

FOOD JUSTICE

FOOD SECURITY

1. *Available*: food is available in sufficient quantities & on a consistent basis
2. *Accessible*: people can regularly acquire adequate quantities of food through socially acceptable methods
3. *Utilizable*: consumed food has a positive nutritional impact on people

WAYS OF ACHIEVING FOOD SECURITY

- Interventionist vs. anti-interventionist (e.g. Singer vs. Hardin)
- Localist vs globalist
 - Does it matter where/from what culture one's food comes from?
 - Does it matter whether a region achieves "food sovereignty"?

Most relevant to our immediate concerns in this paper is the dominant concept of food security and its inability to account for an understanding of food as more than just a nutritional commodity but rather, a set of social relations and cultural practices, including foodways and heritage cuisines that constitute a larger whole (Mares & Peña, 199)

Food Sovereignty:

Food security is not just about satisfying nutritional needs, it also requires an understanding of the relationship between food and culture

LOCAL VS GLOBAL

Localism:

a people's privileging of its own cultural traditions, beliefs, and aspirations over those of other regions when making production/consumption choices

Globalism/Cosmopolitanism:

a joint privileging of (i) the interests of all people, regardless of their relationship to us; (ii) respecting the variety of practices and beliefs that differentiate us from one another (both as individuals and as cultures/peoples/nations)

LOCALISM & THE AGRARIAN IDEAL

Slow food:

grassroots movement to counter "fast" food by emphasizing traditional and regional foods and their cultural ties through encouraging the farming of plants, seeds, and livestock characteristic of the local ecosystem

Agrarianism:

a social philosophy which sees farming as a way of life, valuable not only for the food and agriculture it produces, but also in itself.

DOES LOCALITY AT LEAST SOMETIMES MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO THE KINDS OF FOOD CHOICES YOU MAKE?

1. Yes
2. No

DO YOU FAVOR 'LOCAL' FOODS OVER NON-LOCAL ONES?

1. Yes
2. No

ADVANTAGES OF LOCALISM

- Reduced distance for transport of goods means lower environmental impact
- Promotes the continued existence of specific cultural practices or traditions
- Promotes a connection to a particular locale or "sense of place"
- Promotes or maintains a "sustainable community"

DISADVANTAGES OF LOCALISM

- Elitist?
 - Increased cost of food
 - Increased time required for production/consumption
- Cannot be scaled (i.e. not all populations can be locavores)
- Provincial
- For many areas localism may result in a net decrease in the variety of available foods

ADVANTAGES OF GLOBALISM/COSMOPOLITANISM

- Respect for the diversity of cultures/peoples
- Encourages freedom of choice in how to live

DISADVANTAGES OF GLOBALISM

- Elitist?
- Encourages a kind of cultural homogeneity
- Encourages a kind of alienation from any specific place or culture

BEYOND THE GLOBAL/LOCAL DICHOTOMY?

1. Recognize that going 'local' doesn't mean that one's practices are "healthier" or more "just"
2. Realize that most of our food choices will have global ramifications
3. Acknowledge that the culture of a region and its (presence/absence of) agriculture are linked
4. Accept that there may be irreconcilable costs and benefits to both approaches

[The locavore in me thinks that] the Amish child with the McDonald's bag represents a companion challenge, namely that shopping mall culture exerts a terrible attraction, even to those outside it...

[The cosmopolitan is me asks:] what if that Amish kid wanted to grow up to be a gay vegetarian and sing in a rock band? I nd myself asking. Or what if he just wanted to be a hippie organic farmer instead of an Amish one? A Wiccan, maybe? What support for those life choices would he nd in his community? (Heldke, 34-5)

