



Food and Globalization

Author(s): Lynne Phillips

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 35 (2006), pp. 37-57

Published by: [Annual Reviews](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25064913>

Accessed: 15/02/2015 04:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Annual Reviews is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Food and Globalization

Lynne Phillips

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Ave., Windsor, Ontario, Canada N9B 3P4; email: lynnep@uwindsor.ca

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2006. 35:37–57

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123214

Copyright © 2006 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

0084-6570/06/1021-0037\$20.00

Key Words

agriculture, trade, global governance, consumption, hunger, policy, politics

Abstract

This review takes two key approaches for exploring the theme of food and globalization: first, how food has been mobilized as a commodity in global production and trade systems and governed through global institutions; and second, how the idea of globalization has been nourished through food, particularly with the mobility of people and of ideas about cuisine and nutrition. Stark global inequalities are also noted, and the review calls for attention to policy-based research and to the analytical connections between governance, food politics, and food citizenship in future studies.

INTRODUCTION

"If you ate today thank a farmer." Passing this message on my way to work every day, I think about what I've just eaten for breakfast—all ingredients purchased at the local supermarket—and wonder how one might best do that. To thank local farmers, most of whom grow feed corn, which will travel somewhere far away, seems no more appropriate than thanking the grocer and telling him to pass it on. The conundrum reveals something of the crooked pathways of globalization and suggests that tracing the trajectories of food might be a fruitful way to investigate the processes that we now commonly consider "global." But, as Barndt (2002) discovers in her study of the tomato, the roots and routes of food in the world today are tangled and slippery. Moreover, as the following review indicates, the approaches taken are varied, each one illuminating a slightly different story about this increasingly important area of study. I review these contributions with an eye to opening up new lines of inquiry for the place of food in nurturing our thinking about theory, policy, and politics in a globalizing world.

The exchange of food across regions, nations, and continents has occurred for centuries, although the study of the relationship between food and globalization is relatively new to anthropology. Anthropologists have long been interested in food and its production, consumption, and exchange (see Miller 1995, Mintz & Du Bois 2002 for important reviews), but food issues have largely been examined within the context of relatively closed systems of production—in households, in local communities, and in ethnic groups. The focus, historically, was on how food may reinforce, and at times create, distinct cultural worlds. Not until the 1970s and 1980s were there hints of the global processes at work within local and regional agricultural systems, especially with the anthropological focus on subsistence production in the developing world. A turning point can be identified with

Mintz's (1985) examination of sugar, a book that burst the seams of what anthropologists had until that time considered the "field." In tracing the evolution of the rise of sugar through global systems of production, consumption, sociality, and identity, Mintz offered a unique analytical framework for exploring the nexus of food and globalization. Yet, Mintz's book appeared before the virtual explosion of literature on globalization and culture (Appadurai 1996, 2001; Friedman 1994; Inda & Rosaldo 2002; Jameson & Miyoshi 1998; Tomlinson 1999, to name just a few), a literature that, interestingly, seldom investigates food. The time seems ripe therefore for interrogating ideas about food through the lens of globalization, and globalization through the lens of food.

I begin this review by asking how food has been mobilized on global scales. Here I consider globalization in terms of three distinct, although often interrelated, analytical paths to understanding projects of globality (Tsing 2000)—the international circulation of food products as commodities, the transnational expansion of food-based corporations, and the global governance of food and food issues. In the subsequent section, I examine how food "feeds" globalization as an imagined construct and discuss how the mobilization of ideas and people help shape a global imaginary. Twinning the ideas of globalizing food and feeding globalization challenges common binaries that pervade much of the literature. In the concluding section I consider future directions for research on food and globalization, raising some questions about how anthropologists might "think through food" to offer alternative perspectives on the changing relationships between global processes, food identities, and food politics.

GLOBALIZING FOOD

Commodities

Researchers began to focus systematically on the expansion of commodity relations beyond

national borders in the 1990s (Bonanno et al. 1994, Goodman & Watts 1997, McMichael 1994), replacing nation-based concerns about agrarian structures with an examination of emerging models of international trade (such as the promotion of nontraditional exports and free trade agreements) and their implications for agri-food systems in developing and developed nations. Although scholars have debated how to conceptualize these changes—are they best labeled postfordist or a new regime of private global regulation? (Bonanno 1998; Friedmann & McMichael 1989)—there is considerable agreement that a new era in the global regulation of food has been in the making, marked by a shift to more flexible systems of production, the corporate search for higher profits in new and multiple territories, and a new approach to international trade to permit a freer flow of goods across national borders. For some, the emergence of this new era was a “quiet revolution” (Schertz & Daft 1994); for many it was a threat (Magdoff et al. 2000) or outright piracy (Shiva 1997).

Friedmann’s (1982) research on world food regimes proved useful for mapping important trends in these new commodity production and distribution processes. The concept of a global food regime has helped explain the adoption of standardized planting, picking, and packing practices in agriculture around the world (Barndt 1999, McCann 2001, Pritchard & Burch 2003). The concept also sheds light on increased global sourcing for and distribution of fresh fruit and vegetable systems (Friedland 1994); the standardization of production systems in the chicken, hog, and livestock industries (Boyd & Watts 1997, Bonanno & Constance 2001, Sanderson 1986); and the mobility of the tuna industry to avoid restrictive legislation (Bonanno & Constance 1996).

Other analysts have highlighted the global shift to more flexible labor relations to produce food for export (Collins & Krippner 1999, Kritzing et al. 2004, Ortiz 2002).

Barnet & Cavanagh (1996) refer to this shift as the “feminization” of labor to foreground the temporary nature of labor contracts and increased labor vulnerability. By following women’s work in the tomato industry from Mexico to Canada, Barndt (1999) effectively demonstrates the variations in what flexibility means to transnational corporations and to women workers as packers, food processors, supermarket cashiers, and food service providers. As also evidenced in prawn production for export in Bangladesh (Ito 2002), demands for flexibility in food production usually signal the intensification of women’s labor. The overall costs of orienting local economies to world food regimes are usefully outlined by Murray (2001) and include the destruction of the domestic food base, the loss of plant diversity through monoculture, and increased food insecurities for rural populations.

Researchers have noted concerns about the inability of a food regime approach to explain the diverse and specific circumstances of food production in local-national-global relations (Araghi 2003, Goodman & Dupuis 2002, Goodman & Watts 1997, Moran et al. 1996). Alternative approaches emphasize varied cultural and historical trajectories (Freidberg 2003, Gupta 2003, Hollander 1995, Ohnuki-Tierney 1999, Warman 2003) and the importance of networks and local/actor agencies rather than structures (Arce 1993, Jarosz 2000, Marsden 2000, Marsden Cavalcanti & Irmão 1996) in the globalization of specific commodities. For example, Sonnenfeld et al. (1998), employing a version of the network approach, show that local growers in Washington State have long been actively involved in globalizing the apple industry but primarily in the distribution of the commodity rather than in the vertical integration of its production. Rosset et al. (1999) challenge the parallels being drawn between the globalization of the agro-food industry and that of other industries (electronics and automobiles) by critically assessing

the variations involved in the case of the world tomato. Through investigating the uneven local responses to global demands for fresh fruit and vegetables, Arce (1993) argues that rather than leading farming in Latin America into uniform patterns, the new globalization processes may play a role in reproducing distinct rural localities (p. 49).

Anthropologists most often enter discussions about the globalization of food commodities by insisting that the discussions be placed in their cultural and historical contexts. Commodities are not just products flowing through economic channels; they have social lives (Appadurai 1986). Thus, the symbolic value attached to the production and consumption of tortillas depends on the exchange context in which they are circulated (Lind & Barham 2004). The cultural and class-based status associated with healthy eating is central to the success of the Chilean fresh fruit trade (Goldfrank 2005). Emphasizing what past global projects may have to teach us, Gupta (2003) follows the spice trade in Asia and elsewhere before and after the fifteenth century to hint at an alternative globalization at work, one that tends to be eclipsed by the western European-based view of the sugar trade. Like Gupta, Ohnuki-Tierney (1999) subtly challenges the “temporally shallow frame” (Gupta 2003, p. 2) of current globalization theory by showing how the local-global interplay of rice and meat have long played a role in constituting Japanese identity. A fascinating examination of the uncoordinated and fractured globalization of shea butter, as it moves from a preindustrial to a postindustrial commodity, is provided by Chalfin (2004), who demonstrates the key role played by the domestic market in Ghana over time and by a multiplicity of gendered actors. The argument that commodities cannot be understood outside the networks of meaning and power in which they are circulated opens up lines of inquiry that challenge the idea of globalization as a predominantly economic, hegemonic, or singular process.

Corporations

A different, although clearly related, approach to food and globalization takes the growth and operations of food-related transnational corporations (TNCs) as its starting point. Heffernan & Constance (1994) argue that “if the research question is, ‘What is the driving force behind the restructuring of the global food system?’ the unit of analysis has to be the TNC” (p. 29). Food-related TNCs share the characteristic of having global investments in the food industry and controlling much of how food is grown, processed, distributed, and/or purchased. The literature on food-related TNCs considers both their increased expansion into new territories for cheaper labor and new markets (Bonanno 2004; Kneen 1995, 1997; Rosset et al. 1999; Van Esterik 1989) and their remarkable consolidation and concentration in North America and elsewhere (Banaji 1997, Garcia Martinez & Salas 1999, Lyson & Raymer 2000, Paul & Steinbrecher 2003). Llambí (1993) helpfully distinguishes four generations of food-related TNCs, with the latest and current generation being “constituted by extremely flexible and decentralized forms of organization” (p. 22). It may be useful to distinguish food-related TNCs, as does Friedland (1994), in terms of those companies involved primarily in how food is produced (e.g., agri-business and food processors), those that distribute and trade food, and those that market food (wholesalers, retailers, and food services), but it is very clear that operations are often intertwined in practice (McKenna Roche & LeHeron 1999, p. 38). Indeed, a company may radically change its specialization over time, as Lyson & Raymer (2000) show for the case of Green Giant foods.

For most studies, the global corporation model is an ideal type (Pritchard & Fagan 1999), as closer scrutiny reveals inevitable variations in corporate strategies. Although global sourcing and just-in-time requirements encourage the development of standardized yet flexible production systems, such

development takes place with considerable variability in different locales. In their research on Nestlé, Pritchard & Fagan (1999) refer to the company's different "geographies of accumulation" to highlight these variations. Kneen (1999) explores how the corporate strategies of Monsanto and Cargill differ. Yenil (1999) argues that the local context (Turkey) makes a difference for how Unilever and Nestlé operate. Friedland (1994) reveals important differences between Chiquita and Dole in the fresh fruit industry, and McKenna et al. (1999) note a complex "fluidity" in the relationships between Heinz and growers in New Zealand. Excellent case studies of how agribusinesses have changed in response to criticisms, including becoming "green" themselves, can be found in Jansen & Vellema (2004).

How food is globally traded and marketed can also be highly variable and culturally framed. Arce's (2000) research with international food traders in Chile reveals how, despite working with a dazzling display of technology, traders still find that "it is essential to know the other person well[;] otherwise you lack the element of trust" (p. 42) for food trade negotiations. Applbaum's (2004) unique investigation into the cultural logic of global marketing in itself indicates how reference (and at times deference) to cultural contexts is central to the success of food-related TNCs. These studies help remind us that what we see today as global corporate power in the food industry is not a given, but is instead a product of actions taken by a whole series of actors, including laborers, growers, traders, professional marketers, investors, financial advisors, and grocers.

One important debate in studies of the impact of food-related TNCs on food consumption focuses on the cultural impact of the global outreach of TNCs. Whereas Ritzer (1993) promotes the view that the global proliferation of McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) constitutes a form of cultural imperialism, others (primarily anthropologists) challenge this position by an-

alytically placing consumption in its cultural context. In his edited book on McDonald's, Watson (1997) has taken a leading role in investigating what is referred to as the "localizing" practices of food-related TNCs, examining how their influence on eating patterns, taste preferences, and family life has not been what one might presume. Lozada (2000), examining KFC in China, similarly argues that the corporation's success is related to "its ability to become local" (p. 134) and shows how, despite the appearance of increasing cultural homogenization, studies of the consumption process reveal an expansion of cultural specificities and diversities. Watson & Caldwell's (2005) new reader brings together published work that explores this area of study, including the important work of Miller (1998) and Roseberry (1996) on drink (Coca-Cola and gourmet coffee, respectively).

The expansion of food-related TNCs into developing countries generally involves negative effects on nutrition, as imported food replaces local diets (Beardsworth & Keil 1997, Lentz 1999). Weismantel's (1988, 1999) research highlights how imported foods may culturally introduce "bitter gifts" to indigenous economies. Some evidence shows that developing countries are experiencing increased obesity as a result (Evans et al. 2003; Sobal 1999, 2001; WHO 1998). Concerns about globalizing the "modern" food system have become more acute with North America's increasing obsession about obesity and other health costs of fast food and highly industrialized diets (Brownell 2004, Culhane 2004, Nestle 2002, Tillotson 2004).

Research is sparse on the role of supermarkets, as corporate retail outlets, in reshaping food production and consumption. Although it appears that the emergence of supermarkets in developing countries supports greater dietary choice for those who can afford it, the significant role of supermarkets in deepening the vertical integration of the production process has implied more vulnerability for small farmers (Dugger 2004, Guptill & Wilkins 2002, Konefal et al. 2005,

Myers 2004) and street vendors (Tinker 1999). Guptill & Wilkins (2002), looking at the U.S. situation, show that food retailing has actually moved away from providing standardized food and is including foods from the local economy in its strategy to diversify. The authors argue that this strategy may in fact “weaken the capacity of local food flows to empower regular citizens to shape the local economy” (p. 49). More research on the power of retail outlets to control food availability and choice is required to assess further the implications for both farmers and consumers.

Global Governance

A third approach to the study of the globalization of food considers how international organizations and institutions may mobilize and govern food within and beyond nation-states. Studies have focused on how agricultural production has been shaped by multilateral financial aid and lending institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Escobar 1995, Li 2004, Reynolds 1994) and international trade agreements such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (Anderson 2000, Desta 2001, McMichael 2000, Myers 2004, Raffer 1997). Some analysts understand these institutions to be little more than the handmaidens of TNCs, which demand stable yet flexible arrangements for trade and investment to establish a new global order (McMichael 1999). Yet detailed examination of these agencies shows that their operations are not merely a reflection of TNC requirements.

The United Nations (UN), created with a mandate to develop a new era of international cooperation after World War II, remains relatively understudied from the perspective of food and its globalization. Research into the central role historically played by the UN's Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) in the global management of food challenges the commonly held view that it was only in the 1990s that nation-states were restricted

in the regulation of their own food systems (Ilcan & Phillips 2003, Phillips & Ilcan 2003). Sending food experts and agricultural scientists to countries throughout the world from the 1940s onward, the FAO actively intervened in regional and national agricultural systems and dietary patterns and undertook extensive training of populations to carry on the work of producing “modern” farmers and consumers. The part played by the World Health Organization in promoting a scientific approach to infant feeding in developing countries is also noteworthy from this perspective (Gottschang 2000).

Studies link the global expansion of food exports to the lowering of trade barriers through the Uruguay Round of GATT in the 1980s and the establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995 (Anderson & Josling 2005, Ingco & Nash 2004). Today trade arrangements have come to involve much more than trade tariffs, expanding into food quality and safety standards, patents, and intellectual property rights (Madeley 2000). These agreements raise questions about the future availability of land for local food production as more land is devoted to export agriculture and about the social and economic consequences of standardizing agricultural practices and food products (McKenna & Campbell 2002). The price for local economies is outlined by Myers (2004) who focuses on the impact on Caribbean societies of new trade agreements in bananas.

The issue of how standards should be set and who should set them have troubled farmers, governments, and consumers alike. Putting the Codex Alimentarius in charge of a wide range of responsibilities in these matters (Schaeffer 1993) reinforces the historical preference of international organizations for depoliticizing issues of global food standardization through expertise (Ilcan & Phillips 2006). The current effort from many camps within the UN to help countries meet the WTO sanitary measures alerts us to an increasing convergence of global institutions around neoliberal models of food governance (Phillips &

Ilcan 2004) and is an issue that requires more research.

The ultimate success of the WTO in governing food and agriculture remains a question. Research focusing on the negotiating process fails to produce a consistent “winner” and reminds us that global trade agreements are not a given, but a product of political struggles and negotiations (Curtis 2001, Schaeffer 1993). In this vein, Llambí (1993) usefully follows the political struggles between the United States, Europe, and Japan over their respective agricultural policies, highlights their agency in pursuing loopholes in GATT rules, and documents the persistent challenges to a U.S. hegemony over the agro-food system. National food boards can also be important for trade outcomes, as has been argued for the case of New Zealand (Curtis 2001, McKenna Le Heron & Roche 2001). A promising area is the development of alternative trade agreements such as fair trade. Although researchers are wise enough not to point to fair trade as a panacea, there are glimmerings of hope that these efforts raise incomes for producers and improve the quality of their environment (McKenna & Campbell 2002; Murray & Reynolds 2000; Reynolds & Murray 1998; Reynolds 2000, 2002; Renard 1999). Some analysts have also considered the potential of LETS (local exchange and trading systems) to “relocalize” rural areas that have been negatively affected by the uneven globalization of food (Pacione 1997). Thus, although intergovernmental organizations have emerged as key figures in debates about global governance, much skepticism remains about their ability to develop sustainable global arrangements for food provisioning. Given the unique perspectives on globalization that anthropologists have been able to offer as they document the interfaces between different kinds of knowledges (Long & Long 1992; Hobart 1993; Inda & Rosaldo 2002), these and other international institutions should be investigated further through an anthropological lens.

FEEDING GLOBALIZATION

A full examination of what might be called the production of globalization through food also introduces questions about food producers and consumers as mobilized subjects. By which mechanisms do people and ideas associated with food systems help create, reinforce, and challenge processes of globalization? Supported by literature that interrogates globalization as flows of ideas and people across institutionalized (e.g., national) borders (Appadurai 1996, 2001; Gupta & Ferguson 1997), one can ask how projects of globality are fed by the imagination and practices of mobile and mobilized populations.

Feeding the Global Imaginary

Food has been, and continues to be, central to the production of a global imaginary. Throughout much of the past century, the world was imagined as food—scarce and, indeed, in urgent need of more food for the malnourished, the vulnerable, the victims of famine. The concept of a “modern” globe has been and is still tied to the consumption of particular kinds of foods, the adoption of particular food production regimes (e.g., industrial agriculture), and the acceptance of particular kinds of food knowledge (Escobar 1995). Flows of scientific knowledge have been central to imagining the possibilities of a global modern agriculture (Goodman & Watts 1997, Goodman & Redclift 1991, Gupta 1998, Phillips & Ilcan 2003, Scott 1998) and planet-wide modern nutrition and diet (Gottschang 2000, Jing 2000, Weismantel 1988). Food can play an important role in imagining nations (Appadurai 1988, Caldwell 2002) at the same time that it may problematize the “national.” In this sense, food forms part of what Tsing (2000) refers to as the politics of scale-making.

Both the idea of the farmer who produces food for the world and the idea of the consumer who eats food of (and sometimes for) the world play a role in the production of a

global imaginary. An awareness of this process raises the question of how farmers and consumers are positioned as global subjects and how they, in turn, may nurture multiple ideas about globality—including those related to the environment, to politics, and to citizenship. The international expansion of neoliberal policies has altered farmers' relationships to the global market; farmers have been made responsible for their economic futures (Hall 1998a) and compelled to respond to restructuring only in a limited number of ways (Bonanno & Lyman 1999, Crabtree 2002, Murray 2002, Preibisch et al. 2002). At the same time, international agricultural institutions disseminate the idea of the successful farmer as a "globalizer" who is responsive to the market, technologically savvy, and flexible about knowledge acquisition (Bruinsma 2003). Science and technology play a large role in discursively and materially positioning farmers to relate to the world in its global dimensions (Marglin 1996). Extensively partnered organizations such as CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) explicitly circulate science-based, growth-oriented models of production as politically neutral solutions to agricultural problems (CGIAR 1998). The argument that genetically modified crops will feed the world by 2030 (McMichael 2000; see also Pinstrup-Andersen & Schioler 2000) is a compelling one that positions farmers in the global imaginary with contradictory consequences for their agency. Indeed much of the biotechnology literature could be usefully reread in these terms.

How gender figures in this portrayal of a global food imaginary is a question not often raised. Women remain invisible as food production/processing innovators within the dominant narrative of science as progress (Ferguson 1994), a fact that is not surprising given the gender biases found in research on scientific knowledge and agricultural economics (Elson 2002, Haraway 1991, Harding 1991, Waring 1988). Women often experience food security issues more severely, as

their subsistence base is eroded (Gladwin et al. 2001, Nash 1994, Weismantel 1999) and as men migrate in search of more stable employment (Messer & Shipton 2002). Even alternative forms of agricultural production such as organic farming, which often recognize the importance of women's activities, are co-opted by industrial agriculture in ways that continue to marginalize the work of women (Bellows & Hamm 2001, Hall 1998b, Trauger 2004). An investigation of the global farmer discourse hints at a highly masculinized picture. One analytical way to reconnect women's activities to globalization processes is to challenge the association of men with things global and women with things local. A useful starting point for this project is provided by Freeman (2001) who demonstrates how the mobility of Caribbean higgler shapes the dynamics of globalization. The study of efforts by international organizations to govern gender and food on global scales (Phillips 2005) complements this approach, as does research that highlights women's activism and struggles for survival in the face of structural adjustment and neoliberal policies (Beneria 2003, DeKoven 2001, Frank 2005, Peltre-Wurtz 2004, Razavi 2002, Walton & Seddon 1994).

Work written for the general public more than 30 years ago forced North Americans and Europeans to "think globally" about adjusting their diets to a "small planet" (Lappé 1973) and making connections to "how the other half dies" (George 1977). Recent panics around food risks and food safety have helped reintroduce food as global news (Gee 2002, Lien & Nerlich 2004), as has the "discovery" of its genetic health benefits in genome projects (see *Newsweek*, Jan. 17, 2005, pp. 40–48). Tourism has also played an important role in the global circulation of knowledge about culinary cultures. Today, engagement with good food (whether haute cuisine, fusion, or slow food) reinforces ideas about lifestyle and class within a new world of political associations and choices (Fantasia 1995, Miele & Murdoch 2002, Roseberry 1996). On

the one hand, media and product advertising have been a crucial technical component to how the global imagination regarding consumption practices has been fed (Applbaum 2004). On the other hand, as images of famine victims and malnourished children are regularly circulated for aid and sponsorship efforts, hunger has also formed a central part of the global imaginary (Messer & Shipton 2002). Ironically, even literature that stresses a return to locality contributes to a global imaginary by posing a global “consumer monoculture” as the backdrop for its arguments (Norberg-Hodge 2003, Norberg-Hodge et al. 2002).

Mobile and Gated Bodies

Global imaginaries are realized, and challenged, as people act and move. Traveling itself involves a way of thinking (Clifford 1997), and migrant laborers, refugees and resettled populations, immigrants, students, business consultants, nutritionists, agronomists, tourists, and other travelers all play a role in the reproduction and expansion of ideas about food and food systems, although not all to the same extent or in the same manner. Cunningham’s (2004) concept of the “gated globe” (referring to greater obstacles to movement for some and not others) is worth noting in this respect, as is Friedman’s (2001, p. 68) observation that some travelers have more “pretensions about reorganizing the world” than do others.

Still, research points to the significance of migration to the development of international agriculture (Basok 2002; Kearney 1986, 1996; Sanderson 1985; Smart 1997) and to the production of diasporic food memories (Mankekar 2005). Immigrants, often finding the restaurant business to be their only viable source of revenue, bring their kitchen histories with them but do not impose them exactly as they please (Smart 2003). One of Smart’s case studies, who had lengthy experience in food catering in Hong Kong before coming to Canada, had to learn how to cook Canadianized Chinese food (i.e., “deep fried and

topped with lots of sweet thick sauce” (2003, p. 332) to make a profit. Strategic transborder migration and flexible culinary expertise are central to the entrepreneurial success of Chinese immigrants in the food business.

Studies of nontravelers and their potential contributions to globalization are more rare. Given evidence of international efforts to produce globally astute farmers, it would seem imperative to investigate how farmers and farm workers who are not crossing national and international borders are engaging with such projects. More research is needed on how farmers and farm workers are making ends meet (Hellin & Higman 2003), how their health and environment may or may not be compromised by the global farmer model (Andreatta 1998, Hollander 1995), how new food technologies are being acted on, and how the household has been transformed as a site of production, distribution, and consumption (Preibisch et al. 2002). In short, how are the demands of new food-related processes being reinscribed by nonmigrating people in the current context? One wonders whether the interrelationships between food and globalization would be theorized differently if we balanced studies of globalization and mobility with studies of this kind.

This discussion of food and the global imaginary has highlighted how constructions of the local and the global “nourish each other” (Ohnuki-Tierney 1999, p. 260). Anthropological studies that stay attuned to the role of food in localizing processes can register a “traffic in meaning” (Inda & Rosaldo 2002, p. 11): Foodways may be “deterritorialized” by global projects, but at the same time re-embedded in some place, as changing ideas about food and the world are reinscribed by people. The lesson here is to attend analytically both to how people are being mobilized in new ways through globalization processes and how they produce new meanings as they undertake their food-related practices. In the concluding section, this lesson inhabits my discussion of potential future directions for the theory, policy, and politics of food.

CREATING FOOD FUTURES?

A theoretical shift in the discipline can be noted over the past decade from an emphasis on issues of food production (e.g., how peasant farmers have been marginalized by the global economy) to questions of food consumption (e.g., does the proliferation of fast-food outlets signify the emergence of a global consumer?). Balancing earlier work developed within political economic frameworks, this recent shift attends to the important process of culture-making as a central component of globalization. Yet the heavier emphasis on consumption practices in the current period seems to reflect a bias toward privileged subjects, toward those consumers who can really afford to consume. As particular theoretical orientations rise and fall, it is worth reminding ourselves that food production and food consumption are always two sides of the same coin. As Miller (1995) and Mintz (1996) have reminded us, from quite different perspectives, concepts of commodities are linked to concepts of persons. This insight signals a way forward for addressing the economic/cultural analytical divide that continues to pervade the study of food and raises the following question: If the ideas and practices of food mark human difference, what do current projects of food and globality tell us about who we are? Specifically, what kinds of markers of food exclusion and inclusion are being created in the current situation, how are these markers maintained by global projects, and what do they imply for developing sustainable places to live? This question, which can be explored in a number of ways, is linked to the larger problem of how to create alternative food futures (Le Heron 2003).

One route suggested by the reviewed literature is to document the “lives” of edible commodities in people’s lives. Ethnographic studies of how commodity markets, food-based corporations, and international organizations contribute to the identities and practices of the communities in which they are embedded may

provide a fruitful path to understanding this process. Dupuis’s (2002) research on milk as America’s drink, Cook’s (2004) investigation of the papaya, and Selfa & Qazi’s (2005) analysis of farmer and consumer notions of “local” and “sustainable” take useful steps in this direction. Such work advances understanding of the multiple connections between food governance and food identities, and potentially facilitates the development of a broader politics of food.

An alternative route for addressing this question might be through a consideration of the body: How are bodies going global along with food? To what extent are (gendered) concepts of the body becoming standardized and governed, and how does food figure into this process? During a recent trip to Ecuador—a country with its fair share of hungry people—I was amazed to discover a *Curves* fitness center. What does this center, located in the nation’s capital, say about the production of bodies through national and global associations? The current anthropological interest in fat (Kulick & Meneley 2005, Papenoe 2004), placed within an understanding of globalization processes, may provide insight into the connections between the circulation of industrial diets and the commodification and changing aesthetics of human bodies to offer a unique view on food and globalization.

A third avenue for exploring this question is to examine the relationships between scale-making projects (local, regional, national, global, etc.) and the emergence of new landscapes of food accessibility and scarcity. Focusing on scale-making projects helps to make visible the changing relationships between space and place (Dirlik 2001, Friedman 2001, Gupta & Ferguson 1997) and their implications for crafting sustainable food systems. For example, we may ask how the relationships between people, food, and space have been altered by global projects to create or displace specific ideas of home, community, and region. How may localizing practices for securing food undermine or be undermined

by global projects and, alternatively, how may they be supported by such projects (Bellows & Hamm 2001, Feenstra 2002, Koc et al. 1999, Haan 2000, Hendrickson & Heffernan 2002, Hinrichs 2003)? These research possibilities hint at the tension between sustainable, food-enhanced places and unsustainable and food-deprived places, the boundaries of which are neither static nor always easily discernible (Riches 1997; see *Anthropology News*, Oct. 2004, p. 55).

It is interesting that the study of hunger, and its links to food-deprived places, is dominated by international organizations (FAO 2002, Pinstруп-Andersen & Pandya-Lorch 2001). Important anthropological exceptions are Messer & Shipton (2002), Scheper-Hughes (1992), and Shipton (1990). Not only do these authors examine how food policies produce new borderlands of exclusion (within, as well as between, nations), but they also hint at how little anyone cares about such exclusions until they are shown to interfere with economic or social requirements. In explaining why poor people in northeast Brazil purchase medication instead of food to survive, Scheper-Hughes (1992) argues that health claims are given more attention than are claims of hunger. This point might well be applied to the discipline of anthropology itself. Why do we generally choose to theorize through consumption and health rather than through hunger? A related question is the impact that such theoretical biases may have on policy and politics: Does a focus on consumption politics indirectly contribute to inappropriate policies of intervention, or to a general politics of indifference to food insecurities?

This quandary leads to an obvious, policy-based question: Once we find that global projects create new exclusions through food, what proposals should be put forward to do something about it? What is to be done, for example, about the shifting borderlands of malnutrition and hunger? Messer & Shipton (2002) note that the growing response to this

question in the case of Africa—that famines and hunger are “very complicated”—only feeds paralysis, which is an untenable position in the current context. Sustainable farming practices can be encouraged, better trade agreements can be developed, and the production of adequate and healthy food can be promoted. All these policy decisions could be more easily developed if anthropologists undertook research to support them. Scholars widely recognize that anthropological contributions to policy development are needed (Okongwu 2000, Webb et al. 1998). Because, as anthropologists, we understand food as a marker of difference, we can make important contributions to policy by demonstrating how, in different ethnographic contexts, notions of gender, ethnicity, race, age, class, and nation are drawn into service for new border-making projects that systematically exclude some people, and not others, from healthy food.

A more general policy question that needs to be considered is, how might we all eat and produce food differently—more sustainably and less hierarchically—in a globalizing world? Much of the literature points to the need for consumers to create and choose alternatives to corporately produced and corporation-traded food by growing and eating organic food, by supporting social movements (the Green movement, the Terra Madre movement, and the Community-Shared Agriculture movement), and by participating in alternative trade and other networks (Barrientos 2000, Cone & Myhre 2001, Guthman 2000, Heller & Escobar 2003, Hendrickson & Heffernan 2002, Miele & Murdoch 2002, Murray & Reynolds 2000, Reynolds 2000, Wallace 2005, Whatmore & Thorne 1997). Although writers such as Vandana Shiva (2000) and Frances Moore Lappé (1973, 1980, 2002) have been influential in giving food alternatives a high public profile, anthropologists have tended to shy away from public-policy debates on food. This has left much room for those with

different interests to define the problem of food security and to set the agenda for its resolution. Most anthropologists know, for example, that the global food security problem is not to be solved through more education, more science, and more modeling (compare Runge et al. 2003), but their invisibility in policy circles leaves such approaches unchallenged. Moreover, because anthropologists are well aware of how capital and more powerful others can absorb alternatives when these alternatives begin to look like competitors (Paley 2002; Edelman 1999), the public would be well served if the discipline systematically took on the (admittedly, mammoth) task of identifying the barriers to and possibilities for successful projects pursuing healthy and sustainable food alternatives.

Many analysts, not content to depend on policy for social change, have pointed to the expansion of political struggles around food consumption issues as an opportunity for moving forward (Canclini 2001, Goodman & Redclift 1991, Lien & Nerlich 2004). Others call for an analytical return to an emphasis on the industrial appropriation of food, and thus a politics embedded in the production of food (Buttel 2000, Carrier & Heyman 1997). Guptill & Wilkins (2002) suggest a resolution by replacing the concept of the food consumer and food producer with the idea of the food citizen. Although the idea fuels the legalistic framework that considers food a right, the notion of all of us being food citizens does help to encourage alliances, between producers and consumers and across borders, to build potential policy and political coalitions around food. It is perhaps as food citizens that we can begin to become more analytically and

politically engaged with projects centered on producing sustainable places that attend to food issues, rather than presume them as a backdrop.

Everyone is becoming responsible for making better food decisions today, a process linked to global governance in ways that should make wary social movements organized around food concerns (Hassanein 2003, Le Heron 2003). The contradiction of making responsible consumption decisions in the context of questionable production and distribution practices is already revealing itself, as Johnston's (2001) attention to the problems of "consuming social justice" makes clear. A politics of food citizenship challenges us to make it our global responsibility to be aware of the convoluted paths that currently prevent many consumers from giving appropriate thanks for the food system that keeps them alive and well. Because this food system at the same time keeps others barely fed, our responsibility extends to challenging the ways in which the food world is currently structured and reproduced. In this review I argue that such a challenge requires both an interrogation of multiple arenas of global governance and a recognition of the important role played by imagination and agency in galvanizing the outcomes of the processes we refer to as globalization. Although it is clear that our practices in and visions of food worlds may either reinforce or undermine exclusionary and inequitable food systems, what is not as apparent is how food citizenship may be developed as a sustainable politics to include everyone, not just the privileged. This next step requires both reflexivity and commitment and is crucial in the continuing search for resolutions to these pressing issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend appreciation to Sally Cole, Ellen Judd, Alan Smart, and Josie Smart for their useful suggestions and to Akhil Gupta and James Watson for their help. Many thanks are also due to Karina Schneider for her able research assistance for this project.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anderson K, Josling T, eds. 2005. *The WTO and Agriculture*, Vol. 1. Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, MA: Elgar
- Anderson S, ed. 2000. *Views from the South: The Effects of Globalization and the WTO on Third World Countries*. Chicago: Food First Books and the Int. Forum on Glob.
- Andreatta SL. 1998. Agrochemical exposure and farmworker health in the Caribbean: a local/global perspective. *Hum. Organ.* 57:350–58
- Appadurai A, ed. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Appadurai A. 1988. How to make a national cuisine: cookbooks in contemporary India. *Comp. Stud. Soc. His.* 30(1):3–24
- Appadurai A. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Appadurai A. 2001. *Globalization*. Durham, NC/London: Duke Univ. Press
- Appelbaum K. 2004. *The Marketing Era: From Professional Practice to Global Provisioning*. New York/London: Routledge
- Araghi F. 2003. Food regimes and the production of value: some methodological issues. *J. Peasant Stud.* 30(2):41–70
- Arce A. 1993. New tastes in industrialized countries and transformations in the Latin-American countryside: an introduction to the local cases of Mexico and Chile. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 3:48–70
- Arce A. 2000. Creating or regulating development: representing modernities through language and discourse. In *Anthropology, Development and Modernities*, ed. A Arce, N Long, pp. 32–51. London/New York: Routledge
- Banaji J. 1997. Globalization and restructuring in the Indian food industry. *J. Peasant Stud.* 24:191–210
- Barndt D, ed. 1999. *Women Working the NAFTA Food Chain: Women, Food & Globalization*. Toronto: Second Story Press
- Barndt D. 2002. *Tangled Routes: Women, Work, and Globalization on the Tomato Trail*. Lanham, UK: Rowman & Littlefield
- Barnet R, Cavanagh J. 1996. *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*. New York: Simon & Shuster
- Barrientos S. 2000. Globalization and ethical trade: assessing the implications for development. *J. Int. Dev.* 12:559–70
- Basok T. 2002. *Tortillas and Tomatoes*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press
- Beardsworth A, Keil T. 1997. *Sociology on the Menu: An Invitation to the Study of Food and Society*. London/New York: Routledge
- Bellows AC, Hamm MW. 2001. Local autonomy and sustainable development: testing import substitution in localizing food systems. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 18:271–84
- Beneria L. 2003. *Gender, Development, and Globalization: Economics as if All People Mattered*. New York/London: Routledge
- Bonanno A. 1998. Liberal democracy in the global era: implications for the agro-food sector. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 15:223–42
- Bonanno A. 2004. Globalization, transnational corporations, the state and democracy. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 12(1):37–48
- Bonanno A, Busch L, Friedland W, Gouveia L, Mingoine E, eds. 1994. *From Columbus to ConAgra: The Globalization of Agriculture and Food*. Lawrence: Univ. Press Kansas
- Bonanno A, Constance DH. 1996. *Caught in the Net: The Global Tuna Industry, Environmentalism and the State*. Lawrence: Univ. Press Kansas

- Bonanno A, Constance DH. 2001. Corporate strategies in the global era: the case of mega-hog farmers in the Texas Panhandle region. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 9:5–28
- Bonanno A, Lyman K. 1999. The introduction of capitalism in Russian agriculture: popular response to neoliberal reforms. *Rural Sociol.* 64(1):113–32
- Boyd W, Watts M. 1997. Agro-industrial just-in-time: the chicken industry and post-war American capitalism. In *Globalizing Food: Agrarian Questions and Global Restructuring*, ed. D Goodman, M Watts. London/New York: Routledge
- Brownell K. 2004. *Food Fight*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Bruinsma J, ed. 2003. *World Agriculture: Towards 2015./2030.—An FAO Perspective*. London: Earthscan
- Buttel FH. 2000. The recombinant BGH controversy in the United States: toward a new consumption politics of food. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:5–20
- Caldwell M. 2002. The taste of nationalism: food politics in postsocialist Moscow. *Ethnos* 67(3):295–319
- Canclini NG. 2001. *Consumers and Citizens: Globalization and Multicultural Conflicts*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Carrier JG, Heyman J. 1997. Consumption and political economy. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 3(2):355–73
- Chalfin B. 2004. *Shea Butter Republic: State Power, Global Markets, and the Making of an Indigenous Commodity*. New York: Routledge
- Clark RP. 2000. *Global Life Systems: Population, Food, and Disease in the Process of Globalization*. Lanham, UK: Rowman & Littlefield
- Clifford J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Collins JL, Krippner GR. 1999. Permanent labor contracts in agriculture: flexibility and subordination in a new export crop. *Comp. Study Soc. His.* 41(3):510–34
- Cone C, Myhre A. 2001. Community-supported agriculture: a sustainable alternative to industrial agriculture? *Hum. Organ.* 59:187–97
- Consult. Group Int. Agric. Res. (CGIAR). 1998. Mobilizing science for global food security: fourth external review of CIMMYT. *Tech. Advisory Comm.*, CGIAR (FAO electronic document accessed Feb. 2, 2003)
- Cook I. 2004. Follow the thing: papaya. *Antipode* 36(4):642–64
- Crabtree J. 2002. The impact of neo-liberal economics on Peruvian peasant agriculture in the 1990s. *J. Peasant Stud.* 29(3–4):131–61
- Culhane C. 2004. Super size me. *Food Can.* 64(5):30–35
- Cunningham H. 2004. Nations rebound? Crossing borders in a gated globe. *Identities* 11(3):329–50
- Curtis BM. 2001. Reforming New Zealand agriculture: the WTO way or farmer control? *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 9(1):29–42
- DeKoven M, ed. 2001. *Feminist Locations: Global/Local/Theory/Practice in the Twenty-First Century*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
- Desta MG. 2001. Food security and international trade law: an appraisal of the World Trade Organization approach. *J. World Trade* 35(3):449–68
- Dirlik A. 2001. Place-based imagination: globalism and the politics of place. In *Places and Politics in an Age of Globalization*, ed. R Przniaik, A Dirlik, pp. 15–51. Lanham, UK/Boulder, CO/New York/Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield
- Dugger CW. 2004. Supermarket giants crush Central American farmers. *NY Times* Dec. 8
- Dupuis EM. 2002. *Nature's Perfect Food: How Milk Became America's Drink*. New York: New York Univ. Press

- Edelman M. 1999. *Peasants Against Globalization: Rural Social Movements in Costa Rica*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Elson D. 2002. Gender justice, human rights, and neo-liberal economic policies. In *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights*, ed. M Molyneux, S Razavi, pp. 78–114. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Escobar A. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Evans M, Sinclair R, Fusimalohi C, Laiva'a V, Freeman M. 2003. Consumption of traditional versus imported foods in Tonga: implications for programs designed to reduce diet-related non-communicable diseases in developing countries. *Ecol. Food Nutr.* 42:153–76
- Fantasia R. 1995. Fast food in France. *Theory Soc.* 24(2):201–43
- Feenstra G. 2002. Creating space for sustainable food systems: lessons from the field. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 19:99–106
- Ferguson AE. 1994. Gendered science: a critique of agricultural development. *Am. Anthropol.* 96(3):540–52
- Food and Agric. Organ. (FAO). 2002. *Anti-Hunger Programme: Reducing hunger Through Sustainable Agricultural and Rural Development and Wider Access to Food*. 2nd draft. Rome: FAO
- Frank D. 2005. *Bananneras: Women Transforming the Banana Unions of Latin America*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press
- Freeman C. 2001. Is local: global as feminine: masculine? Rethinking the gender of globalization. *Signs* 26(4):1007–37
- Freidberg SE. 2003. Culture, conventions and colonial constructs of rurality in south-north horticultural trades. *J. Rural Stud.* 19:97–109
- Friedland WH. 1994. The global fresh fruit and vegetable system: an industrial organization analysis. See McMichael 1994, pp. 173–89
- Friedman J. 1994. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage
- Friedman J. 2001. Indigenous struggles and the discreet charm of the bourgeoisie. In *Places and Politics in an Age of Globalization*, ed. R Prazniak, A Dirlik, pp. 53–69. Lanham, UK/Boulder, CO/New York/Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield
- Friedmann H. 1982. The political economy of food: the rise and fall of the postwar international food order. *Am. J. Sociol.* 88(Suppl.):S248–86
- Friedmann H, McMichael P. 1989. Agriculture and the state system: the rise and decline of national agricultures, 1870 to the present. *Sociologia Ruralis* 29:93–117
- Garcia LAH, Martinez EB, Sala HQ. 1999. The role of national and transnational corporations in the globalization of dairying in La Laguna, Mexico. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 8:52–70
- Gee H. 2002. Food and the future. *Nature* 418(6898):1–3
- George S. 1977. *How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger*. Montclair, NJ: Allenheld, Osman and Co.
- Gladwin C, Thomson A, Peterson J, Anderson A. 2001. Addressing food security in Africa via multiple livelihood strategies of women farmers. *Food Policy* 26:177–207
- Goldfrank W. 2005. Fresh demand: the consumption of Chilean produce in the United States. See Watson & Caldwell 2005, pp. 42–53
- Goodman D, Depuis EM. 2002. Knowing food and growing food: beyond the production-consumption debate in sociology of agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(1):5–22
- Goodman D, Redclift M. 1991. *Refashioning Nature: Food, Ecology and Culture*. London: Routledge
- Goodman D, Watts M, ed. 1997. *Globalizing Food: Agrarian Questions and Global Restructuring*. London: Routledge

- Gottschang SK. 2000. A baby-friendly hospital and the science of infant feeding. See Jing 2000, pp. 160–84
- Gupta A. 1998. *Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Gupta A. 2003. *Global movements of crops since the 'Age of Discovery' and changing culinary cultures*. Sirindhorn Anthropology Lecture, Princess Maha Chaki Sirindhorn Anthropology Centre, Bangkok, March 26
- Gupta A, Ferguson J, eds. 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Guptill A, Wilkins JL. 2002. Buying into the food system: trends in food retailing in the US and implications for local foods. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 19:39–51
- Guthman J. 2000. Raising organic: an agro-ecological assessment of grower practice in California. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:257–66
- Haan de LJ. 2000. Globalization, localization and sustainable livelihood. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40(3):339–65
- Hall A. 1998a. Pesticide reforms and the challenges of globalization: making the farmers responsible. *Can. J. Law Soc.* 13(1):187–213
- Hall A. 1998b. Sustainable agriculture: implications for gender and the family farm. In *Transgressing Borders: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Household, and Culture*, ed. S Ilcan, L Phillips, pp. 209–25. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey
- Haraway D. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge
- Harding S. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Hassanein N. 2003. Practicing food democracy: a pragmatic politics of transformation. *J. Rural Stud.* 19:77–86
- Heffernan W, Constance D. 1994. Transnational corporations and the globalization of the food system. In *From Columbus to ConAgra: The Globalization of Agriculture and Food*, ed. A Bonanno, L Busch, W Friedland, L Gouveia, E Mingoine, pp. 29–51. Lawrence: Univ. Press Kansas
- Heller C, Escobar A. 2003. From pure genes to GMOS: transnationalized gender landscapes in the biodiversity and transgenic food networks. In *Genetic Nature/Culture: Anthropology and Science beyond the Two-Culture Divide*, ed. A Goodman, D Heath, MS Lindee, pp. 155–75. Berkeley/London: Univ. Calif. Press
- Hellin J, Higman S. 2003. *Feeding the Market: South American Farmers, Trade and Globalization*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian
- Hendrickson MK, Heffernan WD. 2002. Opening spaces through relocalization: locating potential resistance in the weaknesses of the global food system. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(4):347–69
- Hinrichs CC. 2003. The practice and politics of food system localization. *J. Rural Stud.* 19:33–45
- Hobart M, ed. 1993. *An Anthropological Critique of Development*. London: Routledge
- Hollander GM. 1995. Agroenvironmental conflict and world food system theory: sugarcane in the Everglades agricultural area. *J. Rural Stud.* 11(3):309–18
- Ilcan S, Phillips L. 2003. Making food count: expert knowledge and global technologies of government. *Can. Rev. Sociol. Anthropol.* 40(4):441–62
- Ilcan S, Phillips L. 2006. Circulations of insecurity: globalizing food standards in historical perspective. In *Agricultural Standards: The Shape of the Global Food and Fiber System*, ed. J Bingen, L Bush, pp. 51–72. Dordrecht, The Neth.: Springer

- Inda J, Rosaldo R, eds. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization*: Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Ingo MD, Nash JD. 2004. *Agriculture and the WTO: Creating a Trading System for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank/Oxford Univ. Press
- Ito S. 2002. From rice to prawns: economic transformation and agrarian structure in rural Bangladesh. *J. Peasant Stud.* 29(2):47–70
- Jameson F, Miyoshi M. 1998. *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Jansen K, Vellema S, eds. 2004. *Agribusiness and Society: Corporate Responses to Environmentalism, Market Opportunities, and Public Regulation*. London/New York: Zed
- Jaroszk L. 2000. Understanding agri-food networks as social relations. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:279–83
- Jing J, ed. 2000. *Feeding China's Little Emperors: Food, Children and Social Change*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Jing J. 2000. Food, nutrition, and cultural authority in a Gansu village. See Jing 2000, pp. 135–59
- Johnston J. 2001. Consuming social justice. *Arena* (Electronic document accessed Feb. 7, 2005)
- Kearney M. 1986. From the invisible hand to visible feet: anthropological studies of migration and development. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 15:331–61
- Kearney M. 1996. *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in Global Perspective*. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Kneen B. 1995. *Invisible Giant: Cargill and its Transnational Strategies*. London: Pluto
- Kneen B. 1999. Restructuring food for corporate profit: the corporate genetics of Cargill and Monsanto. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 16:161–67
- Koc M, MacRae R, Mougeot L, Welsh J, eds. 1999. *For Hunger-Proof Cities: Sustainable Urban Food Systems*. Ottawa: Int. Dev. Res. Cent.
- Konefal J, Mascarenhas M, Hatanaka M. 2005. Governance in the global agro-food system: backlighting the role of transnational supermarket chains. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 22:291–302
- Kritzinger A, Barrientos S, Rossouw H. 2004. Global production and flexible employment in South African horticulture: experiences of contract workers in fruit exports. *Sociologia Ruralis* 44(1):17–39
- Kulick D, Meneley A. 2005. *Fat: The Anthropology of an Obsession*. New York: Tarcher/Penguin
- Lappé FM. 1973. *Diet for a Small Planet*. New York: Ballentine
- Lappé FM, Collins J. 1980. *World Hunger: Ten Myths*. Grove Press, NY: Food First
- Lappé FM, Lappé A. 2002. *Hope's Edge: The Next Diet for a Small Planet*. New York: J.P.Tarcher/Putnam
- Le Heron R. 2003. Creating food futures: reflections on food governance issues in New Zealand's agri-food sector. *J. Rural Stud.* 19(1):111–25
- Lentz C, ed. 1999. *Changing Food Habits: Case Studies from Africa, South America and Europe*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic
- Li T. 2004. *Government through community at the World Bank*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Can. Anthropol. Soc./Soc. Can. Anthropol. (CASCA), May 6, London
- Lien MF, Nerlich B, eds. 2004. *The Politics of Food*. Oxford, UK: Berg
- Lind D, Barham E. 2004. The social life of the tortilla: food, cultural politics, and contested commodification. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 21:47–60
- Llambí L. 1993. Global agro-food restructuring: the role of transnational corporations and nation-states. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 3:19–38
- Long N, Long A, eds. 1992. *The Battlefields of Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London/New York: Routledge
- Lozada EP Jr. 2000. Globalized childhood? Kentucky Fried Chicken in Beijing. See Jing 2000, pp. 114–34

- Lyson TA, Raymer AL. 2000. Stalking the Wily Multinational: power and control in the US food system. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:199–208
- Madeley J. 2000. *Hungry for Trade: How the Poor Pay for Free Trade*. London: Zed
- Magdoff F, Foster JM, Buttel F, ed. 2000. *Hungry for Profit: The Agribusiness Threat to Farmers, Food, and the Environment*. New York: Monthly Rev. Press
- Mankekar P. 2005. 'India Shopping': Indian grocery stores and transnational configurations of belonging. See Watson & Caldwell 2005, pp. 197–214
- Marglin S. 1996. Farmers, seedsmen, and scientists: systems of agriculture and systems of knowledge. In *Decolonizing Knowledge: From Development to Dialogue*, ed. F Apfel-Marglin, S. Marglin, pp. 198–248. Oxford, UK: Clarendon
- Marsden T. 2000. Food matters and the matter of food: towards a new food governance? *Sociologia Ruralis* 40(1):20–29
- Marsden T, Cavalcanti JSB, Irmão JF. 1996. Globalisation, regionalisation and quality: the socio-economic reconstitution of food in the San Francisco Valley, Brazil. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 5:85–114
- McCann J. 2001. Maize and grace: history, corn, and Africa's new landscapes, 1500–1999. *Comp. Study Soc. His.* 43(2):246–72
- McKenna M, Campbell H. 2002. It's not easy being green: the development of 'food safety' practices in New Zealand's apple industry. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 10(2):45–55
- McKenna M, Roche M, Le Heron R. 1999. H. J. Heinz and global gardens: creating quality, leveraging localities. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 8:35–51
- McKenna M, Le Heron R, Roche M. 2001. Living local, growing global: renegotiating the export production regime in New Zealand's pipfruit sector. *Geoforum* 32:157–66
- McMichael P, ed. 1994. *The Global Restructuring of Agro-Food Systems*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- McMichael P. 1999. Virtual capitalism and agri-food restructuring. In *Restructuring Global and Regional Agricultures*, ed. D Burch, J Goss, G Lawrence, pp. 3–22. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate
- McMichael P. 2000. The power of food. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:21–33
- Messer E, Shipton P. 2002. Hunger in Africa: untangling its human roots. In *Exotic No More: Anthropology on the Front Lines*, ed. J MacClancey, pp. 227–50. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Miele M, Murdoch J. 2002. The practical aesthetics of traditional cuisines: slow food in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(4):312–28
- Miller D. 1995. Consumption and commodities. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:141–61
- Miller D. 1998. Coca-Cola: a black sweet drink from Trinidad. In *Material Cultures: Why Some Things Matter*, ed. D Miller, Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Mintz SW. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin
- Mintz SW. 1996. *Tasting Food, Tasting Freedom*. Boston: Beacon
- Mintz SW, Du Bois CM. 2002. The anthropology of food and eating. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 31:99–119
- Moran W, Blunden G, Workman M, Bradley A. 1996. Family farmers, real regulation and the experience of food regimes. *J. Peasant Stud.* 12(3):245–58
- Murray W. 2001. The second wave of globalization and agrarian change in the Pacific Islands. *J. Rural Stud.* 17:135–48
- Murray W. 2002. From dependency to reform and back again: the Chilean peasantry during the twentieth century. *J. Peasant Stud.* 29(3–4):190–227
- Murray DL, Reynolds LT. 2000. Alternative trade in bananas: obstacles and opportunities for progressive social change in the global economy. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:65–74

- Myers G. 2004. *Banana Wars: The Price of Free Trade*. London/New York: Zed
- Nash J. 1994. Global integration and subsistence insecurity. *Am. Anthropol.* 96(1):7–30
- Nestle M. 2002. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Norberg-Hodge H. 2003. The consumer monoculture. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* 27(4):258–61
- Norberg-Hodge H, Merrifield T, Gorelick S. 2002. *Bringing the Food Economy Home: Local Alternatives to Global Agribusiness*. London: Zed Books
- Ohnuki-Tierney E. 1999. We eat each other's food to nourish our body: the global and local as mutually constituent forces. In *Food in Global History*, ed. R Grew, pp. 240–72. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Okongwu AF. 2000. The anthropology of public policy. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 29:107–24
- Ortiz S. 2002. Laboring in the factories and in the fields. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 31:395–417
- Pacione M. 1997. Local exchange trading systems—a rural response to the globalization of capitalism? *J. Rural Stud.* 13(4):415–27
- Paley J. 2002. Toward an anthropology of democracy. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 31:469–96
- Papenoe R. 2004. *Feeding Desire: Fatness, Beauty, and Sexuality Among a Saharan people*. London/New York: Routledge
- Paul H, Steinbrecher R. 2003. *Transnational Biotech Companies Colonize the Food Chain*. London/New York: Zed
- Peltre-Wurtz J. 2004. Luchar para Comer: estrategias familiares para la alimentación en sectores populares. Quito, Ecuador: CEDIME, IRD, Abya-Yala
- Phillips L. 2005. Gender mainstreaming: the global governance of women? *Can. J. Dev. Stud.* 26:651–63
- Phillips L, Ilcan S. 2003. A world free from hunger: global imagination and governance in the age of scientific management. *Sociologia Ruralis* 43(4):434–53
- Phillips L, Ilcan S. 2004. Capacity-building: the neoliberal governance of development. *Can. J. Dev. Stud.* 15(3):393–409
- Pinstrup-Andersen P, Pandya-Lorch R. 2001. *The Unfinished Agenda: Perspectives on Overcoming Hunger, Poverty, and Environmental Degradation*. Washington, DC: IPRI
- Pinstrup-Andersen P, Schioler E. 2000. *Seeds of Contention: World Hunger and the Global Controversy over GM Crops*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins Univ.
- Preibisch K, Rivera Herrejon G, Wiggins S. 2002. Defending food security in a free-market economy: the gendered dimensions of restructuring in rural Mexico. *Hum. Org.* 61(1):68–79
- Pritchard B, Burch D. 2003. *Agri-Food Globalization in Perspective: International Restructuring in the Processing Tomato Industry*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate
- Pritchard B, Fagan R. 1999. Circuits of capital and transnational corporate spatial behaviour: Nestlé in Southeast Asia. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 8:3–20
- Raffer K. 1997. Helping southern net food importers after the Uruguay Round: a proposal. *World Development* 25(11):1901–7
- Raynolds LT. 1994. The restructuring of third world agro-exports: changing production relations in the Dominican Republic. See McMichael 1994, pp. 214–37
- Raynolds LT. 2000. Re-embedding global agriculture: the international organic and fair trade movements. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 17:297–309
- Raynolds LT. 2002. Consumer/producer links in fair trade coffee networks. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(4):404–24
- Raynolds LT, Murray D. 1998. Yes, we have no bananas: reregulating global and regional trade. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 7:7–44

- Razavi S, ed. 2002. *Shifting Burdens: Gender and Agrarian Change Under Neoliberalism*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian
- Renard MC. 1999. The interstices of globalization: the example of fair coffee. *Sociologia Ruralis* 39:484–500
- Riches G, ed. 1997. *First World Hunger: Food Security and Welfare Politics*. New York: St. Martin's
- Ritzer G. 1993. *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press
- Rocheleau D, Thomas-Slater B, Wangari E, eds. 1996. *Feminist Political Ecology: Global Perspectives and Local Insights*. London/New York: Routledge
- Roseberry W. 1996. The rise of the yuppie coffees and the reimagination of class in the United States. *Am. Anthropol.* 98(4):762–75
- Rosset P, Rice R, Watts M. 1999. Thailand and the World Tomato: globalization, new agricultural countries (NACs) and the agrarian question. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 8:71–85
- Runge CF, Senauer B, Pardey PG, Rosegrant M. 2003. *Ending Hunger in our Lifetime: Food Security and Globalization*. Published for IFPRI (Int. Food Policy Res. Inst.). Baltimore/London: John Hopkins Univ. Press
- Sanderson S, ed. 1985. *The Americas in the New International Division of Labor*. New York: Holmes and Meier
- Sanderson S. 1986. The emergence of the 'world steer': internationalization and foreign domination in Latin American cattle production. In *Food, the State and International Political Economy*, ed. FL Tullis, WL Hollist, pp. 123–48. Lincoln: Univ. Neb. Press
- Schaeffer R. 1993. Standardization, GATT and fresh food. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 3:71–81
- Scheper-Hughes N. 1992. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Press
- Schertz LP, Daft LM, ed. 1994. *Food and Agriculture Markets: The Quiet Revolution*. Washington, DC: Econ. Res. Serv. U.S. Dep. Agric., Food and Agric. Comm. Natl. Plan. Assoc.
- Scott J. 1998. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT/London: Yale Univ. Press
- Selfa T, Qazi J. 2005. Place, taste, or face-to-face? Understanding producer-consumer networks in 'local' food systems in Washington State. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 22(4):451–64
- Shipton P. 1990. African famines and food security: anthropological perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 19:353–94
- Shiva V. 1997. *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: South End
- Shiva V. 2000. *Stolen Harvest: The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply*. Cambridge, MA: South End
- Smart J. 1997. Borrowed men on borrowed time: globalization, labor migration, and local economies in Alberta. *Can. J. Region. Sci.* 20(1–2):141–56
- Smart J. 2003. Ethnic entrepreneurship, transmigration, and social integration: an ethnographic study of Chinese restaurant owners in rural western Canada. *Urban Anthropol.* 32(3–4):311–42
- Sobal J. 1999. Food system globalization, eating transformations, and nutrition transitions. In *Food in Global History*, ed. R Grew, pp. 171–93. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Sobal J. 2001. Commentary: globalization and the epidemiology of obesity. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 30:1136–37
- Sonnenfeld D, Schotzko T, Jussaume JRA. 1998. Globalization of the Washington apple industry: its evolution and impacts. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food.* 7:151–38
- Tillotson JE. 2004. America's obesity: conflicting public policies, industrial economic development, and unintended human consequences. *Annu. Rev. Nutr.* 24:617–43
- Tinker I. 1999. Street foods into the 21st century. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 16:327–33

- Tomlinson J. 1999. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press
- Trauger A. 2004. Because they can do the work: women farmers in sustainable agriculture in Pennsylvania, USA. *Gend. Place Cult.* 11(2):289–307
- Tsing A. 2000. The global situation. *Cult. Anthropol.* 15(3):327–60
- Van Esterik P. 1989. *The Breast-Bottle Controversy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
- Van Esterik P. 1999. Right to food; right to feed; right to be fed: the intersection of women's rights and the right to food. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 16:225–32
- Wallace J. 2005. Terra madre: a global gathering of food producers. *Can. Org. Grow.* Winter:26–27
- Walton J, Seddon D. 1994. *Free Markets and Food Riots: The Politics of Global Adjustment*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Waring M. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics*. San Francisco: Harper Collins
- Warman A. 2003. *Corn and Capitalism: How a Botanical Bastard Grew to Global Dominance*. Chapel Hill/London: Univ. N.C. Press
- Watson JL, ed. 1997. *Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Watson JI, Caldwell MI, eds. 2005. *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Webb KL, Pelletier D, Maretzki AN, Wilkins J. 1998. Local food policy coalitions: evaluation issues as seen by academics, project organizers, and funders. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 15:65–75
- Weismantel M. 1988. *Food, Gender and Poverty in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
- Weismantel M. 1999. Tasty meals and bitter gifts: consumption and production in the Ecuadorian Andes. In *Changing Food Habits*, ed. C Lentz, pp. 135–53. Amsterdam: Overseas Publ. Assoc.
- Whatmore S, Thorne L. 1997. Nourishing networks: alternative geographies of food. In *Globalising Food: Agrarian Questions and Global Restructuring*, ed. D Goodman, M Watts, pp. 287–304. London: Routledge
- WHO (World Health Organ.). 1998. *Obesity: Preventing and Managing the Global Epidemic*. Geneva: WHO
- Yenal NZ. 1999. Food TNCs, intellectual property investments and post-Fordist food consumption: the case of Unilever and Nestlé in Turkey. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 8:21–34