. It would just be totally embarrassing! I think that what we’re trying to do with, well one person’s sustainable agriculture is another person’s exploitive agriculture.

Responsible Consumption

The theme of responsible consumption appeared in seven interviews, seven documents and was evident throughout my experiences as a participant in the alternative agrifood movement. This theme includes the promotion of consuming local and organic produce as a method of subverting the conventional agrifood system (See Table 3). This theme also includes discussion surrounding self-reliance, contributing food insecurity to an individualized failing of prioritizing spending dollars accordingly. The salience of responsible consumption highlights the way in which the theme is realized as a knowledge in which actors of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region engage. The theme is illustrated through the selected narratives below:

You go to the supermarket and you seen the family with three little kids and they’ve got chips and soda and crap in their shopping cart and you say that’s really not where you’re food dollars should be going, and then it’s an educational and a motivational and how do you change people’s behavior?
It’s just priorities too, whatever you want your life to be, you can be privileged in a lot of ways if you’re happy with what you have, everyone has different priorities. I think that a lot could be said for that because I think it’s really easy for me to figure out how to have lots of great food because I prioritize it.

As an adult you have a responsibility to care for yourself you know. We have a moral responsibility as a society to care for each other but truthfully you’re an individual and we have kind of an individualist society in a bit so you know, you have to support yourself somehow, that’s my belief.

I definitely put happiness and enjoying life and freedom and food at the top of my list whereas most people might say a car or money or kids going to a great school, but whatever you have you should embrace it.

It’s easy to say that things are basic human rights but somebody has to provide them. If you think food is a basic human right, then it’s also a basic human responsibility so people need to get together and grow their food.

Food Security

The theme of Food Security appeared in twelve interviews, eight supplementary documents and as a dominant theme throughout my experience as participant in the movement. Discussion of food security involved mention of inequalities in food distribution, challenges to food access and the efforts toward mitigating these inequalities and challenges (See Table 3). As a central theme of the work of some AFI’s, food security appeared most among actors and organizations solely affiliated to food security efforts. However, the theme maintained a strong presence throughout this research and thus proved to be a salient knowledge in which actors of AFI’s in the Humboldt Bay Region engage. This theme is revealed through the narratives below:
Food security…I think really addresses accessibility and…the access and insurance that communities will have the food goods that they need and so places like inner-cities don’t just have liquor stores, they also have grocery stores with fresh produce of the kind that they eat. It really has so many levels.

Access to healthy food is one of the most important issues for health, if you don’t eat, you can’t think, you can’t be a productive member of our society. Food access is one of our most important health indicators.

I guess the change for me that I would like to see is people with more access to fresh local foods […] fresh healthy foods you know.

Food security gets into the idea of having a grocery store in the neighborhood and they don’t really care where that food comes from.

People will make healthy choices if they have the ability to make healthy choices. I truly believe that, with food insecure people as well, if they have the opportunity to make healthy choices and they feel that they can make affordable healthy choices they will. If they don’t have that opportunity they won’t.

There are so many systems that are failing not even related to food that we need to address in order to affect food security. With food security, policy is really one thing I see, our government is doing things just opposite to it, really hurting food security. Locally, I feel like we have a good grasp on getting involved in food production and having community gardens and growing your own food and buying locally. I feel that’s really important.

The Human Right to Food

The theme of a human right to food appeared in eight interviews while maintaining a strong presence throughout my experience as a participant in the movement. This theme includes discussion surrounding rights and access to food, promoting food access as a fundamental right of human beings. Additionally, this theme involves critique on the capitalist food production system (Table 3). As a prominent idea revealed through this research, the human right to food represents a knowledge in which
actors of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region engage. This theme is explored in the narratives presented below:

The model isn’t working, obviously, I think that if food is going to be a human right which I definitely think it is, that requires us to create a new paradigm of how food is grown and distributed.

Having food be a fundamental right, healthy food that is a fundamental right that communities have access to. Especially when you think about the indigenous communities here, struggling for access to their food. That is part of a global national, and global social movement that is absolutely inspiring and that is something that I want to be a part of.

People want to argue, “it’s better that the organic thing is accepted by these big companies because for them they saw that there’s a niche to make money,” that’s fine but at the same time….I struggle with this idea […] I don’t even know how money can come into something like that…it is such a basic right of people and I think it’s so unfair to put any dollar amount to it.

You have the right to grow your own and I think people should have the right to land, at least to some degree. I realize we have this private property situation that we have to honor, but not completely honor that.

A huge power shift has to happen in terms of how we are able to democratically going forward, if we are to talk about food as a human right. I know some people who tout that industrial farming is the only way to make food a human right or accessible to all, but that’s what we’ve been doing for thirty years now and it’s not working. People are starving even more, our land is depleted, we have no water, there’s wars happening to get oil to make the pesticides, farmers are going out of business, industrial farmers aren’t making the money….all the while corporations get richer and richer off of tax-payer subsidies and absurd prices for the amount of nutritional value the food contains, and for our ability to access it in different locations.
Inter-Movement Tension

As identified throughout my time as a participant and presented in twelve interviews, inter-movement tension revealed itself as a prominent theme in this research. This theme refers to tension or conflict between various knowledges and practices within the alternative agrifood movement and the work of AFIs in the region (See Table 3). Inter-movement tension revealed itself in a multitude of ways, from post-meeting discussions which overtly critiqued the meeting’s agenda to conversations in which actors spoke about the tension confidentially. This tension is largely found in the conflicting ideals of the movements of Sustainable Agriculture and that of Food Security.

For instance, a group focused on food security issues may receive scrutiny from proponents of sustainable agriculture over their acceptance and distribution of non-organic food produced from non-local sources. Since the food security group is focused on providing food to food insecure people, the source of such food is not at the forefront of their concerns. However, proponents of sustainable agriculture may argue that the food security group supports the conventional agrifood system through their work, a critique with great weight throughout the AAM. The tension between these two groups and ideals builds over time and becomes a source of great frustration for the actors involved. The theme is revealed in the narratives below:

They’re very much related ideas, access and the local organic food, but the access gets left out of the discussion sometimes. And it’s key you know, if there’s locally organic food abundantly available but people can’t access them for whatever reason, what good are they really doing?
The general food movement here is made up of people who have the best intentions who do important work, but they have yet to really engage in systemic struggle around food. Instead they want healthy food for their communities which, while they’re saying the county, they mean the people that they know which are all white middle class kids or students, as opposed to the diverse communities of people here who are undeserved, who have very little access, who stand to gain a lot from engaging in an alternative food system as opposed to the corporate model.

Sometimes I feel like they’re passionate about it and they kind of unfairly judge people on their eating habits and but then they don’t really care to extend that possibility to certain people.

I think a lot of misconceptions, stereotypes maybe if you will. Prejudices on both sides about “oh all of those rich people are just too snobby, shopping at the coop and don’t care about the poor people” and “all of those poor people are just lazy and don’t have a job and aren’t helping themselves” gross generalizations but that has a lot to do with it.

I talk to people and they’ll be like, “oh yeah and I don’t really care, I just want to do it for me, I want to be healthy” and it’s like…okay, that’s fine, it’s good but why…I feel that there is this disconnect between people who want to do it for themselves which is great, we need those people too, but I just don’t understand why they don’t have this concern with getting that food to other people.

The questions you hear over and over again when anyone talks about the importance of local farms and local food is the price, not everybody has access to it, either physical or financial access. It’s a challenging topic in that way. That’s not to say that people here and all over the world aren’t figuring out creative ways to make it accessible but, I think there’s a danger in dogma of any kind and right now local is a dogma or it’s turning into one if it’s not.

Inter-Movement Collaborative Potential

As presented in twelve interviews, nine supplementary documents and throughout my experience as a participant in the movement, the theme of inter-movement collaborative potential proved to be a dominant knowledge in which actors of AFI's in the Hum-
boldt Bay Region engage. This theme presented itself as discussion surrounding the importance of partnerships and the potential thereof within the AAM and the work of AFIs in the region (See Table 3). Interestingly, the theme appeared throughout the interviews which simultaneously highlighted the presence of inter-movement tension in the movement. As corresponding with the inter-movement tension, the theme of inter-movement collaborative potential largely referred to the potential of marrying the efforts of sustainable agriculture with those of food security. This theme is illustrated through the narratives below:

The idea is, by using sustainable agriculture, being good stewards of the land, that we can actually feed everyone and if the subsidies where going to that type of farming than local, sustainable, food would be affordable to everyone. The idea is that, we’re trying to get closer to a place where those two worlds are colliding because right now they’re very separate.

I think that’s kind of our main thrust is trying to connect them, trying to improve or promote access to those local organic fresh foods that are often times unattainable for many people.

In the last 8 years it’s been really cool to see these different sort of sections of the food movement weave together and understand each other as one food movement.

I think one starts with the Earth-centered attitude and one starts with a people-centered attitude. Luckily the best thing for each complements the other. That’s what’s empowering, if we were buying from a local farmer and if more people had money for healthy local organic food, there would be more healthy local organic farms.

Where I see the dialogue happening and where it’s most exciting to me is, it seems like an enclave within that group of people who spend fifty dollars on their local food dinner are engaging, and are understanding a little bit of what’s happening on the other end of the food movement. There’s potential for real work to be done in terms of that cross-pollination.
I think it would be cool to have a more cohesive, stronger, web of people interacting together, recognizing each other for the type of work that they’re doing. When it comes to things that are disparate, people who are doing the downstream work versus people who are doing systemic work, there are things that come up that do not work together. Like if you do this it is directly against the work that I’m doing at the systemic level. It would be great to see a genuine dialogue move from that. I’m not saying that one shouldn’t do one or the other, to have people engage on a different level.

Race

Presenting itself in six interviews, the theme of Race was established as a salient theme in this research. As it only appeared in six interviews, this theme served as a pivotal topic of discussion throughout my experience as a participant in the movement. This topic, however, was only discussed within certain circles of people. The theme refers to mentioning of race as a variable in one’s food security and as a factor that is dismissed in the work of the AAM and the work of AFIs in the Region. The theme also involves discussion surrounding whiteness and colorblindness (See Table 3). Equally as important as the theme’s presence in six interviews is the theme’s lack of presence throughout the supplemental documents and interviews. The theme largely presented itself as a critique on the AAM’s lack of discussion surrounding race, as further illustrated through selected narratives below:

I don’t think those people are really privy to the whole race thing, they don’t see that. They go to the farmers market on Saturday, it’s a great way to see friends and all of that…but they don’t want it to be uncomfortable, they don’t want it to be this unknown.

A lot of people are familiar with slow food and the very upper-middle class white perspective on local and organic food as healthy, the words
used to frame it are different for certain people. I think there’s a compo-
nent of the thing that’s classified as a food movement that appeals to the
people all ready in a position of privilege, in particular this slow food
movement, cache of heirlooms and all of that.

When you’re a white person you don’t have to think about those things,
afforded the luxury of obliviousness, so unless you want to take the effort
to think about it, to think about how it relates in your life without getting
defensive you know, most people don’t because they don’t have to.

Most of the work here, though, […] most people are coming from funded
non-profits with typical non-profit structures, who are between 25-50 typi-
cally white, who have the best of intentions and important things to say,
but the people who have typically suffered the most because of our corpo-
rate control of the food system, are not at the table.

I guess I feel like maybe other, more systemic factors divide us to and I
guess that all plays together with race, class, even our planning, our
neighborhoods are segregated.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter explores the way in which my results interact with the larger body of work surrounding the Alternative Agrifood Movement (AAM) by highlighting relevant knowledge-practices of alternative food initiatives (AFIs). Overall, my research asserts that there is social movement surrounding alternative agrifood issues within the Humboldt Bay Region which is largely composed of efforts toward sustainable agriculture and food security. Additionally, this thesis reveals a tension between the differing goals of sustainable agriculture and food security within the region. Key-informants highlighted the desire, if not necessity of transcending this tension for the success of AFIs in the region. This thesis highlights the concept of community food security as a means to move beyond the tension between sustainable agriculture and food security, while stressing the importance of addressing race in the work of AFIs.

Alternative Agrifood Movement

This research found that there is indeed an alternative agrifood movement which seeks to mitigate the environmental and social injustices associated with the conventional agrifood system (Allen 1999, 2004; Carroll 2006; Gottlieb 2001; Gottlieb and Fisher 1998). The AAM has indeed articulated itself as a collection of AFIs throughout the Humboldt Bay Region as a variety of groups and organizations striving to achieve goals of sustainable agriculture and food security. Throughout this research, my participation in
various events (See Table 1) and interviews of key-informants highlighted the notion that actors of local AFIs considered themselves and their as work part of a larger AAM.

Additionally, the results of this research are in support the existing literature which establishes the AAM as a New Social Movement (Allen 2004, 1994; Doherty 2006; Gottlieb 2001; Hassanein 2003). Some common characteristics of new social movements include a multiplicity of efforts, where individuals work in concert together towards achieving a similar goal (Buechler 1995; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Cohen 1985; Edelman 2001). The various AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region actively sought disparate goals, from organic farming to child nutrition. At the same time they aligned themselves within the same social movement for an alternative agrifood system. Also characteristic of NSMs is the seeking of knowledge-production and identity (Allen 2004; Casas-Cortes et al. 2008; Eyerman and Jamison 1996). The way in which actors established an identity with this movement was evident throughout my experience as a participant. The importance of knowledge-production and identity is underlined by one key-informant’s assertion, “It’s really a social movement but it’s also a lifestyle movement because we’re trying to get people to change their whole lifestyle, their whole way of thinking.” As a new social movement, the AAM is seeking to shape the physical and mental landscapes of food producers and consumers throughout the Humboldt Bay Region through the efforts of sustainable agriculture and food security.
Food Security

This research revealed concerns surrounding inequalities in food access by actors in local AFIs (See Table 3). This theme served to illustrate the way in which actors of local AFIs largely approach inequalities of food distribution through efforts for food security, a notion which renders this research in agreement with existing literature surrounding food security (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996; Fisher 2002; Guthman 2004).

Throughout this research, the concept of food security most often occurred as discussion surrounding the importance of access to healthy food for low-income individuals and families. However, my experience as a participant in the food security movement revealed a multiplicity of definitions for the term food security in the region. With regard to the two disparate definitions of food security discussed above (See Literature Review) actors of local AFIs often considered food security to encompass either efforts to mitigate inequalities in food distribution or the ability for a particular community to feed itself (Allen et al. 2003; Anderson and Cook 1999; Maxwell 1996). As individuals and organizations generally spoke of food security in light of efforts to improve access to food for all people, there was often discrepancy over the conceptualization of the term throughout the events in which I participated. This thesis asserts that food security efforts should prioritize the mitigation inequalities in food distribution to account for issues related to health and culturally appropriate food.
Sustainable Agriculture

Efforts toward sustainable agriculture promote environmentally sustainable food production processes through organic agriculture while seeking to promote small-scale farming as a viable enterprise (Friedmann 1993; Lang 2003; Rigby and Caceres 2001; Shiva 1999). This research revealed knowledge-practices surrounding sustainable agriculture as primarily concerned with environmental impacts of food production processes and the viability of small organic farming enterprise. The way in which sustainable agriculture presented itself throughout this research renders it in agreement with the literature surrounding sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Carroll 2006; Hassanein 1999, 2003).

Throughout my experience as a participant in the movement, the knowledge-practices surrounding sustainable agriculture were readily apparent. Actors of local AFIs often stressed the importance of mitigating the environmental degradation caused by the conventional agrifood system. For instance, one key-informant explained, “Having started with being an Environmentalist and then coming into food, I was concerned with helping organic farmers get a foot in the door or helping people with information about transitioning over to organic.” Additionally, key-informants were quite persistent in their assertion that sustainable agriculture is concerned with production processes rather than distribution, as evidenced by another key-informant, “Sustainable agriculture cares about the land and the productivity of it, they don’t necessarily care that everybody gets to eat it, they don’t necessarily care that it gets distributed evenly.” The insistence on food production processes and small organic farming enterprise aligns my research with

Responsible Consumption

My research findings highlight a means for supporting the efforts of local AFIs through responsible consumptive practices. The term responsible consumption refers to an approach to consuming practices wherein an individual or group relies upon knowledge of the environmental or social impacts of consumables in their decision making processes (Baumann 2007; Roberts 1996; Webb, Mohr and Harris 2007; Webster 1975). Scholars assert that this mode of thinking is largely driven by principles of a “consumer society.” (Bauman 2007; Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006).

A consumer society is largely organized by the exchange of goods and services and it fosters an understanding of political action as achieved through the role of consumer rather than that of a producer (Jameson 1985; Bauman 2007; Lavin 2009). In addition to political engagement, a consumer society articulates identity formation and social control through the lens of consumption (Jameson 1985; Bauman 2007; Lavin 2009). One is able to reveal the way in which the idea of responsible consumption may indeed resonate with individuals within the AAM within the framework of consumer society (Lavin 2009; Vigneault 2009). The purchasing of local-organic produce may be seen as a central means of undermining the conventional agrifood system if political action is achieved through consumption (Bauman 2007; Lavin 2009; Vigneault 2009). Additionally, approaching issues through the purchasing of certain foods may render
responsible consumption especially suiting due to the fact that food is an ingested commodity (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006; Vigneault 2009).

The findings of this research support the existing literature which highlights the presence of responsible consumption throughout the AAM, while being most evident in efforts toward sustainable agriculture (Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006; Vigneault 2009). Often touted as the power of “voting with your fork,” responsible consumption was seen as a premier vehicle through which individuals may promote the AAM throughout this research (Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006; Vigneault 2009). The presence of responsible consumption is frequently found throughout campaigns which promote the purchasing of local foods, a premise especially evident in efforts toward sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006). For instance, the slogan “Buy Fresh Buy Local” leads a campaign by CAFF to promote the consumption of local organic produce “to strengthen regional markets for family farms” (Community Alliance with Family Farmers 2011b).

The importance placed upon political engagement via consumptive practices promotes the notion that a more direct engagement, such as organized collective action with political systems, is unnecessary or inappropriate (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Maniates 2001). Within this framework, the consumption of certain types of goods in certain types of settings is deemed a political act (Pollan 2006; Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006). The consumption of locally-produced organic goods through direct-market outlets such as farmers markets is promoted as a key strategy in subverting the conventional agrifood system within efforts for sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009;
Pollan 2006, 2008). However, critics argue that such an approach to subverting the conventional agrifood system is cursory and largely ineffective (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Patel 2008; Winne and Fisher 1998; Vigneault 2009). The critique of responsible consumption was conceptualized in this thesis within the theme of The Human Right to Food.

The Human Right to Food

The human right to food theme aligns this research with the literature surrounding the relationship between the concepts of food security and fundamental human rights (Hamelin, Habicht and Beaudry 1999; Maxwell 1996; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998). The key-informant interviews revealed the importance of knowledge-practices which promote the human right to food. In addition to the key-informant interviews, this was a knowledge in which I engaged extensively throughout my experience as a participant in the movement. Actors of local AFI{s}, especially those associated with food security efforts, stress similar sentiments as scholars when they assert that the issue of food insecurity may be largely mitigated through an implementation of the human right to food (Allen 2004; Hamelin, Habicht and Beaudry 1999; Maxwell 1996; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998). This implementation may occur through channels of policy at the local, national or global level and it is currently encouraged by the United Nations (Bultrini et al. 2009; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998).

The human right to food aligns the issue of food insecurity within the broader human rights framework surrounding human health, development and wellbeing
An example of human rights issues for health and wellbeing concerns the human right to clean water (Bluemel 2004; Gleich 1998; Salman and McInernry-Lankford 2004). The human right to clean water asserts that every human has a nonnegotiable right to access clean water throughout life (Gleich 1998; Salman and McInernry-Lankford 2004). In context of food, a human right to food dictates the availability of healthy food to every human throughout life (Hamelin, Habicht and Beaudry 1999; Maxwell 1996; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998). An approach to food security through a lens of human rights asserts that the conventional agrifood system systematically violates the rights of food insecure people (Hamelin, Habicht and Beaudry 1999; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998).

The Human Right to Food and Capitalism

The findings of this research support findings in the literature that highlight the capitalist model of food systems as a source of environmental and social injustices (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Haiven 2009; Riches 1998). Max Haiven (2009) stresses, “At risk of being obviously unfashionable or unfashionably obvious, the problem with food in the world today is capitalism” (11). By pinpointing capitalism as impetus for injustices stemming from the conventional agrifood system, scholars and actors must seek mitigation of these injustices vis-à-vis subversion of the capitalist model of food systems. This subversion of capitalism is found through the establishment of the human right to food, which distances food from the capitalist logic. Taken in context of responsible consumption, the promotion of the human right to food serves as a distinct approach to
mitigating the environmental and social injustices perpetuated by the conventional agrifood system.

In this research, key-informants cited the corporate control, or capitalist food production and food distribution, as a primary source of rights violation with regard to food access. For instance, one key-informant stressed, “Looking at corporate control of our industrial food system […] who has control over the production, distribution, all the way down to our taste buds…are colonized. Corporations have dictated, to a degree, what our taste buds respond to.” The key-informant extended this critique, “A huge power shift has to happen in terms of how we are able to democratically going forward, if we are to talk about food as a human right.” This key-informant’s analysis of corporate control over the food system and this control’s implications on the human right to food highlights how the concept of the human right to food interacts with a critique of capitalism.

Taken together, responsible consumption and the human right to food present two distinct means of supporting the AAM (Allen 2004; Allen and Malecarek 2009; Lavin 2009 Winne and Fisher 1998; Vigneault 2009). The differences of these two concepts highlight a tension within the AAM, which was found throughout the work of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region.

Inter-Movement Tension

The presence of Inter-Movement Tension (See Table 3) among the varying efforts of AFIs in the Humboldt Bay Region aligns this research with scholarship surrounding ideological and empirical conflicts within the AAM (Allen 2004; Allen and Malecarek
2009; Lavin 2009 Winne and Fisher 1998; Vigneault 2009). My research reveals inter-
movement tension as largely surrounding the two disparate themes: responsible
consumption and the human right to food. Additionally, this thesis agrees with literature
which asserts that responsible consumption is largely promoted by sustainable agriculture
while the human right to food is associated with food security (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009;
Maxwell 1996; Mechlem 2004). Hence, the inter-movement tension may be understood
as discrepancies between the efforts of sustainable agriculture and food security.

The tension between the themes of responsible consumption and the human right
to food was identified vis-à-vis across-group criticism amongst various AFIs in the
Humboldt Bay Region. Criticism was identified in statements wherein actors of local
AFIs spoke to the assumed ineffectiveness of other actors throughout my experience as a
participant and in the key-informant interviews. For instance, an individual who critiques
responsible consumption may assert that consuming produce from a small organic farm
does not further efforts to realize and equitable distribution of food. Conversely, a
proponent of responsible consumption may dictate that the human right to food dismisses
the work the goes into food production.

The tension between responsible consumption and the human right to food is
found in the literature associate with the alternative agrifood movement (Allen 2004;
instance, an author who promotes the human right to food, Chad Lavin (2009), critiques
Michael Pollan, one who largely promotes responsible consumption. Lavin (2009) asserts
that “Pollan suggests backyard gardening because he probably can’t imagine us doing anything much more challenging, like, say, reclassifying food and water as human rights rather than purchasable commodities” (61). This example reveals the way in which scholars articulate critique surrounding the contentious themes of responsible consumption and the human right to food. Beyond the literature, the inter-movement tension was notable throughout my experience as a participant in the movement and in the key-informant interviews. For instance, one key-informant criticizes responsible consumption as a pathway to change:

The change doesn’t come from individuals making these individual choices and then demonizing people who aren’t making those choices. I’m not going to go point my finger at somebody who’s not buying organic food and say they’re part of the problem because that’s not true.

Conversely, the key-informant interviews revealed this tension through critique of the human right to food. For example, a differing key-informant critiques the notion of a human right to food by assessing the value of labor inputs in food production:

The thing about that is, some rights should be basic human rights like the right to go hunting or fishing you know. But food, just being like what, delivered to you? Who is providing that? It doesn’t quite make sense to me as a person who realized that, if I was going to try to give you a dinner I’d have to put a fair amount of work into that. There’s energy involved, there’s my time, my money. I think that you don’t have the right to that.

I argue that the human right to food provides an avenue through which food insecurity may be addressed appropriately, an assertion driven by the need to mitigate injustices on
the health and wellbeing of food insecure communities (Allen 2004; Slocum 2006; Nord et al. 2005).

Inter-Movement Collaborative Potential

The theme of inter-movement collaborative potential presented itself through the various data collected as a part of this study. This includes my experience as a participant observer in the movement, key-informant interviews, and review of organizational pamphlets and printed materials. The theme of inter-movement collaborative potential encompasses discussion of potentially combining the disparate ideas of responsible consumption and the human right to food. As responsible consumption is primarily supported through sustainable agriculture (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Seyfang 2006; Vigneault 2009) and the human right to food is supported through food security (Allen 2004; Lavin 2009; Mechlem 2004; Riches 1998), the potential for inter-movement collaboration seeks to unite efforts for sustainable agriculture and food security.

I assert that a collaboration of sustainable agriculture and food security is evidenced in the concept of community food security throughout this thesis (Allen 2004, 1999; Anderson and Cook 1999; Feenstra 1997; Gottlieb 2001; Pothukucki et al. 2002; Winne and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1997). For instance, as an effort to establish a “condition wherein everyone has a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritious diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice” (Ahn 2004:2), community food security seeks to enable all people the ability to consume responsibly (Anderson and Cook 1999; Feenstra 1997; Gottlieb 2001; Pothukucki et al.
2002; Winne and Fisher 1998; Winne et al. 1997). In context of the distinct efforts for sustainable agriculture and food security, Winne et al. (1997) stress that community food security seeks to combine “disparate fields, including community economic development, environmentalism, community gardening, sustainable agriculture, nutrition/public health, and anti-hunger into a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts” (2). This combining of efforts highlights the way in which collaborative potential is found the concept of community food security.

An instance of collaborative partnerships in alternative agrifood efforts is evidenced in the creation of food policy councils (Allen 2004; Anderson and Cook 1999; Dahlberg 1994; Feenstra 1997; Fox 2010; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999; Stubblefield et al. 2010). Food policy councils are collaborative efforts to address a locale’s food security and food system planning which are often integrated into institutionalized bodies such as government agencies (Dahlberg 1994; Feenstra 1997; Fox 2010; Gottlieb 1996; Winne 1994). These collaborative efforts maintain the potential to identify and investigate pathways for the promotion of AFIs. (Anderson and Cook 1999; Feenstra 1997; Winne 1994).

A recently established food policy council in Humboldt County highlights an avenue of potential collaboration for AFIs in the region (Stubblefield et al. 2010). Key-informants highlighted the collaborative potential of this food policy council:

In the community you have a lot of people concerned with access to food, protection of food, distribution of food, waste and many other portions of
“The entire food system.” The policy council brings those together to discuss how you can provide, improve economic outcomes and provide healthy, nutritious food to low-income and food insecure people. What policies need to be changed, what networking needs to happen, what programs should be included in order to get better health outcomes and also economic development outcomes.

Within the food policy council setting, an application of the community food security lens may encourage a food system that prioritizes equitable distribution of goods as produced through sustainable agriculture practices. It is essential, however, that collaborative efforts such as food policy councils prioritize equitable access to participation in their decision making processes (Allen 2004; Feenstra 1997; Winne 1994). In the promotion of equitable access, food policy councils may establish meetings within food insecure communities, subsidize public transportation and structure a forum which encourages direct input by community members (Allen 2004; Feenstra 1997; Winne 1994). The food policy council setting provides an arena for collaboration among AFIs. However, as highlighted by this research (See Table 2), an issue in need of attention throughout the work of local AFIs is that of race.

Race

This thesis asserts a need to integrate discussion surrounding the impacts of race in the work of local and national AFIs. The literature on the work of AFIs highlights the role of race in the AAM, and it largely critiques the absence of attention placed toward race in policy and action surrounding food system issues (Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006). This research highlights the way in which local actors of
AFIs place importance on the role of race within the work of the AAM. Race presented itself as the least important theme in this research, 40% key-informant interviews. The lack of prominence of the theme of race aligns this research with the literature focused on race in the AAM (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004; Guthman 2004; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006, 2007, 2008). However, the presence of this theme in my research and the literature of the AAM highlights the importance of a comprehensive discussion surrounding the implications of race within the work of the AAM (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). The role of race in the work of AFIs becomes apparent in context of the racialized patterning of food insecurity (Liu and Apollon 2011; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999; Slocum 2006; Nord et al. 2005).

Race and Food Insecurity

The dearth of race as a theme in the work of AFIs is problematic when considering the way in which food insecurity is largely experienced within communities of color (Burnham 2001; Liu and Apollon 2011; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999; Slocum 2006; Nord et al. 2005). According to the USDA, 45.4% of United States residents deemed “food insecure” throughout 2008 where either African American or Hispanic (Nord et al. 2005). Scholars and organizations identify race as a significant predictor of food insecurity and diet related illness (Adams, Grummer-Strawn and Chavez 2003; Drenowski and Kaufman 1999; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999; Furness et al. 2003; Townsend et al. 2000).
The current data surrounding food insecurity rates of Humboldt County suggests a pattern of food insecurity that reveals increased rates of food insecurity among people of color (Arsdale 2006, 2008; Stubblefield 2010). For instance, Arsdale (2006) found that within the county of Humboldt, “non-white respondents were 2.9 times more likely to experience very low food security compared to white respondents” (11). Additionally, 22.5% of “Native American” respondents reported experiencing “very low food security,” a significant figure when compared to 6.4% of “White” respondents (Arsdale 2006). These figures suggest an increased likelihood of food insecurity for people of color in Humboldt County. Evidence of a racialized pattern of food insecurity in Humboldt County highlights the importance of incorporating the role of race the work of local AFIs (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006). In light of the role of race in the AAM, scholars argue that researchers must examine the way in which whiteness permeates the work of alternative food initiatives (Allen 2004, 1994; Allen et al. 2003a; Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006).

**Whiteness in the Alternative Agrifood Movement**

An examination of how whiteness interacts with the AAM aids in articulating an understanding of the movement and how it is experienced in the Humboldt Bay Region (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). An analysis of this nature serves to highlight the way in which this movement succeeds or fails in creating an inclusive approach to an alternative agrifood system. (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Within this thesis, the term “whiteness” refers to the physical and cognitive dimensions
of space and culture which are enacted through a whitened discourse and practice (Brown et al. 2003; Bush 2004; Feagin 2010; Frankenberg 2003; Lipsitz 2006). An understanding of whiteness reveals the way in which systems of power and privilege maintain their advantages, as well as illustrating potential avenues for anti-racist work by whites and nonwhites (Brown et al. 2003; Bush 2004; O’Brien 2001; Rothenberg 2005). First, one must explore what it means to be “white” and how this whiteness serves to dominate institutions and spaces in order to understand the nature of whiteness in AFls (Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006).

As a frame through which the world is understood, whiteness highlights social problems and solutions through a lens of white privilege (Brown et al. 2003; Bush 2004; Feagin 2010; McIntosh 2004; Rothenberg 2005). As a structure which involves cultural and physical processes, white privilege refers to the way in which whiteness operates as a position of structural advantage for whites (Bush 2004; Feagin 2010; Rothenberg 2005). The lens of whiteness shapes the way in which problems and their proposed solutions are addressed, an approach which often results in proposals not applicable for people of color (Brown et al. 2003; Lipsitz 2006; McIntosh 2004; Slocum 2006). Wherein a whitened perspective dominates understandings of socioeconomic and physical conditions the advantages of white privilege are normalized (Bush 2004; Feagin 2010; O’Brien 2001).

Normalized whiteness is promoted and maintained by colorblindness (Brown et al. 2003; Bush 2004; Feagin 2010; Guthman 2008; Lewis 2004; O’Brien 2001). The concept of colorblindness stresses that race is not a pertinent issue of society; therefore
individuals are to be blind to race due to the fact that we all experience the world in the same way (Brown et al. 2003; Guthman 2008; Lewis 2004; O’Brien 2001). As such, colorblindness serves to dampen the importance of injustices surrounding race and racism as a social issue (Brown et al. 2003; Guthman 2008; Lewis 2004; O’Brien 2001). This research highlights the presence of colorblindness in the work of local AFIs. For instance, key-informants conveyed concern over the lack of discussion around race in AFI events:

> It is a bad thing that there is this embedded racism in our society, it’s terrible, but the lack of acknowledging it is way worse in my opinion, it’s there, let’s deal with it, let’s talk about it, but everyone is always like, no, no, no…not me, I’m not racist.

> I think any and every space is a good place to talk about race […] when you’re a white person you don’t have to think about those things, afforded the luxury of obliviousness, so unless you want to take the effort to think about it, […] most people don’t because they don’t have to.

In context of the larger AAM, whiteness and colorblindness serve as dominant organizing principles throughout much of the movement’s work (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006). The way in which this movement maintains whiteness is largely found in the way that AFIs maintain “white spaces” (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006).

An acknowledgement of white spaces within AFIs is essential in understanding the way in which the AAM maintains whiteness as an organizing principle (Brown et al. 2003; Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Scholars argue that
spaces surrounding the AAM, especially farmers markets, are “white spaces” which
discourage participation in AFI efforts for people of color (Alkon and McCullen 2010;
Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Key-informants detailed the presence of white spaces of
local AFIIs within this research, for instance:

Talking about race […] that’s just like this undercurrent, a comfort for the
people that are involved in it because they look around and like oh yeah,
I’m in the right thing, these are people I like, these are people that I
associate with and it’s comfort for them. And on the opposite end of that
spectrum there’s the discomfort of people who look around thinking, these
are not the people.

The discouragement of participation for people of color is promoted by a
universalization of values held by whites and overt colorblindness (Alkon and McCullen
2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006), as suggested in the following example of a farmers
market.

Scholars assert that an AFI which especially serves to maintain and perpetuate
whiteness and colorblindness is the farmers market (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman
2008; Slocum 2006). The preservation of white spaces at farmers market was evident in
this research, one key-informant stressed, “I don’t think those people are really privy to
the whole race thing, they don’t see that. They go to the farmers market on Saturday, it’s a
great way to see friends and all of that…but they don’t want it to be uncomfortable, they
don’t want it to be this unknown.” The ascription to whiteness by farmers markets is
illustrated by their physical placement and an overt promotion of a universalized set of
values (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006).
The universalized set of values posits the participation in farmers markets as driven by values, rather than privilege (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). These values largely involve placing importance on the experience of buying food directly from the farmer, the appreciation of nature and the quality of local organic produce (Guthman 2008). Within this value-framework, it is assumed that the people who shop at farmers markets are driven by good values while those that do not participate may be seen as not ascribing to values (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). This research revealed concern over the reliance of the value-framework within local AFIs. For instance, one key-informant stressed:

I think needs to be part of the food discussion is to understand where everybody else is coming from […] otherwise it turns into a “you should be eating local food why aren’t you? You must be immoral or something.” That’s where I think it needs to go, people need to take the value judgment out of it, people make choices based on their condition and circumstances, it's not always a moral thing.

In contrast to the value-framework discussed above, evidence that farmers markets are more expensive than grocers and largely held in upper-class white neighborhoods supports an analysis of participation in farmers markets as driven by affluence and privilege rather than values (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006).

In addition to the creation of white spaces, the way in which the AAM ascribes to individualism and self-reliance may serve to demonize those who do not participate in AFIs (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Liu and Apollon 2011; Slocum 2006). The concepts of self-reliance and individualism motivate an analysis of food insecurity which places
blame on food insecure communities for their condition (Allen 2004; Liu and Apollon 2011; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Throughout my experience as a participant in this movement, critique regarding the promotion of self-reliance became an evident knowledge in which certain actors engaged:

> It’s connected to the bootstrap myth you know. It’s connected to individualism, enlightenment theory, […] most of us have not gotten beyond that legacy of, ‘if you learn these skill and these traits and this stuff, you can fit better into the middle class…or you’ll become more able to pull yourself up from your bootstraps because it’s you and your behavior that needs fixing not the system,’ the systemic whatever that’s going on, that is putting up barriers to access to healthy food.

The example above highlights the way in which self-reliance and individualism serves to perpetuate the notion that individuals are culpable for their food insecurity. When contextualized in the evidence that communities of color experience high rates of food insecurity, self-reliance and individualism act to blame communities of color for their food insecurity (Liu and Apollon 2011; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Evidence of critique surrounding this demonization of food insecure populations is cited throughout the literature on whiteness and the AAM (Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Liu and Apollon 2011; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006).

In sum, the creation of white spaces and an emphasis on self-reliance and individualism operate to perpetuate racialized discrimination within the AAM (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Allen 2004; Allen et al. 2003a; Liu and Apollon 2011; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). This racialized discrimination is rendered invisible by ascription to
colorblindness (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). Indeed, the value-framework attributed to participation in AFIs and colorblindness was apparent throughout my experience as a participant in this movement and it maintained a presence in the key-informant interviews. In light of this research and the literature surrounding the consequences of whiteness within the AAM and local AFIs, it is imperative that the movement actively engages with this topic.

Conclusion

In closing, this thesis presents an analysis of the alternative agrifood movement as a bustling social movement with great potential to mitigate the environmental and social injustices perpetuated by the conventional agrifood system. This research reveals the knowledge-practices in which actors of AFIs throughout the Humboldt Bay Region engage as an array of ideas and actions which seek to establish environmental sustainability and social justice. However, the alternative agrifood movement is riddled with internal conflict surrounding the notions of responsible consumption as largely promoted by sustainable agriculture and the human right to food as largely promoted through food security. This internal conflict must be addressed in order to realize the goals of the AAM. By addressing this tension, AFIs may create more collaborative partnerships and spaces. The collaboration between efforts for sustainable agriculture and food security maintains the potential to extend the accessibility of sustainably produced agricultural products to the people who need it most, those of food insecure communities.
The concept of community food security may serve as a mediator of the inter-movement tension throughout the AAM, a model which seeks to connect the concepts of sustainable agriculture and food security. However, I stress that this AAM must address the role of race in food security and that the maintenance of whiteness and white spaces serves to perpetuate the injustices of the conventional agrifood system. An example of race as addressed in the AAM is found in the Community Food Security Coalition. This organization has focused on the issue of race in the food system and has even incorporated anti-racist trainings for AFIs throughout the United States (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). In light of the Community Food Security Coalition’s efforts to address race in the work of the alternative agrifood movement, it is essential that a similar approach be taken in the work of alternative food initiatives in the Humboldt Bay Region and throughout the United States.

With the potential to realize food systems which bring the availability of healthy and sustainably produced foods to low-income communities, the alternative agrifood movement could prove to be one of the most vital contemporary social movements in the United States (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Lavin 2009). However, the alternative agrifood movement must grapple with the inter-movement tension surrounding responsible consumption and the human right to food. The danger of not mitigating this inter-movement tension is found in the realization of a movement working against itself, while the environmental and social injustices of the conventional agrifood system carry on. This thesis promotes the human right to food, asserting that a reliance upon
responsible consumption in undermining the conventional agrifood system risks perpetuating food insecurity within certain communities (Allen 2004; Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006). The promotion of the human right to food may open the doors to a healthy and nutritious diet for every person, not just those who can afford it (Lavin 2009; Winne and Fisher 1998; Vigneault 2009). After all, the alternative agrifood movement shouldn’t serve those who are already served best; it can and it must serve everyone.
Figure 6: Study Site: California Regional Map.
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Figure 7: Study Site: Humboldt County, Bay Region, Map
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