Communities of Abundance: Sociality, Sustainability, and the Solidarity Economies of Local Food-Related Business Networks in Knoxville, Tennessee

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Tony Nathan VanWinkle
May 2014

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my dissertation committee: to my co-chairs, Gregory Button and Tricia Redeker-Hepner for their continued patience, support, and encouragement, and for their essential guidance and critical feedback through the draft stages of the dissertation; to De Ann Pendry, who was always willing to listen to and comment on new ideas; to Damayanti Banarjee, whose graduate seminars in environmental sociology provided a forum for the initial explorations of many of the ideas that appear in this dissertation. I would also like to thank Jon Shefner of the sociology department.

Without the community and fellowship provided by fellow graduate students I could not have made it through this process. I would especially like to thank Erin Eldridge, Gabriella Maldonado, and Amanda Reinke for their support, friendship, and feedback. I would also like to thank those undergraduate students whose enthusiasm and engagement helped tremendously in the formulation of parts of this dissertation. Thanks especially to Amanda Cappanola, Lain Myers, Joey Green, Jordon Fouts, Casey Jackson, and Steven Hodge. Also thanks to those friends who lent support and suggestions throughout—Corey Dugan, Jason Robinson, Jill Houser, and Jason & Jodi Watts.

Lastly, this would not have been possible at all if not for the unconditional support and encouragement I received from my family, who continued to believe in me even when I didn't. Thank you Nancy, and Greyson, and Cole.

Abstract

This dissertation examines the socio-economic and eco-political dimensions of contemporary localist food movements in Knoxville, Tennessee. More specifically, it explores the implications of the mutualistic and networked socio-economies (solidarity and/or community economies) of such movement expressions as they are experienced, embodied, and understood among the small-scale, independent food-related business owners who often serve as the interpellators of such movements. This study is likewise concerned with ways in which movement actors are actively shaping/creating place (via the processes of emplacement), and relatedly, the way place—as an entity possessive of its own accretions of environmental, historical, cultural, economic, and political identities—shapes actors, therefore determining the textures of particular localisms in return. Such processes and expressions, while explicitly oriented toward the recovery and reassertion of the "local," however, are also necessarily embedded in the structural matrix of neoliberal globalization. Indeed, it is precisely from the negotiation of such global/local dialectics that localist food movements draw their oppositional political value. Accordingly, the study is also preoccupied with the ways in which localist food movements, particularly in their contestational positioning vis-a-vis the global industrial food system, are also actively producing new, and perhaps critical-neoliberal subjectivities that bridge post-Fordist symbolic and cultural economies on the one hand, with affective solidarity economies on the other.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Communities of Abundance? 1

Chapter 1: Visible Hands & Market Stands 45

Chapter 2: Savor the Earth To Save It 101

Chapter 3: Thinking Little . . . The Next Big Thing 152

Chapter 4: Your Localism and Mine 209

Conclusions 255

Bibliography 270

Vita 289

Introduction: Communities of Abundance?

This dissertation examines the socio-economic dimensions of contemporary localist food movements in Knoxville, Tennessee. More specifically, it explores the implications of the mutualistic and networked socio-economies (solidarity and/or community economies) of such movement expressions as they are experienced, embodied, and understood among the small-scale, independent food-related business owners who often serve as the interpellators of such movements. This study is likewise concerned with ways in which movement actors are actively shaping/creating place (via the processes of emplacement), and relatedly, the way place—as an entity possessive of its own accretions of environmental, historical, cultural, economic, and political identities—shapes actors, therefore determining the textures of particular localisms in return. Such processes and expressions, while explicitly oriented toward the recovery and reassertion of the "local," however, are also necessarily embedded in the structural matrix of neoliberal globalization. Indeed, it is precisely from the negotiation of such global/local dialectics that localist food movements draw their oppositional political value. Accordingly, the study is also preoccupied with the ways in which localist food movements, particularly in their contestational positioning vis-a-vis the global industrial food system, are also actively producing new, and perhaps critical-neoliberal subjectivities that bridge post-Fordist symbolic and cultural economies on the one hand, with affective solidarity economies on the other.

While indicative of long-term interests in food studies and alternative economies, the particular nature and direction of the current study was gestated in upper division classes focused around the intersecting topical arenas of globalization, consumerism, and sustainability. Within these classes, the regularly featured section on food is often the most popular among students. Together, we find that contemporary food economies are a particularly resonant lens through which to ground inquiries that can otherwise veer into abstraction. After all, we all eat. Because of its contemporary dualistic nature as a major global commodity imbricated in vast global exchange networks as well as an intensely local product bound up in all sorts of affective relations—food is perhaps especially illustrative of local/global discourses, particularly as these are further refined through emergent ethical consumption practices like fair trade and so-called artisanal food production.

Exploring the multivalence of such formations, in class we watched a short profile and promotional video featuring Brooklyn, NY based business, Mast Brothers Chocolate. This highly aestheticized production is built around scenes featuring the company's artisanal production processes (slow, deliberate, exacting) along with video portraits and the philosophical musings of Rick and Michael Mast, the young, hip proprietors of their namesake company; whose style of self presentation and highly referential, romantic, even anachronistic locution collapses entrepreneur and raconteur into a single persona. Indeed, the theatricality, the performativity of it all, appears more like a stage-set from HBO's newest 19th century period drama, or a steam-punk costume party, than an operating business. Considered within the context of the neoliberal present, it

brought to mind a rather prescient quote from C. Wright Mills' 1959 study, *White Collar*: ". . . the saleman's world has now become everyone's world, and, in some part, everybody has become a salesman" (161). Placing the current neoliberal moment in the genealogy of post WWII countercultural expressions, William Deresiewicz concurs, writing, "Today's ideal social form is not the commune or the movement or the individual creator as such; it's the small business. Every artistic or moral aspiration—music, food, good works, what have you—is expressed in those terms" (2011).

The derisive tone of Deresiewicz's article, revealingly entitled, "Generation Sell," however, provides a critical counterpoint for an examination of other, perhaps heretofore largely invisible, possibilities inherent in such formations. Deresiewicz's contempt for business in the most broadly general terms expresses a kind of essentialist anti-capitalist bias shared by several generations of scholars whose work is located at the intersection of commerce and culture (and counter-culture more specifically). In such formulations, capitalism is often a given—an ahistorical, transcendent, and inexorable force (the prime mover) with unlimited capacity to recuperate any and all challenges to its hegemony. In Heather Paxson's words, however, such an orientation ". . . reproduces a dichotomy between quantitative market value and qualitative social values, such that the pursuit of one is assumed to diminish the other" (2013: 8). Indeed, rather than labeling an entire generation as sell outs simply because of their desire to participate in economic activities (suggesting such desires are categorically always already appropriated by capital)—what if the current generation of independent, food-related business owners and their reticulate networks

represent something other than capital's ever enveloping recuperative tentacles, and instead embody real, substantive, and even antagonistic economic alternatives? This project explores just such possibilities through two principal points of entry: 1. Solidarity and/or community economies—particularly those affective, extra-economic interdependencies that adhere in the relational practices cultivated and maintained by emplaced (local/place-based), food-related small businesses, and; 2. Artisanal politics—the attendant shift toward a political project that poses a radical revaluation of the small-scale, the handmade, the local—all experiential categories fundamentally at odds with the operative logic of global neoliberal capitalism. This latter analytic is likewise indicative of a second socio-economic operative that will be variously identified as the cultural and/or symbolic economy of the post-industrial Global North (and increasingly characteristic of urban socio-economic realities everywhere). Thus, this project is centrally concerned with examining the implications of the socio-economic formations and cultural negotiations expressed in local food movements as these adhere in the concatenations where solidarity and symbolic economies meet.

The Temporalities of Subjectivity: The Neoliberal Moment and the Politics of the Possible

In many analyses undertaken in the social sciences, the current neoliberal moment is presented as having created a totalizing global climate of market fundamentalism in which the principle market subject, the consumer, or somewhat more generously—the consumer-citizen—has been discursively constructed as the primary locus of agency. In such a context, social and

environmental justice initiatives often become the imperative of market actors and presumably enlightened consumer choice rather than matters of policy and/or regulatory oversight.

Research on emergent subjectivities within these contexts has focused largely on various expressions, experiences, and practices of "ethical consumerism" as principal axes of negotiation. The work of Jaffe, Kloppenburg, & Monroy (2004), Jaffe (2007), and more recent edited volumes by Moberg & Lyon (2010) and Lewis & Potter (2011) attest to currency of this orientation. Animating most such studies is the perennially vexing question of structure vs. agency, a quandary further complicated by the contingencies and experiences of the neoliberal present. Indeed, in assessing the expansion of fair trade markets and networks Moberg & Lyon state, "For consumers who embrace one or more of fair trade's transformative goals, its appeal, and no doubt one reason for its phenomenal growth, lies in its ability to engage a newfound sense of agency and identity through consumption" (8). Similarly, as Arjun Appadurai put it in a seminal essay, such a context often yields a "fetishism of the consumer . . . [who] is consistently helped to believe that he or she is an actor, when in fact he or she is as best a chooser" (1990). As Appadurai argues, the constant non-reciprocal flows of the global economy—non-overlapping, yet mutually constitutive flows of capital, human bodies, goods and technologies, media-generated images, and competing ideas, together create a fragmented global cultural economy of disjuncture and difference. Ethical consumption practices, in such an estimation, are but the latest mode of just such a fetishism of the consumer as Appadurai suggests.

As other scholars (Isenhour 2010) have recently noted, theories of ethical and/or sustainable consumerism often identify the constellation of practices and identifications so identified as responses (often antagonistic ones) to globalization and/or as expressions of reflexive modernity accompanying the processes the ecological modernization that has become a hallmark of late-modern advanced industrial societies. In the arena of alternative food movements more specifically, Julie Guthman (2003, 2008) suggests such modalities have yielded a reflexive consumer whose subjectivity is formulated in hierarchical oppositional terms, where "In contrast to the fast food eater, the reflexive consumer pays attention to how food is made [and we might add, to where it comes from], and that knowledge shapes his or her 'taste' toward healthier food" (2003: 46). Guthman goes on to analyze the various ways in which such "reflexive tastes," imbricated in the emergence of alternative food production and distribution systems (organic, local, etc.) and novel cuisines, results in a kind of "Yuppie chow" that becomes an emblematic source of cultural capital and distinction in the larger arena of oppositional subjectivities. In other ways too—specifically in its tendencies to emphasize what Guthman enumerates as the quintessentially "neoliberal rationalities . . . [of] consumer choice, localism, entrepreneurialism, and self-improvement" (2008: 1176)—alternative food movements tend to reproduce neoliberal subjectivities in her estimation.

Guthman's analyses, however, as "narratives of hegemonic neo-liberalization" (Barnett et al. 2008: 648), tend to emanate from a theoretical matrix of "governmentality" in which "Everyday life and social relations are reduced to residual effects of initiatives emanating from dispersed, but

nevertheless coherent concentrations of authority" (ibid: 628). So situated, Guthman's engagements may rely over heavily on the very kind of dichotomous incommensurability suggested by Paxson above (see page 3). As Guthman herself admits as to the uroboric nature of her positionality: "It is difficult to know what something outside of neoliberalism might look like when all is seen an neoliberalism" (2008: 1181).

In her study of sustainable consumerism among the Swedish middle class, Cindy Isenhour (2010) suggests that such overbearing theoretical engagements often fall short of capturing the considerably more nuanced motivations and sentiments that encourage such behaviors and identities. In presuming a certain level of self-interest coterminous with the perception of personal risk, an a priori theoretical framework of reflexive modernization proved untenable in Isenhour's study, where participant's consumer decisions were most often grounded in sentiments of global solidarity and equality and a genuine concern for environmental sustainability. Likewise, as citizens of the advanced capitalist global north, Sweden's middle class sustainable consumers make decisions to live in their inherited world in the best way they can, though with an understanding that such actions alone are not enough to affect structural change. Concerned with whether such consumerist subjectivities are but the latest means by which to display social distinction and impose a class-based morality on others, Isenhour found that contrary to the assumption that a working class other would be the subject of such differentiation and imposition, "The most damning critiques of others were, instead, directed toward Sweden's upper class" (520-521). As a model for challenging Guthman's analysis of "reflexive tastes," perhaps the

antagonism is more properly directed toward the corporate elite at the helm of what is often seen by alternative food movement participants as a predatory and unscrupulous global industrial food system. As Jeff S., an independent coffee roaster and food truck proprietor interviewed for this dissertation, spoke of his motivations for making the food choices he does: "I decided some years ago that I didn't care to eat at McDonalds . . . because I don't appreciate what they do. I don't appreciate what's going on there . . . I don't really need for them to go away, I'm just not directing my resources there."

Such subject positions may be seen as reflective of Sayer's (2005) "lay normativities," or those everyday rationales actors employ to navigate concerns about "what is of value, how to live, what is worth striving for and what is not" (in Barnett et al. 2008: 640), rather than as "residual effects" of an unknowing and conforming subject, a sort of neoliberal automaton. Barnett et al assert that without the kind of humanized and rational subjectivity that Sayer's concept of lay normativities allows for, "we are left with a picture of 'bloodless figures who seemingly drift through life, behaving in ways that bear the mark of their social positions and relations of wider discourse, disciplining themselves only because it is required of them, but as if nothing mattered to them'" (640).

Others have similarly argued that the neoliberal present might be generative of new kinds of counter-subjectivities. In his study of emergent and negotiated neoliberal subjectivities in the hyper-capitalist context of the "city-corporation" that is contemporary Dubai, Ahmed Kanna references recent studies (those of Cahn, Freeman, Ferguson, Ong, and others) as exemplifying an approach concerned more explicitly with "the connections between neoliberalism

and cultural process" (2010: 102). Such studies, Kanna suggests, provide a more nuanced perspective, revealing as they do an on-going and adaptive process of negotiation and agency attending the formation of neoliberal subjects, than do previous models postulating a monolithic and inexorable process of globalization. In a parallel alternative formulation, Yanagisako suggests "A nondichotomous processual model of culture and capitalism [that] treats capitalist action as culturally produced and, therefore, always infused with cultural meaning and value" (6). Similarly, Gibson-Graham (2008) suggest that "diverse economies" embodied by all manner of alternative economic activities suggest something other than inexorable market penetration, but rather an active reimagining and remapping of economic subjectivity and possibility. In such a framework, emergent negotiations of the perceived neoliberal totality of the present, including those of ethical consumption, might be interpreted *not* as yet another example of the recuperative power of capitalism, but as antagonistic counter-subjectivities. As Lewis & Potter argue, "What the practices and politics of ethical consumption at its most radical can bring us to . . . is a rethinking of the 'good life' and of living in ways that fundamentally challenge the logics of consumer culture itself" (2011: 18).

In adding further nuance to processes of neoliberal subject formation, this dissertation shifts attention from the neoliberal consumer-subject to a less often explored counterpart and counterpoint—the producer-subject (in this particular case referring to the secondary producers who are the owner/proprietors of the food-related businesses that are the primary subject of this dissertation). Returning for a moment to Mast Brothers Chocolate, their efforts could be quite

easily placed into a convenient ontological hierarchy suggesting a kind of unknowing Foucauldian subject—variously characterized as either a kind of neoliberal dupe or an extension of the entrepreneurial self. However, as Mike Featherstone reckons it, Foucault argued in his theorization of the "art of living" and "care of the self," that "a way of life can generate a culture and an ethics, which for Foucault implies that a way of life is an ethics, a way of being together, of being with others which generates shared space. This space is one of experimentation in forming a polis, that is, in making politics, which emphasizes the political character of ethics" (Featherstone 2011: xix).

From a social justice and environmental sustainability perspective, and therefore from a position of a political ethics, Mast Brothers Chocolate is exemplary. They practice a kind of horizontal workplace democracy that is becoming increasingly rare in the age of austerity and benefit-reduction, offering permanence and security in the forms of full-time work and health and dental insurance plans. As bean-to-bar chocolate makers, the Mast Brothers likewise employ direct trade relations in the acquisition of their cacao—sourcing this primary resource from small farmer cooperatives in Belize, the Dominican Republic, and elsewhere. Combining a dedication to equitable trade relations with sustainability, the brothers have even gone so far as to sail a hand-built schooner from Brooklyn to the Dominican Republic, a four-week round-trip journey, to pick up raw cacao beans supplied largely by La Red de Guaconejo organic-cacao cooperative. Is this a display of a remarkable dedication to convictions grounded more in the ethos of ethical solidarity than in the bottom line logic of traditional business enterprises? Or is it something else? While

noteworthy, The Mast Brothers are far from alone in their efforts toward affecting change through the economic vehicle of interlinked small-businesses, or what we might characterize as a growing, though still marginal, solidarity economy. Further illustrating this alternative economy of solidarity-driven sentiment, as Kristen F., owner/operator of a small, independent specialty grocery and café in downtown Knoxville, Tennessee stated in explaining the criteria that determine the scope and content of their offerings:

> Our first interest is to support artisanal and southern foods if we can. Our second criteria (sic) is to try to promote independent producers, so we try to buy from independent companies instead of companies that have been bought up [by multi-national corporate brands]. So we try to buy from companies that are still family owned . . . or cooperatively owned—we like to support cooperative endeavors where we can.

Clearly, something is operating here that cannot be explained by the conventional economic calculus of cost-benefit analysis.

If we accept and/or sympathize with the contemporary social movement mantra that "another world is possible," are the Mast Brothers and other solidarity oriented business models one node of affinity in such an-other world? One in which the socially and environmentally responsible small business yields or demands (which?) an immaculately curated entrepreneur whose deliberate embodiment of alternative/ counter sensibilities and practices (equitable trade networks, non-hierarchical office/factory relations, cradle to grave sustainability practices) demonstrates the potential to transform the world one chocolate bar at a time? By such measures, the Mast Brothers indeed appear to be doing

everything right—trying to maximize both environmental and social justice in the processes of novel commodity production. But then what about the commodity itself—the $10 chocolate bar? This is certainly an elite commodity the consumption of which, as the Mast Brothers suggest, is an edificatory tool as much as an indulgence in sensory immediacy. Indeed, as elder brother and principal raconteur Rick Mast states: "We don't have a marketing department; we have an education department" (Wallace 2012: 2).

Indeed, it is precisely the dual tendency of small (secondary) producer-owned businesses to operate on much-touted principles of cooperation and interdependency, while simultaneously reproducing structures of inequality via their position as purveyors of elite cultural commodities, that render them particularly interesting nodes for analyzing the politics attending the formation and fluorescence of local food movements. In thus circumscribing the study's population, however, other kinds of producers have necessarily been left out of the analysis. Most notably among these, perhaps, are those who might be classified as primary producers—the small-scale and alternative farmer/growers—who form the first link in the development of local food movements. Furthermore, while organic farming and farmers have become the subject of a greater range of academic and popular literature (as in Guthman 2004 & Pollan 2006, to cite the most prominent recent examples), much less attention has been paid to the kinds of secondary producers who populate this research. Thus while growers most certainly engage in parallel forms of mutualistic practices, this research is more directly concerned with the activities of those secondary producers (i.e., the food-related business owners suggested in

the subtitle) who have most directly increased the visibility and popularity of local food movements everywhere, but most especially in the hip urban contexts and post-industrial economies which they have been instrumental in instantiating. Such developments are not without considerable race and class dimensions.

One theoretical avenue for exploring the potentiality and navigating the class implications of such formations is to be gleaned from the rich autonomist-Marxist orientation (the *autonomia* movement) developed most fully by a cadre of Italian theorists and activists over the course of the last fifty years. Central to the autonomist orientation, and particularly relevant to our discussion, is the concept of *cycles of struggle*, developed most fully in the English language by Nick Dyer-Witheford (1999) and Kathi Weeks (2011). As Weeks suggests, "Perhaps what characterizes the autonomist tradition more than anything else is its attempts to restore the methodological and political primacy of subjectivity" (93). In an inversion of orthodox Marxist perspectives, in the autonomist formulation the perennial cycles of struggle that characterize capitalism's movement and formation through time and space are driven not by the inexorable internal logic of capital, but rather by and through the agency of workers. As Dyer-Witheford characterizes it, "Far from being a passive object of capitalist designs, the worker is in fact the active subject of production, the wellspring of skills, innovation, and cooperation on which capital depends" (65). In such a framework, resistance to the totalizing ambitions of capital is constant—and indeed constitutive. Through on ongoing process of subjective

negotiation and counter-appropriation led by worker/citizens themselves, capital becomes the respondent force rather than the prime mover.

Furthermore, rather than focusing on class-consciousness, the autonomist tradition looks to the formative practice of class composition, wherein class is a process of becoming/un-becoming, rather than a categorical thing (i.e., *the* working class, forever and always). These linked processes, defined by continuous cycles of composition, decomposition, and re-composition, suggest the possibility of autonomy even within neoliberal structures. In other words, as the latest expression of capitalism, we are perhaps witnessing the onset of a new cycle of struggle wherein neoliberalism (composition) is being challenged (decomposition) by small businesses/activist-entrepreneurial subjects and practices (re-composition) that are, in the process of becoming/un-becoming, producing what Gibson-Graham (2009) label a new kind of "econo-sociality." An exploration of these possibilities, and their limits, are indeed central to the overall objectives of the research agenda lying ahead.

A second useful theoretical entry point is located in the concept of *alternative hedonism* (and the artisanal politics it implies/embodies), particularly as this may, or may not, be generative of new kinds of critical praxis and experience. As Kate Soper defines it, alternative hedonism is a kind of emergent alternative consumerist orientation characterized by a radical recalibration of the metrics of what constitutes "the good life." This dissertation is in part an exploration of a general disillusionment with the predominant economistic model that equates endless consumer choice, convenience, lowest-price calculus, and profit maximization with a "high standard of living" that is not

only worthy of our commitment and loyalty as consumer-citizens, but defensible by a global coercive machinery of military and police enforcement. This is perhaps a reaction to an explicit recognition that, as Aruhndati Roy (2009) puts it, "Freedom has come to mean choice. It has less to do with the human spirit than with different brands of deodorant." Alternative hedonism, as a new kind of counter-consumerism then, recognizes that if such formations are to be challenged, alternatives must be developed and brought into being as counter-possibilities, as new ways of assessing and embodying what it means to live "the good life." Such counter-measures include the elevation of relationships and a discerning sensuality above the self-maximizing interests of the rational actor. According to Soper:

> For these consumers, what is needed—and reflected in their exercise of purchasing power or withholding of it—is not to sustain and hand on to future generations a living standard as currently defined, but to consume differently now in order to accommodate the goods (including that of dealing more fairly with those who labor to provide them) that are currently being lost or marginalized By "high" standards of living (2008: 572).

A similar orientation adheres in other such alternative modalities of exchange, including the example of local currencies (locally redeemable monetary units). As Faidra Papavasiliou contends in her analysis of the affective potential of such developments: ". . . consumption in local currency is moralized as *productive consumption* . . . that elevates the individual and promotes the collective good rather than being a sign of personal and social corrosion" (2012: 218).

Inasmuch as such a repositioning replaces a normative orientation to quantity and convenience with an alternate orientation to quality and relationality, the chocolate bar becomes an educational tool precisely to the extent it represents a kind of shift in the basis of valuation, wherein a system valuing affective linkages and the binding mutualism of moral economies displaces the hegemonic valuation of competitive maximization. Small business owner/operators interviewed in the course of my fieldwork articulate parallel conceptualizations, stating: "[When] you have relationships with the people who either produce your food or benefit from you producing it [for them]—food or whatever –you care about them. So you want it to be better . . . We start being accountable to each other." And:

> I think one aspect of small business that tends to be more sustainable in general is that there is less distance in what's going on. There is more monitoring . . . and as a result you're less likely to be wasteful. Partly, small businesses can't usually afford to be wasteful. Secondly, for us, it hurts our feelings to have to throw food away. So we try to waste as little as possible, we try to recycle everything we can. I think there is just a greater responsibility because there its just more hands on, it's more tangible.

Useful as such concepts may be, it should be noted that participants in Knoxville's local food movement constitute a population that is both racially and socio-economically homogeneous, composed almost entirely of college educated, white, middle class subjects. This should not, however, be interpreted as reason for dismissing the very real alternative projects they are instantiating. As Carlsson & Manning (2010) note of their own examination of the largely middle

class phenomenon of analogous expressions of alternative econo-social activities they define as "Nowtopian," the myth of a universal American middle class has rendered older notions of class antagonism redundant while at the same time providing fodder for a kind of middle class rebellion against both the vacuity and excesses of contemporary middle class existence. As they authors put it,

> The adherents of this inchoate Nowtopian tendency are in revolt against social injustice, and keenly recognize the perilous ecological path global society is treading. They come almost unanimously from the "middle class," and it is the development of the myth of the middle class that can be partially blamed for the destruction of an antagonistic working class and for the current nowtopian surge (2010: 933).

Revolutionary Anachronisms: Praxis, Embodiment, and "Utopian Horizons"

Adding yet greater depth to these formations are the embodied dimensions characterizing the critical praxis of the artisan: that is, his/her/their commitment to what we might call new-old ways of doing things that are often grounded in the holism of basic production and manufacturing processes. These often acquire the mystique of the handmade, and demand an experiential, working knowledge of the materials and processes attending *manu*-facture, all of which is quite deliberately antagonistic to both the machine-assisted repetitive task of the global assembly line and the immaterial labor processes of what Franco Berardi (2009) calls the *cognitariat* of the global information economy. What we might call a pervasive neo-transcendentalism (referencing the 19th

century American literary movement) is endemic to these formations and a cornerstone in their imaginal & experiential framework. Indeed, current alternative food movement expressions share much in common with earlier revivalist cultural projects dating back to the Arts and Crafts Movements of late nineteenth and early twentieth century England and the U.S., and even with one of any number of music revivals spanning into the present. Ethnomusicologist Tamara Livingston identifies two primary elements that together give form and purpose to musical revivals: "(1) To serve as cultural opposition and as an alternative to mainstream culture, and (2) to improve existing culture through the values based on historical value and authenticity expressed by revivalists" (1999: 68). Such referential utopian sensibility is often turned against such efforts, however, as evidence of their hopeless naiveté amid the harsher demands of the so-called real world of competitive global markets. But it is precisely in their refusal and/or their negation of such hegemonies that these alternative economies embody and become political. As Erin B., who besides running a community-supported bakery out of her home kitchen in Knoxville also sings and plays banjo in an all-female old-time string band by the name of Possum Riot, asserts, "The world I want to live in is one where people create the things they need and provide for each other rather than relying on mysterious, outside sources and factories and things just appear."

In a review of the dramatic production *Wild Blessings*, a stage adaptation centered around the poetry of Wendell Berry, writer Eric Reece (2009) articulates parallel processes in relation to the life and work of the great Kentucky farmer/poet: "Critics have often dismissed Berry's work as too idyllic and too

idealistic—too . . . old fashioned. I would suggest, however, that we may finally be ready for a movement I will call the New Old-Fashionism. It is an era of climate crisis and peak oil, wherein the Jeffersonian values of conservation, decentralization, and local self-sufficiency don't look quite so unrealistic" (82). In terms of what this means in relation to those operating as producers (and therefore as brokers of a sort) at the forefront of contemporary alternative food movements, I return to Kate Soper, who, speaking of James Clifford's reimagining of the task of ethnography, writes: "We should be looking not only at the residual and disappearing, but also the interstitial and emerging, and even to the way in which the old and residual gets re-cast as an emergent avant-garde."

Indeed, considered in concert with autonomist-Marxist concepts of cycles of struggle and class composition, such experiments and subjectivities are reflective of an active engagement with less alienated ways of being in the world, and echo insights developed by David Graeber (2007) in his essay "The Twilight of Vanguardism." In it, Graeber explores the historical intersection of the political and artistic avant-garde (distinguished as the vanguard and avant-garde, respectively). Both descriptors, Graeber demonstrates, were used to indicate general and overlapping orientations (one political, the other artistic) toward the exploration of paths that might lead to a future society of less alienated relations and modes of being. Many of the experimental bohemian enclaves actively engaged in such explorations included a significant number of the disaffected children of the bourgeois as well as children of more rural and classically working class backgrounds. It was not until Marx instantiated the proletariat as the sole and singular revolutionary class, Graeber insists, that the potentialities therein

were expunged from Marxian political discourse. Marxian politics thereafter ". . . ruled out the possibility that less alienated enclaves, whether of artists or . . . artisans and independent producers . . . had anything significant to offer" (308). Against the temptation to categorize the products and activities of small business owner/operators as reflective of some kind of mass bourgeois subjectivity—and therefore inherently insignificant to revolutionary politics (especially when understood as a revolution of everyday life)—this projects allows for the possibility that bourgeois subjectivity might represent some kind of affective agency that is not always already appropriated by capital, and indeed might even be capable of taking forms that are antagonistic to it. This is particularly the case when such subjectivities articulate with social justice initiatives, which is often the case. If, as Graeber suggests, ". . . revolutionary coalitions always tend to consist of an alliance between a society's least alienated and its most oppressed" (2007: 310), then the notion of a networked artisanal politics is central to their realization.

As suggested by Michael Osterweil and Graeme Chesters (2007), such artisanal sensibilities are vital components in the realization of larger socio-political transformations, particularly when the political is understood as being an inherently cultural process. In such formulations, everyday practice, affectivity, and ethical relationality are themselves transformative forces. Such cultural politics, the authors estimate, is "a politics based as much on creating and producing critical subjectivities—on creating carnival and joy, on recombining cultural codes—as it is about changing current laws and institutions" (258). Similar to the processes of reassessment so critical to the

articulation of an alternative hedonism, such a political process requires an analogous repositioning along consciously minoritarian lines; which drawing from an example first elaborated by Deleuze, means actively shifting our subjectivity from that of the architect to that of the artisan. The former, trafficking in blueprints and plans that are transposable, is, for our purposes, a surrogate for corporate globalization—the universal imposition of top-down economic models; while the latter "works at the cusp of the imaginary and the material, [and] whose imagination is directed by the self-organizing tendencies of social and material systems" (259). Thus the artisan does not impose his/her will as a universal prescription, but allows for more organic processes that shift to accommodate changing contexts and demands. As Kathi Weeks suggests, speaking to the related processes yielding post-work imaginaries (which may include places utilizing models of radical workplace democracy), "There are advantages . . . to more partial visions of alternatives, fragments or glimpses of something different that do not presume to add up to a blueprint of an already named future with a preconceived content . . . [but rather] point toward a horizon of utopian possibility . . ." (2011: 30). This is precisely the sentiment expressed by Erin B. in stating "There is no *ideal* local economy and food system because the ideal is that each community decides what works for them. *There's no universal model.* [But] that's what we're taught—there's a universal model that is the best way, that everyone does."

In this statement, Erin B. points towards possibilities that are already visible on this horizon—the very kinds of solidarity economies embodied and enacted by the kinds of interlinked small business owner/operators that are the

focus of this project's inquiry. Originating in Latin America and France in the 1980s, solidarity economy as it is being used here is understood as "a counterhegemonic nodal point around which a creative antagonism to neoliberal capitalist economic relations can be constructed" (Miller 2013; forthcoming: 14). As part of a larger anti-essentialist movement, however, these solidarity economies are characterized, as much as by anything else, by their diversity. In other words, there is no *one* solidarity economy, but rather many diverse, locally adapted, economies. It is the economic realization of the Zapatista mantra, "one world in which many worlds fit." In speaking of these kinds of formations and the possibilities they offer, J.K. Gibson –Graham writes, "The diverse economy catapults multiplicity and economic differentiation to the fore and helps us to counter the ingrained belief that capitalist economic relations are the only driving economic force" (2009: 330).

The Plurality of Localism(s)—Global/Local Dialectics, Place-Making, and the Trouble with Community

The main title for this research project—Communities of Abundance—comes from a statement issued by one of my interviewees, Dale M., proprietor/ producer of a mobile fried pie stand, describing what the ideal local economy and/or food system might look like. The phrase was spoken in the midst of conversation concerning negotiations attending an emergent food landscape that continues to fluoresce as part of Knoxville, Tennessee's biweekly downtown farmer's market and its host locality, Market Square. Like cities everywhere, Knoxville's flagship farmer's market has generated a vibrant local (and *localist*)

food culture that in turn has stimulated an ever-widening circle of prepared food vendors. The end goal of such an endeavor, Dale states, is "To create a community of abundance, where none of us feel like we're taking away from each other, and understanding that the more great places there are, the more people will want to come."

Though Dale M. most certainly intended to imply material and food abundance in choosing this phrase, she also points to a more intangible, symbolic, and ethical kind of abundance as well—what we might call an abundance of cooperative spirit and mutual investment in the communities in which we actually live. In doing so she raises several closely related issues. The first of these we might call emplacement, or simply place-making—by which I refer to the active processes (political, economic, discursive, performative) by which specific places (cities, regions, etc.) are made and remade, and through which people become attached to and/or otherwise personally invested in a perceived, or an "imagined" community (Anderson 1983) but one that nonetheless becomes real through lived experiences and sociality. Through this analytic I also intend to imply something akin to Wendell Berry's conceptualization of a kind of regionalism that he defines as "*local life aware of itself*." In Berry's words, "The motive of such regionalism is the awareness that local life is intricately dependent, for its quality but also for its continuance, upon local knowledge" (1972: 67). Among producers in the localist food movement, such a local knowledge is being cultivated via a complex multi-dimensional relationality and awareness.

A second issue is entwined in Dale's stated hope that "more people will want to come," which reminds us, if a bit obliquely, that food movement activities are tethered to larger economic imperatives, though, as the chapters that follow will demonstrate, economic imperatives that are themselves being redefined and re-embedded in a larger social matrix. This takes a variety of expressions. Jeff S., who purchases raw coffee from those he identifies as "doing good work" in the arenas of ecological farming and socio-economic equity to roast and resell direct to consumers in Knoxville, exclaims that his business is driven by more than profit margins. As he states, "Ultimately, to be able to take any given dollar spent on a cup of coffee and to let that pass through people's hands that are doing good work was really key to me." Similarly, Dale M. states of her own motivation to move forward in her food business:

> Sharing food with people is one of the quickest and easiest ways to connect with them. I was already very invested in the Knoxville community when I started, but even more so . . . Just feeding people in Knoxville is a great feeling. It makes me feel very emotionally connected to the place. I also think that for people who buy the pies; I think the more places you have in the town that you live in that you comfortable with and you feel proud of—I have people who come every single week and buy the same thing—that provides a connection to the place [where] you live and makes you sort of invested in your community. When people come [to visit] you want to come and show them and say, 'this is part of Knoxville.' I think it goes both ways. For me I feel really connected to people by feeding them . . . and I think for the customers it provides a connection as well.

As Dale's statement makes clear, the economic imperatives in such reckonings become subordinate to the processes of place-making, thereby illustrating David

Harvey's contention that "There is . . . a politics to place construction ranging dialectically across material, representational, and symbolic activities which find their hallmark in the ways in which individuals invest in places and thereby empower themselves collectively by virtue of that investment" (1993: 24).

The third issue, into which the previous two are enfolded, is the endlessly contested meaning of community itself. In both the larger context of a nationally expressed though varied food localism, and in the more immediate nested contexts of the field site (the American South, Southern Appalachia, Knoxville, TN) the specter of community gathers added resonance. Peter Dickens (1996) writes (in a statement that applies equally if not perhaps to an even greater degree in our example of local alternative food movements), "In the environmental literature frequent appeal is made to 'community.' . . . It is a rallying cry, and one which contains all kinds of resonances about past and future societies which are wholly good and which must be recovered and retained" (132). Dickens suggests that to avoid the obfuscation of inequality inherent in the uncritical usage of "community," it should be replaced with the more neutral "civil society," a phrase of some contention itself. Acknowledging the largely academic debate over its meaning, Dickens contends nonetheless that 'civil society' (whatever it is!) represents a sphere of relative freedom for human beings and the possibility for the active creation of personal identity" (1996: 133). Among food movement actors intent on cultivating affinitive and relational local economies and culinary cultures, however, community continues to be the preferred descriptor, often to the same ends as Dickens' civil society. Among local alternative food movement participants, community is conceptualized as the

critical operative locus for differentiating itself from the global industrial food system. Community, in this context, is a totality consciously juxtaposed to impersonal global economic forces, the homogenization of space, place, and taste, and the acceleration of time that renders enjoyment and conviviality less possible.

Local food movement actors' deployment of community thus cannot be understood as an unreflexive, romantic, or nostalgic projection of some ideal type, but rather as reflective of the movement's demand for specificity, for a place-based, *trans*-local politics of self-determination—a process Paul Routledge (2005) calls "Grassrooting the Imaginary." Community, in local food movement usage, is the site of "re-inhabitation," a process that involves, as explained by Reid and Taylor (2010), "rebuilding infrastructures of embodied being, in particular places, in sedimented and emergent dependencies within ecological matrices and *given* limits of the nonhuman surround and placed histories" (4). An additional and intimately related concept further distinguishes this usage of community from the kind of apolitical and essentializing imaginary suggested by Dickens—the closely interrelated development of reciprocal networks. As stated in the quote by Dale, above, she desires a community in which "none of us feel like we're taking away from each other," indicative of a kind of networked econo-sociality essential to the realization of the greater "community of abundance" that is the ultimate goal. In such a way, the network constitutes the web of connectivity and the "pedagogical space" (Maeckelbergh 2009) wherein "new stories and myths," as well as new places and practices are generated toward the end of building a vibrant local food community.

In academic engagements more directly concerned with localization efforts, a great many warn that such sentiments and formations risk morphing into reactionary political positions, kinds of "protective" or "defensive localism." The engagements of Julie Guthman (2008) and Claire Hinrichs (2003) offer useful counterpoints in assessing the textures of this debate. Guthman's analyses tend to reiterate Scott Romine's striking and provocative statement, issued in his 1999 study *The Narrative Forms of Southern Community*, that "insofar as it is cohesive, a community will tend to be coercive" (2). In reapplying this very sentiment to localization, but placing it within a larger political cosmology in which the state occupies the position of beneficent godhead, Guthman chides, "What is inscribed by this embrace [the embrace of the local, presumably to the exclusion of any exteriority] . . . is a turn away from the state, articulating with devolutionary tendencies" (2008: 1177). In attributing a neoliberal ontology to localism, one positioned as the degenerate other of the centralized enlightenment state, Guthman elides the mutual constitution of the state and capitalism, as elaborated so expertly by Polanyi—i.e., the state is and has always been an instrument playing in concert with capitalism; it indeed made the expansion of capitalism possible in the first place.

From the perspective of an anarchist anthropology of the sort that David Graeber (2004) has theorized and encouraged, self-organization is not inherently expressive of naïve neoliberal subjectivity, but is rather expressive of an active agent whose position is one that rejects the centrality of the nation-state. More directly, the current effort toward place-making that is embodied by the food localization efforts examined in this research is qualitatively different from the

kinds of defensive localisms Guthman so fears. In keeping with Claire Hinrichs' perhaps more balanced interpretation, this research acknowledges that while positive and negative forms of localism are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the former embodies tremendous possibilities. For as Hinrichs notes:

> On one hand, food system localization may involve defensive, perhaps subtly exclusionary protection of a region constructed as discrete, homogeneous, static and beleaguered. But on the other hand, the very experience of localization can foster social and gustatory exchanges that demand new receptivity to difference and diversity" (2003: 34).

Local life aware of itself, yes, but local life also aware of that which is beyond itself. Knoxville food proprietor Dustin B. articulates this kind of understanding:

> I don't think we're ever going to get away from needing, and I guess, *desiring*, exports and imports of global products. And I don't think it's necessary. I think we just have to come back a little bit and kind of get our priorities straight. From a health sense, from a monetary sense, from a supporting-community sense—I think we, we in the sense of the [trans-local] community of farmers across the world and the country that are trying to do this local movement, all working together, we can support and bring a more healthy and sustainable product to the next generation. I think undoubtedly it will have a global effect.

The notion of a reactionary politics arising out of localist movements may likewise owe a good deal of its currency to a larger socio-political predisposition toward big, top-down solutions, or, not unrelatedly, the universal (state-level) revolution we are supposed to keep waiting around for. It is the inability or unwillingness, to summon Wendell Berry, to "think little." Guthman, in decrying the "devolutionary tendencies" she detects in localism's deliberate "turning away

from the state," is perhaps expressing the kinds of fears Gary Snyder anticipated in outlining a bioregional model of eco-socio-political organization, a "fear [of] the small society and the critique of the State" (1990: 44). This orientation is parallel in many ways to the problems noted by anthropologists working in the field of international development, wherein, through shear bellicosity, the spectacular intervention of the heroic State is presented as the only legitimate vehicle for "development." Or just as often, in an inversion that scenario, while those efforts abroad that intentionally bypass the State may be seen as valiant eruptions of grassroots agency, similar (if qualitatively and contextually different) efforts in the global north are more often dismissed as unwitting reproductions of neoliberal governance structures, due of course to their lack of deference to the State. If the example of the Zapatista Revolution and its subsequent diffusion through social movement circles around the globe may be taken as an indicator, for most people in most places it would seem, perennial promises of big solutions (coming soon!) from far off centers of political and economic power have long since played out. As research participant Jeff S. proclaimed: "My activism is on a very small scale. I'm doing what I'm doing because I think it needs done! That's the change I'm able to affect." Participant Dale M., who initiated a charitable offshoot of her fried pie business that she calls the Awesome Girl Squad (which provides small grants to young girls who want to initiate their own creative projects), perceived her own efforts similarly, stating:

> I'm not policy minded in the way that I'd be particularly good at solving problems on a larger scale or in creating systems in that way to address problems. My strength would be giving people tools to empower

> them[selves] to do work that is important to them. Doing writing workshops in prisons I did that; at the community TV station I was training people to use equipment to produce their own television shows. If you take that with the Awesome Girls Squad, it is giving people encouragement and help to do projects.

In her deployment of the rhetoric of empowerment and self-improvement, such an effort could easily be deconstructed as reproducing the structures of neoliberalism. But as they constitute a sort of economy of feeling, to dismiss them as such would be to miss their affective dimensions, which to quote Jeff S., "can be reduced to a simple, heart-felt axiom—am I doing the right thing? That's kind of it."

So as it is used in this dissertation, the utilization of the local in the sense of embedded tradition or heritage—the employment and deployment of the local vernacular—is important only as it serves as a hook or anchor (or both), behind which lies a broader sense of place, one that perhaps expresses a new kind of socio-ecological understanding. This process is often identified as a return to some earlier form of being-in and dealing-with the world one inhabits (the nostalgic immediacy of *reinhabitation*), but one that exists everywhere and has no particular locus of privilege, and is not therefore exclusionary. This is a kind of cosmopolitan-localism (one might even say a kind of Taoist-localism) in which a radical equality of place is recognized through the specificities of difference unique to each. It is a position analogous to the more spiritual-ecological musings of Scott Russell Sanders in an essay entitled "Settling Down." In it he writes,

> There are no privileged locations. If you stay put, your place may become a holy center, not because it gives you special access to the divine, but because in your stillness you hear what might be heard anywhere. All there is to see can be seen from anywhere in the universe, if you know how to look; and the influences of the entire universe converges on every spot (1999: 89).

In the sense of food localism then, what is unique to a particular locality, while necessarily different from some other place in an ecological sense, is imminently transferable. No hierarchy of place can exist in such a conceptualization, but rather a radical equality-by-way-of-difference, a recognition that might have much broader political implications.

In the urban southern Appalachian culinary culture that is the topic of this research, such formations create novel new culinary expressions that both would and would not have been recognizable as "southern" or "mountain" foods a generation ago. The current public culinary culture of the region—while paying homage both to the rich historic food traditions of the past and looking toward a future in which a truly cosmopolitan local food culture may finally emerge triumphant—is firmly rooted in the present. It is a rooted expression that is fully engaged in dialogue with global influences and flows. In its particular context, it is reflective of what James Peacock (2005) has referred to as "grounded globalism," the notion that "the global can synergize with the local, specifically that a sense of place could be preserved under globalism, creating a sort of grounded globalism that might resonate with yet also transform the South's traditional emphasis on place" (271). To again invoke Gary Snyder:

> Cultural pluralism and multilingualism are the planetary norm. We seek the balance between cosmopolitan pluralism and deep local consciousness. We are asking how the whole human race can regain self-determination in place after centuries of having been disenfranchised by hierarchy and/or centralized power. Do not confuse this exercise with "nationalism," which is exactly the opposite, the imposter, the puppet of the State, the grinning ghost of the lost community (1990: 46)

Site & Context: Knoxville, Tennessee, Southern Appalachia, and the American South in the World

Three miles west of the confluence of the Holston and French Broad Rivers, a meeting that marks the beginning of mighty Tennessee River, the frontier outpost of White's Fort (named after settler James White) was established on the river's north bank in 1786. Five years later the settlement was renamed Knoxville by resident and Governor of the Territory South of the River Ohio (the old Southwest Territory), William Blount. The town served as that territory's administrative capital until rendered obsolete by the founding the State of Tennessee in 1796. In 1791 a town plat of sixty-four lots was laid out, two of which were reserved for a church and cemetery, and four of which were reserved for Blount College. By 1810, Knoxville's population had grown to only 730 persons, but grew steadily up until the onset of the Civil War, standing at 5000 in 1860 (Wheeler 1998). For much of its pre-Civil War history, Knoxville was nothing more than a stopover for travelers destined for points farther west, though the arrival of the East Tennessee & Georgia Railroad in 1855 held the

promise of transforming this unremarkable river town into a distribution and commercial center. That promise was deferred, however, when most of Knoxville's citizens voted to secede from the Union in 1861, a position at odds with the pro-Union sentiment common through much of the greater East Tennessee region. A city of strategic importance during the Civil War, after the brief Battle of Knoxville of 1863, the city remained under Union control for the remainder of the conflict (Wheeler 1998).

From the post-war era to the turn of the twentieth century Knoxville emerged as a regional distribution, wholesaling, and manufacturing center, a position facilitated by expanding railroad development and the efforts of local boosters and business owners. Eagerly pursuing the line of New South progress and development that characterized larger patterns of southern urban industrialization in the early twentieth century, Knoxville boosters took to calling it the "Queen City of Mountains," signifying both the rhetorical hype typical of the New South gospel of progress and the city's inextricable linkages with its surrounding Appalachian hinterlands (Banker 2011). From 1910 to 1913 Knoxville hosted three expositions that further emphasized this orientation and extolled its potential for regional economic development. These were the first and second Appalachian Expositions of 1910 and 1911, and the National Conservation Exposition of 1913. The latter presaged the city's status as the first and most vocal promoter of the idea that would become the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, a concerted effort that began in 1923 and resulted in the park's dedication by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1940. Knoxville's history of boosterism-through-spectacle continued in the latter quarter of the twentieth

century as well, culminating in World's Fair of 1982, also known as the Knoxville International Energy Exposition. The official title of the exposition is reflective of the city's twentieth century position at the center of the regional energy economy, especially in its capacity as the administrative headquarters of the Tennessee Valley Authority since the agency's founding in 1933.

Knoxville's "official" history belies its considerable socio-cultural complexities. In the pre Civil War nineteenth century, the city was home to George Washington Harris, one of the founders of the literary genre known as (old) southwestern humor. Harris's style was a precursor to the humor of Mark Twain and a direct influence on many seminal twentieth century southern writers from William Faulkner to Flannery O'Connor (McClary 2009). In the twentieth century Knoxville was the natal or adoptive home of several notable American literary artists, including poet Nikki Giovanni, and novelists James Agee and Cormac McCarthy (serving as the setting for the former's 1957 classic, *A Death in the Family*, and the latter's 1979 Knoxville cult favorite, *Suttree*). The city also played an instrumental role in the development of early "hillbilly" and country music as the home town of radio station WNOX, whose live noon-day broadcasts launched the careers of Roy Acuff, Charlie Campbell, Chet Atkins, and the Louvin Brothers, among others (West 2009). The city was likewise a center for early blues and jazz, being the natal home to blues guitarist Brownie McGee and jazz singer Ida Cox. The city was also the adoptive home of Memphis-born jazz pianist Donald Brown, who was a central figure in the development of the University of Tennessee's nationally noted Jazz Studies program. Indeed, Knoxville's musical history is in many ways a cultural history of the city in

microcosm. In a locally oft-referenced description issued by a man who traveled through the town in 1798, he disquietingly commented on witnessing African Americans playing banjo on a street corner for an enthusiastically receptive mixed audience of blacks, whites, and Native Americans, men and women. He thought the town "confused with a promiscuous throng of every denomination" (Gibson n.d.: online).

Just such complexities as adhere in Knoxville's many overlapping histories are captured in a favorite description by long-time local observer and commentator Jack Neely, who writes:

> Its paradoxes are deeply ingrained in its character and history. During the Civil War, tiny Knoxville was home to slaves, masters, free blacks, slave traders, abolitionists, Confederates, Unionists, all living within a geographically tiny area, even next door to each other. It was a city that was known for its harsh temperance laws at the same time it was one of the nation's clearinghouses for illegal liquor. It's one of the East's larger centers of higher education, but located in the center of a large region known for its illiteracy. It's a city that had an elaborate opera house and log cabins at the same time, within shouting distance of each other. It's a city where mountain men sold ginseng around the corner from industrial designers who were changing modernist architecture. It's a city where eastern Ivy Leaguers ran the college while Western-style gunslingers fought it out in the streets and saloons of town (1998: 6).

Indeed, such paradoxes continue to characterize the rapidly changing Knoxville of the twenty-first century.

As a site for research on local food movements, Knoxville is but one locality among many, the movement being national, and even international, in

scope and expression. As Charlotte T., director Knoxville's downtown farmer's market, explains the phenomenon, "the local movement has become a buzzword, it has become a way of life, it has become a part of the national conversation . . . There are a lot people really interested in local food, everywhere." In a metaphor that is highly resonant in a football-crazed region and town, Charlotte further elaborates:

> In a way it's kind of like football or something. Nationally, people are all about football, but they're about their team, and they want their team to win, and they want their team to crush your team! But Alabama is just as crazy as Tennessee. So its like a sense of place and sense of pride . . . You know you're always trying to one-up things, especially in a global culture where you can get anything, anytime you want it. The taste of a place becomes—I mean it's still going to be better if you go to Louisiana and eat creole food in New Orleans than if you buy [a] bag [of packaged food] at EarthFare or whatever. Like Italian food. The reason that Italian food in Italy is so delicious is because—hello—these are the olive trees and these are the tomatoes that they grow. And it's their dirt and it's their minerals that give it the flavor. And the traditions that come from that place. The traditional food comes from a place because it's what they've had . . . I think there is just a lot of pride in where you're from. So local is going to be local wherever you are!

Likewise akin to football, as Charlotte suggested, rivalries are beginning to emerge in local food movement activity. Most often in Knoxville the principle rivalry, discussed most often with a mixture of admiration and envy, is Asheville, North Carolina, just over one hundred miles to the east. The second rivalry is Nashville, Tennessee, the state capital that has long overshadowed Knoxville (and

generated a kind of perpetual inferiority complex in the latter). Accordingly, while Knoxville serves as the primary site for this research, it is often necessary to draw comparisons from both of the city's most immediate local food movement rivalries. This will be especially the case for Nashville, where I was personally deeply involved in the local food movement (as a producer and farmer's market organizer) before returning to Knoxville to pursue the doctoral work that led to this dissertation. While Knoxville's local food movement may not have the depth or breadth of either Asheville or Nashville, it is of interest as a site of study precisely because of the nascent (though rapidly maturing) stage it occupies. Such a status provides more direct access and greater resolution related to process than might be possible amid a more fully fluoresced local food scene.

Knoxville is also of interest as a site because of the multiple identities and registers it straddles as a city both *in* and *of* southern Appalachia and the broader upper South at this particular historical moment of global integration and the instantiation of post-industrial cultural and/or symbolic economies in the global North. As anthropologist James Peacock elaborates the negotiation of historically-informed U.S. Southern identity as refracted by/through such processes:

> The south is labeled, by both nonsoutherners and southerners, as different from, lesser than (poorer, lazier, dumber than) the North; hence the South resents the North, and the North decries the South. Seeing the South as part of global world potentially emancipates both South and North because sectional opposition—diminishing perhaps, but still latent and salient—is dwarfed by larger world issues and patterns (2007: 12).

Even once such emancipation may be achieved, however, as he continues, it will require a recalibration of local/global identities. For as Peacock asserts, "Once we achieve global identities, we must ground them, integrating both the global and the local in some way that energizes and sustains both" (10). Such processes are especially evident through the lens of food, and even more so through "local" food movements that express a great deal of global hybridity. Thus if, as Mark Sohn (2005) states, the particularities of the South has yielded "one of the nation's richest food heritages" (8), that heritage is rapidly hybridizing into a range of globally informed regional food expressions, as will be explored in much greater detail in the chapters ahead (particularly chapters 2-4).

Methods and Procedures

In order to inventory and assess solidarity economies and artisanal politics and their relation to larger political economic processes, the collection of life histories and the auto-theoretical (self-generated) understandings of small business owner/operators and workers in Knoxville, Tennessee constitute an important form of data utilized in this study. Likewise, the documentation of attendant actions, communications, and events has been instrumental in the analysis of the dynamic inherent in the formation and maintenance of solidarity economies. These more traditional ethnographic sources of data are enriched by an analysis of complimentary materials, especially those textual, media, and/or material and symbolic manifestations produced by small business owners (textual, audio-visual, and related promotional materials), as these sources serve as principal narratives in the articulation and identification of a shared counter-

subjectivity. The analysis also necessarily includes a thorough examination of place—Knoxville, Tennessee, Southern Appalachia, and the American South. Indeed, place might be thought of as an informant with whom I will have an ongoing non-verbal conversation. As this study looks at the way localist food movement actors are actively shaping/creating place (the process of emplacement), it also looks at the way place, with preexistent historical, cultural, economic, and political identities of its own, shapes the actors in return. Further, while it is a study on some level of contemporary expressions of "food in the South," particularly as they intersect with economic, political, environmental influences, it also a study of the "Southern Food" of popular imagination.

My methods for collecting and analyzing evidence are divided into two main areas: interviews/life histories, and textual/media /object analysis. All interviewees and other participants signed a statement of informed consent and were given the option of remaining anonymous during the course of my research (only one interviewee chose this option). Interviewees were identified by a snowballing technique.

All participants were asked to sign an informed consent form. A format of semi-structured interviews was utilized in order to generate individual and group insights and interpretations of solidarity economies and artisanal politics as these adhere in the practices and subjectivities of independent, food-related business owners/participants/workers. In particular, the interviews were used to assess the internal meanings and/or understandings of solidarity economies and artisanal politics—shared values—as these are understood by research participants. Besides the aforementioned areas, interviews were also used to

elicit biographical information as this relates to the history of social movement activity among participants (life histories) in order to more fully flesh out the political genealogy of these formations. Interviews ranged across a representative sample of movement participants, accounting for gender, ethnic, and class differentiation as well as the variety and range of independent business enterprises where these exist. A total of twelve interviews were conducted, several of which included multiple respondents. These semi-structured interviews were supplemented by ongoing informal conversations held in numerous contexts through the course of the fieldwork stage.

Finally, text, object, and media analysis forms another significant component of the research methodology. As businesses owners, the research population routinely generates a large body of self-referential materials taking the form of graphic and written advertisements, event flyers, promotional videos, and of course, websites. As these materials often constitute a principal site for instantiating the ethical and moral claims of "storied food" (Pollan 200), thus functioning as part of critical cultural infrastructure for diverse manifestations of alternative economies all over the world (Gibson-Graham 2008), these have served as important sites for evaluating the kinds of auto-theorization that become central to the formation of the subjectivity of the entrepreneurial activist. As affectivity is central to the socially responsible business model as a project of socio-economic change and possibility, these internally produced materials are essential to the development of a robust interpretation of the experience and larger social significance of interlinked business activity and its social and

environmental implications. Such materials in effect constitute the "field," and will accordingly be analyzed as thoroughly ethnographic sites.

Another central site for the articulation of contemporary subjectivities and the dissemination of discourses is of course the website and/or other digital sites, texts, and multi-media assemblages. In her recent profile of food truck proprietors in Austin, Texas, Lok Siu notes the centrality of digital communication channels to their success. Similarly, she observes, "their permanent address is not necessarily a site that is represented by a number on a particular street; it is their web page" (2013: 236). Food truck proprietors are prominent among the small food business owners interviewed for this project and their experience in Knoxville (as everywhere) is likewise deeply imbricated in digital media. As Dale M. says of her marketing strategy, "It's 100% word of mouth and social media. I've never paid for any kind of advertising . . . but I have been fortunate to get a lot of media attention and free publicity. But for my part, we're really active in social media, which is nice because we change so much where we are located we need that kind of dynamic platform to be able to tell people that." While Dale's business is a mobile, even stationary food-businesses are relying similarly on digital communication, as Matt G., owner of a more traditional brick-and-mortar downtown Knoxville restaurant attests: "We've done no advertising essentially since we've opened. Facebook has been one of our best tools so far [and] I do try to share quite a bit on Facebook [too]."

As recent volumes delving into the possibility and necessity of a digitally engaged anthropology assert (Whitehead & Wesch 2012; Boellstorff et al. 2012), such formations, global in the scale of distribution and usage, will have to become

more central to any ethnographic project that is to remain relevant to the lived experiences of most human beings. In their introduction to the edited volume *Human No More: Digital Subjectivities, Unhuman subjects, and the End of Anthropology*, Whitehead & Wesch observe, "as the internet and other new media forms increasingly integrate with even the most mundane aspects of everyday life in even the most remote regions of the world, and the 'virtual' blurs with and ultimately becomes the 'real,' issues raised by an anthropology of the virtual necessarily become the issue for anthropology at large" (2012: 2-3).

Besides being sites for the construction and maintenance of certain discourses and channels of communication, digital locations and productions are also important in the larger of project of auto-ethnography that, I will argue, characterizes much cultural production in the contemporary era. In her introduction to the 1997 collection *Auto/Ethnography*, Deborah E. Reed-Danahay notes that "either a self (auto) ethnography or an autobiographical (auto) ethnography can be signaled by 'autoethnography'" (2). It is autoethnography in the first of these senses that I intend to use that descriptor here. As long ago as 1989, John Dorst conceived of the auto-ethnographic mode as *sine qua non* of "the culture of advanced consumer capitalism," a modality that "consists largely in the processes of self-inscription, indigenous self documentation and endlessly reflexive simulation" (2). These processes are indeed intensified within the arena of contemporary "public culture" as it has developed in tandem with ever increasing levels of media saturation. As Sherry Ortner (2006) states of the relation between such processes and the ethnographic project, public culture "claims, and the ethnographer must grant, that it stands as

a competing subject, a competing authority" (80-81) in the production of cultural narrative and representation.

Recent observations by Stephanie Aleman (2012) likewise indicate the intensification of such processes, particularly as they intersect with newer digital subjectivities. In her work among the Waiwai peoples of the Brazilian and Guyanese Amazon, Aleman documented the importance of the internet to young male members of this society. After some initial difficulties overcoming her own notions of categorical purity ("The black-painted hunter is at the same time the keyboard-tapping emailer" [151]) Aleman discovered that for young male Waiwai, competence in the using the internet, and knowledge of online "places," has become as important to conceptions of personhood as the more traditional activities of hunting and travel. Indeed, it has been transformed through Waiwai usage into what she calls "the shamanic device of the young," for its perceived abilities to traverse space and time. This includes active participation on Facebook and other social media, where, Aleman found, Waiwai young men were fashioning their own very complex self-inscriptions, sometimes stressing indigeneity, sometimes downplaying it, depending on the situation. As Aleman notes, "For my own work, [this] means venturing into fields such as e-mail, Yahoo, Messenger, Skype, each with its own set of peculiarities and each manipulated by the Waiwai to position themselves using these tools of modernity." Continuing, Aleman observes a challenge to ethnographic practice as it has been conventionally conceived, wherein the "e-thropologist or netnographer is to provide a context in which both online and offline worlds can exist as they actually do—simultaneously" (154).

Returning for a moment to Dorst, he claims that contemporary cultural activity is an autonomous field of endless auto-ethnographic reproduction that "does for itself, and massively so, the sort of thing ethnographers and other species of documentarist claim to do" (1989: 2), yielding an era Dorst labels as "post-ethnographic." This position mirrors the recent theoretical engagements by Ortner, who observes that, "anthropology becomes only one voice, one entry, within an enormously complex and multivocal universe of 'public culture'" (2006: 105). Building on such insights we might assert that the current moment of informational saturation (including nearly endless recourse to cultural information) and highly referential cultural economies of images and stories, necessitates a shift in the role of ethnographic research—from the generation of ethnographies to the interpretation of auto-ethnographic practices, but not in the sense of the Geertzian interpretivist paradigm, but much more humbly, as a critical reader and interpreter of the "textual" manifestations of self-inscription. In other words, expertise in the realm of cultural knowledge(s)—particularly as this relates to the circulation and deployment of such knowledge(s) in daily practice and the formation of socio-economic subjectivities—is no longer limited to an elite coterie of professionally trained ethnographic practitioners. Rather, it might be argued that everyone is a potential ethnographer, especially in the production and negotiation of positionality within the larger cultural economy—which, it might argued, for better or worse, is the principal manifestation of the economic function in the post-scarcity era of the advanced capitalist global north.

Chapter 1

Visible Hands and Market Stands—Infrastructural Affinity, Moral Economies, and the Metro-politics of Local Food Networks

Arriving early for a scheduled interview with the manager of Knoxville's only cooperatively structured grocery and oldest organic foods outlet, Three Rivers Market (TRM), I decided to treat myself to lunch at the hot bar. After serving up my own food I had my plate weighed at a checkout isle, paid accordingly, and proceeded to find a table in the sit-down dining area in the front of the store. Taking in the atmosphere I noticed three large banners hanging from the ceiling and clearly in the sightline of both diners and those standing in the checkout lines. Each banner featured a single word printed in stylized letters with accompanying symbols. The first read, "Co-op," in the green and white logo common to all groceries and food outlets sharing membership in the National Cooperative Grocers Association. The second featured the word "Local," above a small imprint of the Tennessee State Flag. The third featured the word "Small," and the symbol for the Principle 6 (P6) Cooperative Trade Movement. Launched in 2009 and led by Equal Exchange (profiled in Chapter 4) and a core group of participating cooperatives (including TRM), the movement website states that the initiative "exemplifies just and equitable trade relations between farmers, producers, retailers, and consumers rooted in cooperative principles and values." Continuing, the site states, "P6 is a national movement guided by shared values and three overarching criteria: cooperative, small, local. The goal? Increasing market access for small farmers, building co-operative supply chains, and, ultimately, *changing* our food system" (www.p6.coop, italics added). The name

P6 itself evokes "cooperation among cooperatives," referencing the sixth principle of the Statement of Cooperative Identity (of which there are seven such principles) as upheld by the International Cooperative Alliance. De Peuter & Dyer-Witheford (2010) assert that the sixth principle, more broadly considered, projects "an ethos of mutual aid that encourages individual coops to support one another and contribute to the development of a parallel economy through practices of inter-cooperation" (39).

In practical terms, the current P6 initiative provides a labeling system for participating coops wherein products carrying the label exhibit two of the three criteria listed above (cooperative, local, small). In effect a kind of alternative branding, P6 has several interrelated goals working across multiple scales of influence. On the level of store participants who voluntarily adopt its criteria, it provides a common system by which to enact solidarity and mutualism while increasing buying power, both of which are grounded in the shared values of cooperativism, equity, and sustainability. On the level of the consumer, it is intended to both enable and guide reflexive purchasing behavior (serving as "a point of conversation"), instantiating a critical node in the development of an ethical consumerist subjectivity. On the level of the producer, it is intended to increase the visibility and viability of small, local, and/or cooperatively organized producers through providing a consistent and reliable outlet for their products. Societally, the movement seeks nothing less than the creation of a "values-based economy." As such it might be considered one expression of those "intentional and unintentional economies [whose] variously enacted ethics of social, cultural and environmental sustainability are actively shaping transactions and

performances" (Gibson-Graham 2003: 126). On a local level, the P6 directive adopted by Three Rivers Market is but the latest iteration of their long-term efforts in creating a viable first-tier infrastructure for Knoxville's local food movement.

First-tier infrastructure is conceived here as the primary network of local market spaces that provide those entry-level opportunities and outlets that connect producers to both consumers and to one another, either directly or indirectly. This may come in the mediated form of shelf or freezer space, or it may come in the direct-market form of a booth-space at the seasonal, bi-weekly farmer's market. This is contrasted to second-tier infrastructure, which, though much less a focus of this chapter (as much as for its minimal development in Knoxville at this time as anything else), refers to the more strictly producer-utilized infrastructure that many identify as essential to the moving the local movement beyond its still marginal status in the larger food economy. This would include such facilities as local slaughterhouses and meat processors, cooperative community kitchens, storage facilities, and distribution centers that were common before the centralization and hyper-regulation of the industrial food system. In a recent profile of just such second-tier infrastructure as it has developed in Vermont's Mad River Food Hub, Rowan Jacobsen notes that without these kinds of critical processing and distribution facilities, "many small scale food artisans find it discouragingly difficult to grow beyond the booth at the farmer's market" (2013: 20). The manager of TRM, who chose to remain anonymous, supports this general observation, stating, "Your first entrée as an entrepreneur in a food business might be to go to farmer's markets. That's good,

but it's not good enough. Usually you need two or three income streams to really make something like that work, because [the farmer's market] not open in the winter; it's not open if it rains—it's very unpredictable."

While the necessity of second-tier infrastructure cannot be denied, this chapter will demonstrate that first-tier infrastructure is neither always nor inherently limiting, and can in fact be generative of novel developments and expressions within local food networks. As will also be argued, this basic infrastructure as it exists in Knoxville, Tennessee is animated by the very sentiments and intentions that precipitated the P6 movement. It is, in other words, an infrastructural network characterized by affinity, understood to be an extension of the general concepts of mutuality and cooperation that link participants in the development of a values-driven local food economy. Labeled by Vieta (2010) as the "new" cooperativism, he states that "Even with the entrenchment of neoliberalism over the past four decades, cooperative practices and values that both challenge the status quo *and* create alternatives to it have returned with dynamism in recent years" (2). Indeed, the manager of TRM similarly noted that a recent revitalization of cooperatives is taking place that she labels a "third phase" of cooperative development (a genealogy that will be explored more fully below). Continuing in his assessment of these newest cooperative ventures, Vieta asserts that

> The new cooperativism has a tendency to *prefigure* different, less-exploitative, and less-alienating forms of economic organization. A political concept of prefiguration does not shun "utopian" considerations but embraces them. Not as a new totality--a new and detailed socio-economic model, ready-made to replace

> the old one--but, rather, as a set of future- oriented possibilities or preliminary sketches that suggest alternative economic, productive, cultural, and social practices in the present *and* for tomorrow (4).

Having supported local food networks in Knoxville and the greater region long before the current trend of food localism, TRM is one of several first-tier infrastructural nodes that will be examined in this chapter. A second grocer in downtown Knoxville, a business that morphed into its current form after having originally been conceived as worker cooperative (by a former employee/owner of TRM), will provide another site for the exploration of the infrastructural development of Knoxville's local food networks. While these stationary stores have indeed provided consistent shelf-space and points of consumer contact for the products of local and regional producers (as well as business mentorship in the case of TRM), the downtown farmer's market, Market Square Farmer's Market (MSFM), has arguably served as the single most important catalyst for the explosion of local food movement activity witnessed over the last decade. In such a capacity it has served as a hub of just the kind the infrastructural affinity that forms one of the central analytic frameworks of this chapter. As Charlotte T., MSFM manager states of the market's status in this regard: "For us and our mission, what we're trying to do is make local farming viable and get it in front of people," a mission not unlike that of the P6 movement.

Reflective too of a larger national trend in farmer's market growth, this chapter is likewise concerned with MSFM's growth and the larger evolution of direct market models as alternative loci of production and exchange. Farmer's market growth in the U.S. has likewise been concurrent with the trend of urban

downtown revitalization efforts, or the "new urbanism" strategies, in which markets often acquire the role of "third spaces/places" (Gagne 2011) that are generative of perceived cosmopolitan urban socialities. Situated as such, farmer's markets, and MSFM in particular, have been sites for the enactment and maintenance of an edgy urban hipness and innovation that has propelled a new generation of food trucks and other prepared-food vendors to the forefront of the local food movement (the former explored in greater detail in Chapter 3), engendering an unexpected mechanism for sustaining local farms and enriching local foodscapes. A concern with infrastructural affinity, as I will call it, will be accompanied in this chapter by an exploration of the historical antecedents and evolution of both outlets and markets (understood here as market-places), particularly as it illuminates the role these critical infrastructural nodes occupy in the formation and maintenance of moral and/or solidarity economies as they intersect with associated cultural and/or symbolic economies.

The Moral Economy of the Shopkeeper & the Rise of Hip Enterprise: Cooperation, Consumerism, and the Struggle for Connectivity

From Rochdale to Arthurdale: Cooperative Genealogies

The "sixth principle" from which the P6 initiative derives its name is one of seven principles that have continuously served as the framework for the identity and mission of contemporary cooperative enterprises since they were first enumerated in the mid nineteenth century. The seven principles, as listed on the website of the current gatekeeper of cooperative movement organizational

identity, the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) [http://ica.coop/en/what-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles], are as follows:

1. voluntary and open membership
2. democratic member control
3. member economic participation
4. autonomy and independence
5. education, training, and information
6. cooperation among cooperatives
7. concern for community

These seven principles, while having undergone two modifications/revisions under the adoptive auspices of the ICA—first in 1966, and again in 1995—were first articulated in 1844 by the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers, a mutual aid organization founded in the textile producing village of Rochdale in Northern England (Birchall 1994). The Rochdale Pioneers, like other groups of laborers newly beset by the harsh realities of the capitalist industrial revolution, sought practical solutions to the problems attending the convergence of dispossession (via the mechanism of enclosure), atomization (via the mechanism of competitive labor markets), and mechanization, which taken together rendered individual workers and families susceptible to the vicissitudes of the new economic order. This was a difficult time of transition when, as E.P. Thompson wrote in his magisterial *The Making of the English Working Class*, "Alternative and irreconcilable views of human order—one based on mutuality, the other on competition—confronted each other" (1963/1966: 206). Groups like the Rochdale Pioneers opted for the former, particularly as such assemblages could

aid in securing the basic sustenance of their members. Indeed, the formation of mutual aid and cooperative organizations must be understood in this larger historical context of confrontational navigation.

Autonomous mutual aid organizations of the sort developed in Rochdale were one expression of the varied practical experiments arising from the formulations of the Welsh pre-Marxist utopian socialist, Robert Owen (1771-1858). Owen can be characterized as an industrial-utopian, one who extolled the liberatory potential of the machine and factory, but only when these came under the cooperative control and ownership of the workers themselves, and organized in redistributive form (a vision he attempted to enact at the mill village of New Lanarck, Scotland, where he took over as manager in 1800). Indeed, Owen's greatest contribution to the evolution of socialist thought was his dedication to a radical equality that was unknown among his contemporaries (Birchall 1994; Day 2005). In Owen's larger vision for a "New Society", Richard J.F. Day (2005) notes that "Owen based his system on townships full of properly educated subjects, which, as they increased in number, would choose to be 'federally united . . . formed in circles of tens, hundreds, thousands, etc.'" (103), or what he conceptualized as dispersed "Villages of Cooperation," that would form critical nodes of a networked society based on the principles of mutuality. At the grassroots level, Karl Polanyi determined that the Owenite movements "represented the cravings of the common people, smitten by the coming of the factory, to discover a form of existence which would make man master of the machine" (1944/2001: 175).

Taking inspiration from Owen but more concerned with the practical realization of cooperative ideals on the more operative scale of daily life, physician and social and economic reformer William King (1786-1865) started publishing *The Co-operator* in 1828. As Birchall (1994) states, *The Co-operator* "was a systematic exposition of the Co-operative philosophy, combined with some shrewd advise about how to run a shop." For "Unlike Owen," Birchall continues, "(who had said that while a community might build a store, a store could never build a community), King thought that is was better to begin small than not to begin at all" (23). For, while the larger society-transforming ambitions of the Owenite project ultimately failed, one practical and lasting manifestation of this greater project was the development of cooperative organizations, including cooperative stores. The first successful and lasting store of this sort was established in Rochdale, when a group of subscribers rented space in a warehouse and opened shop on December 21, 1844. Of their humble beginning Birchall writes, "After repairs were made and fittings bought, there was only £16 left to buy stock, so they bought twenty eight pounds of butter, fifty six pounds of sugar, six hundredweight of flour, a sack of oatmeal and some tallow candles" (1994: 43). So began the "retailing revolution" of the cooperative store.

While concerned with providing member/owners with the collective purchasing power to ensure access to staple food items, the Rochdale store, like cooperatives to follow, was equally concerned with providing its consumer-members with "pure" and unadulterated foods. Not unlike current concerns related to food purity and chemical contamination (albeit considerably different in terms of scale), consumers in eighteenth and nineteenth century England had

similar concerns. Adulteration of food items in England had attended the marketization of food provisioning systems as these transitioned away from more customary moral economies grounded in the mode of subsistence production, a process elucidated by E.P. Thompson in his essay "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd" (1971).

Even after the rural peasantry's initial dispossession of land through the mechanisms of enclosure and vagrancy laws led to the formation of an urbanized working class, former peasants (the new urban poor) often maintained tenuous connection with the former subsistence economies they had known through the activities of food provisioning, activities now enfolded in local market exchanges and no longer bound to the moral economy of the pre-capitalist paternalism of the benevolent landlord (and by 1795, the Speenhamland law, guaranteeing all citizens a basic scaled income based on the current market price of bread [Polanyi 1944/2001]). In such a context, as Thompson puts it, "The conflict between the countryside and the towns was mediated by the price of bread" (189). Not only the price, as he later elaborates, but also the quality, as the impersonal forces of fetishized production processes commonly led to such unscrupulous practices as short-weighing and adulteration, particular of baked bread and flour, respectively, but other items as well. Thus the food riots common to eighteenth century marketplaces were, in Thompson's estimation, the expression of the indignant poor (mostly women) as they attempted to assert their own demands for purity and price controls. Though the political economy of the free market would ultimately supplant the larger "moral economy of provision," Thompson concedes that the moral economy of the crowd was

nonetheless tenacious, and "lingered on for years somewhere in the bowels of the Cooperative Wholesale Society" (CWS) [258]. Indeed, the CWS was a direct outgrowth of the Rochdale experiment, which, from the original forty subscribers in 1844, generated a domestic movement with over three million members by 1914. Based on the dissemination of the Rochdale Principles of 1844, that genealogy extends into the present international context of cooperative enterprises including over one billion members according the ICA. As the ICA website states: "The principles that underpinned their way of doing business are still accepted today as the foundations upon which all co-operatives operate. These principles have been revised and updated, but remain essentially the same as those practiced by the Pioneers in 1844" (http://ica.coop/en/what-co-op/history-co-operative-movement).

While parallel cooperative enterprises (particularly of the consumer cooperative variety) developed independently in the United States—from Benjamin Franklin's mutual fire insurance company of 1752 and extending to the First Workingmen's Protective Union founded in Boston in 1845—the first U.S. based organization to adopt the Rochdale Principles was the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry, better known as the Grange, in 1875 (Center for Cooperatives nd: http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/whatisacoop/History/). Other retail cooperatives based on the Rochdale model were established in the nineteenth century U.S. by the Knights of Labor, the Sovereigns of Industry, and numerous others. The push for a more centrally organized, broadly conceived, and socio-economically ambitious cooperative organization led to the formation of the Cooperative League of the United States of America (CLUSA) in 1916. Preceded earlier by the

publication of *The Cooperative Consumer*, leaders in the nascent organization, including the periodical's business manager, William A. Kraus, articulated a socio-political vision that bears a striking resemblance to the ideas of Robert Owen. In *The Cooperative Consumer*'s first issue, as quoted in an article by Clarke Chambers (1962), Kraus wrote of a previous failed venture in cooperative retailing: "Most of us were socialists, and we imagined ourselves extending the one store to a chain of stores, which would eventually be supplied by factories and farms, also owned and controlled by the organized consumer, until the system became universal and merged into the cooperative commonwealth" (61). The notion of a cooperative commonwealth (as a utopian socialist formation) built through the voluntary, self-directed, and self-organized efforts of expanding cooperative enterprises parallels Owenite articulations which similarly sought to cultivate a non-political middle ground between the capitalist and socialist states, a neutral "middle way," that would transform society from the inside out. Even so, it articulated nicely with the emergence of New Deal era cooperative experiments, signaling for the first time the entry of national government into an arena that was heretofore an overwhelmingly grassroots phenomenon (an entry that was, however, quite short lived). These included enabling legislation for the creation of credit unions, the efforts of the Rural Electrification Administration and the multiple projects undertaken by the Resettlement Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority, both of which integrated cooperative enterprises into ambitious social engineering projects such as those at Arthurdale, West Virginia and the Village of Norris, Tennessee. Besides New Deal initiatives, at the grassroots John Curl points to a "spontaneous mass movement" of self-help

organizations emphasizing mutual aid and barter, which had become widespread by 1934 (2010). These efforts were recognized at the government level as well, and in this unprecedented era of government-supported cooperatives initiatives, facilitated their expansion and solvency under the aegis of the Division of Self-help Cooperatives of the Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA) [Curl 2010].

A few depression era consumer cooperatives managed to hold on in the post World War II era, but most of them faltered and/or were systematically dismantled after the war, never to recover. Direct government incursions into the world of cooperatives ceased altogether. But the Rochdale style cooperative store found a viable platform for revival once again in the countercultural foment of the 1960s and 1970s. As one component in a constellation of countercultural movements, expressions, and institutions revolving around food production, consumption, and distribution, food coops served as "neighborhood outposts of the countercuisine," and played a central role in the development of an enduring alternative infrastructure that survives to the present (Belasco 1989/2007: 87). Charting their own "middle way" between the depression era cooperatives—many of which, owing to their apolitical and neutral orientation Chambers (1962) characterized as "tailor-fit for middle class America in the depressed years" (70)—and the contemporaneous elitist health food stores, the new-fangled food coop was decidedly political. As Belasco observes,

> At a time when commercial health food stores were plagued by charges of fraud and hucksterism, co-ops were no-frills source for counter-cuisine stapes such brown rice, whole grain breads, herbal teas, and soy products, all of which could

> be purchased in bulk. As sources of health information and moral support, the co-ops were indispensable (1989/2007: 89).

Belasco continues, quoting contemporaneous journalist Daniel Zwerdling, who in 1979 wrote of food co-ops as possessing "'an almost religious spirit that seeks to satisfy the human needs forgotten in the plastic-coated world of the corporate supermarket. Some of the people who work and shop at co-ops seem almost starved for a sense of communion with the earth and with their food, and co-ops help provide it'" (ibid). It is precisely in the context of the maturing and reticulate network of the countercuisine that the first node in the alternative food infrastructure of Knoxville, Tennessee was established in 1981.

Grit, Glamor, and Granola: From Hippie Outposts to Hip Enterprise

Chartered as a mutual benefit non-profit organization, what became Knoxville's Community Food Co-op (KCFC) in 1981 started as a small buyers club for its core-group of founding members in the late 1970s. What members sought was access to organic and natural foods as part of larger strategy of political consciousness and community action. The current manager of Three Rivers Market (TRM), which grew out of KCFC, has been a longtime co-op participant. Her background might serve as a sort of rough template for the kinds of people who were often attracted to such projects. With a background in community nutrition, she attended graduate school at the University of California, Berkeley, where she earned a degree in social welfare, focusing more specifically on non-profit organizations. With a penchant for community organizing and action, she and other early co-op participants were part of a larger current of social

movement activity grounded in local urban environmental health and community development concerns. As she characterized the early founders and their multiple engagements:

> There was a definite relationship between people working against redlining in the Fourth & Gill neighborhood and some other inner city neighborhoods. All of the Fourth & Gill area sort of became occupied . . . the Knoxville co-op started at the same time, the Knoxville Recycling Coalition started. There was supposed to be an incinerator—I think right down here [in the current vicinity of Three Rivers Market]—that a lot of people rallied around. So they started the first recycling center behind the old co-op, and that was before they had recycling in town. There was a lot of overlapping circles of people . . .

In their critique of the "modernization" of contemporary recycling in Chicago, Pellow et al (1999) situate the emergence of the earliest recycling centers in that city within a rubric of larger community action projects analogous to those of the KCFC founders. Organizers of originally low-tech community drop-off centers in economically distressed sections of Chicago "were united in viewing recycling as a social movement that was beneficial for the community, the local economy, and the environment" (13). The founding of a recycling center, organizing to protest the siting of an incinerator in the greater Fourth & Gill neighborhood of Knoxville, and the founding of KCFC were all components in a similarly social movement-grounded project in Knoxville. KCFC stood at the center of these projects.

The early goals and mission of KCFC, while rooted partly in precedents derived from the 1960s countercultural sensibilities, can also be seen as

expressive of feminist environmentalist paradigms that were maturing by the early 1980s. As Joni Seager (2003) notes of the development of feminist environmentalism in this period, "throughout the 1980s and 1990s a growing chorus of voices from women's and social justice movements challenged the mostly male-led mainstream environmental movement on its bias in prioritizing wilderness, animal conservation, and wildlife protection and its concomitant neglect of urban and social environmental issues, including, prominently, human health issues" (958). In considering the intersection of such strains as they motivated participants in alternative food movements in this period, the current manager of TRM stated,

> I think it has to do with failing to trust the environment that people find themselves in at different times. It's a do-it-yourself approach. I think a lot of the early interest in health foods, obviously, wasn't supported by a lot of research—it's intuitive! Even organic, it just makes sense that we wouldn't want to spray chemicals on our food. I do feel like it's this desire to take charge of your own situation, and it's a similar thing with the local economy.

Indeed, this statement foregrounds the oft cited hermeneutic of reflexive modernity generated by a vague awareness of the ubiquity of threats characteristic of late industrial capitalist "risk society," associated with the theories of Ulrich Beck (1992) and Anthony Giddens (1999). It likewise highlights the ethos of grassroots initiative and self-help that has animated both classic urban community activism of the 1970s onward and cooperative endeavors ever since Rochdale.

Amid these broader political concerns and rising public awareness of health-related environmental issues more and more often expressed through a distrust of the corporate-industrial food system, KCFC and other modern food coops emerged as hip urban oases in an increasingly bewildering and complex foodscape. Still, the politically conscious countercultural proclivities of KCFC were perceived as a liability as it sought to "modernize" and expand its operations in the late 1990s and early 2000s. From its gritty original location in an early twentieth century house on the busiest thoroughfare linking downtown Knoxville with its first-ring neighborhoods to the north, in the late 1990s KCFC launched a promotional and capital campaign aimed at nothing less than a reinvention. Indeed, after the arrival of two outlets of the Asheville, North Carolina-based "natural foods" supermarket, Earthfare, in the early 2000s, KCFC felt the pressure of serious competition for first time in its history. As the TRM website recounts this history through the current period of transition:

> Throughout the next two decades [the 1980s and 1990s], the KCFC continued to increase its selection and grow its business but it had two big problems. It was not structured as an authentic cooperative and its facility was outdated and unable to serve the whole community. This meant the business was not sustainable so, in 2005, the KCFC changed its membership structure from a dues-based club to an equity-based cooperative. This change in structure signaled a new era and the former KCFC became Three Rivers Market, a genuine customer-owned food co-op. In 2009 Three Rivers Market purchased land at 1100 N. Central Street, less than 1/2 a mile from the old store, and began work on our new store. We relocated in August of 2011 and in 2012 and 2013, the community voted Three Rivers Market its Best Health Food Store/Grocery and

its Best Green Business (http://www.threeriversmarket.coop/about-three-rivers-market/).

In our interview, the current manager of TRM expounded on the associated necessity of purging the countercultural baggage associated with the early KCFC constituency, a backstory not recounted in the "official" historical account above. As she states:

> I think in the past, because the coop was such a small group, that people felt unwelcomed there if they didn't fit into this image that people had of it. We've worked really hard to dispel that, that all walks of life come here, that everyone's welcome—our common ground is food, and we don't care how you vote, if you eat meat or you don't eat meat. We just try to put our standards out there—we review them all the time, the boards weighs in on them, if they choose to—and so the people just kind of know where we stand, take or leave it . . . That was one big change—we've become more inclusive, I really feel. But its also part of more people wanting to be included in this!

Indeed, TRM serves very much as a site that cultivates feelings of belonging among its patrons. As a site for the enactment of a subjectivity that is often conceived in antagonistic terms, TRM similarly functions as a site for the inculcation and reproduction of the values it espouses. As such, TRM is a highly social site where one is likely to see acquaintances or friends. With a large and prominent board near its entrance for the posting of public announcements (cultural events, alternative health services, various gatherings, for sale and for rent notices), its small but selective book and magazine sections, and the placement of local and regional art (both on display and for sale), TRM serves as an important node in a larger (mostly) progressive social network.

Relatedly, amid the current explosion in the organic and natural health-food retail sectors, the turn toward inclusivity does not negate TRM's oppositional identity, which is internally conceptualized in terms that are antagonistic to the pernicious trends of green-washing and corporate cooptation. The TRM manager discussed at length the differences between cooperative retail organizational structure and the two competing models of publicly traded and private equity ownership which most often structure the greater food retail sector. While publicly traded companies such as Whole Foods offer ownership via the mechanism of stock share investment, "your shopping at Whole Foods," in the estimation of TRM's manager, "has absolutely nothing to do with any sort of dividend or return you get on that—it has to do with something else. They are not based here . . . so they have no local, no real contribution in a deep way, to the local economy. All the big money, all the big jobs, are not here!" The structure of the private equity firm, represented in our conversation by Earthfare, is considerably less transparent than even the publicly traded corporation: "They're very secretive—you can't find out anything about them. It [Earthfare] has changed ownership three times . . . I don't think they have a deep commitment to issues of sustainability or natural/organic. I think they're just taking advantage of [the growth in the natural & organic foods market segment]." In contrast, TRM's manager goes on to explain the structure of the co-op:

> We've been here over 30 years and we are owned by our customers. The structural difference between us and a for-profit, or a publicly traded corporation is that all the shares cost the same here, they don't change in value . . . you don't make money based on how many shares you have—everyone has the same

> financial rights and the same governance rights regardless, as long as they have met the requirements of ownership. Where you get your money back is how much you use the actual business. So it exists purely to serve the needs of the people who own it and so its very localized and very deeply entrenched in the local community.

This statement is indeed a direct reflection of the cooperative principle number 7, concern for community. It is this orientation that truly distinguishes the nature of the cooperative enterprise from the purely profit drive motives of corporate organic food retailers in the auto-theoretical ontology of TRM.

As TRM's manager concedes, however, the growth in the greater organic food sector has forced alternative institutions like food co-ops to reconsider their overall purpose and position in the larger food distribution system. Once again, such considerations are turned inward toward a renewed commitment to the community function:

> Now that there is more access, depending on how you think about it, to local, natural, and organic foods, the coops that started for that reason are always working on, 'well, what is our purpose now?' Is it okay that people can just go to some corporate store, like Earthfare, or Whole Foods or something, or is . . . [there] still a desire to be locked into the local community, that's not going to abandon the community when this wave, maybe, is over.

It is indeed at this level of community embeddedness that the infrastructural position of TRM becomes most evident. It is likewise as a counter-institutional anchor in the first tier infrastructure of Knoxville's local food economy that TRM maintains its most direct link to the political concerns that first drove the development of food co-ops.

In discussing the particular contributions of TRM in the evolution of Knoxville's local food economy, the current manager exclaims that the co-op was a pioneering infrastructural institution, the first to feature locally produced and prepared foods on their shelves. They have continued to do so throughout their growth and development. In elaborating on this larger function, TRM's manager explains:

> What we hope is that by providing a steady, growing market . . . that more people will be inspired, because they know they can deal with us. We're very fair. We tell them exactly what we're paying for non-local organic products and we just negotiate the prices and try to help people [local start-ups] understand how they should be pricing things, what will make it sell better. So we do a lot of business incubation . . . I think if you tried to get your stuff in Kroger you may end up with some good volume, but you're not going to get that hand-up that we can provide. We just feel like that's part of our service.

In addition to providing business incubation services and active guidance and consultancy to small food-related start-ups, TRM also initiated a wholesale distribution outlet they refer to as "small scale wholesale," wherein wholesale prices are offered to other local food producers. As TRM's manager stressed, "We only do that with small scale local people. Lots of times its start-ups and they haven't figured out how to make those connections, or its simply that we get a better price." Yet another way TRM attempts to provide outlets for locally produced and/or prepared foods is through incorporating and/or offering these in dishes and as whole items for sale in their in-store hot and cold bars/deli.

Indeed, my lunch on the day of my interview with the manager was tamale pie fearing locally grown potatoes and locally made cheese.

While also intended as a consumer outreach initiative with multiple components (from in-store labeling to a regularly updated on-line local food guide), the P6 initiative discussed in the introduction to this chapter is also the latest iteration of TRM's efforts to provide critical infrastructure for small local producers. In meeting one of three criteria required for inclusion in the P6 labeling scheme—produced by a cooperative, local, small—each participating food co-op sets their own criteria for evaluating the latter two categories. TRM employs strategic nested criteria in determining what they call local. Radiating outward from the most proximate to the most distant, these include items produced in East Tennessee, those produced bio-regionally (based on the larger multi-state cultural region contiguous with the upper Tennessee River watershed), and those produced regionally. The latter is intended to roughly align with the efforts of the Tennessee Department of Agriculture's Pick Tennessee Products campaign, though as TRM's manager pointed out, these are not always commensurate, as TRM does not "support local food at the expense of *how* it's grown" (i.e., organically), a differentiation that is deemphasized in the state-led initiative. In terms of determining what will be categorized as "small," TRM simply asks "Can we actually talk to the owner?"

Besides the support function provided to local food producers in the form of a steady retail outlet, TRM is likewise deeply imbricated in a larger solidarity network with other local, independent businesses. The evolution of this kind of counter-institutional infrastructure composed of businesses is implicated in

larger academic discourses concerned with the "marketization" of the life world assumed to attend the inexorable and totalizing tentacles of neoliberalism. In many ways perhaps, cooperative efforts from Rochdale to Three Rivers anticipate (and complicate) many of the analytic registers common in contemporary critiques of neoliberal subject formation. As stated on the ICA website, "Cooperatives are based on the values self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity" (http://ica.coop/en/what-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles). In such a statement, the values of self-help and self-responsibility—often interpreted as metonymic iterations conjuring Reagan-Thatcher era neoliberal instantiation—signal the systematic and hostile dismantling of the state-level obligations to the commonwealth. These are listed in jarring juxtaposition to values more often associated with the political left—equality and solidarity. It is often assumed that such values are mutually exclusive. Social formations or utterances suggesting some arbitrating force other than or outside the purview state are often interpreted as ready indicators of neoliberal colonization. They are "turning away from the state" (gasp). This likely has something to do with psycho-political hegemony of the state-form, a hegemony that has been internalized at nearly all levels of society, including among those who produce the most trenchant critiques of neoliberalism. As David Graeber writes of such a tendency, "If utopian dreams were brought to bear on some stubborn social reality, it was always assumed—usually without even having to state it, so much was it the very basis of Left, Right, liberal, radical, and conservative thought—that this could only be accomplished through the coercive mechanisms of government" (2007b: 318).

Much of this discursive bias is indeed grounded in the same countercultural sensibility that yielded 1970s era food co-ops and the nascent countercuisine. As Thomas Frank cogently argues in the introduction to his now landmark study, *The Conquest of Cool*, a persistent dualistic narrative emerged in the countercultural zeitgeist of the 1960s. "According to the standard story," he writes,

> business was the monolithic bad guy who caused America to become a place of puritanical conformity and empty consumerism; business was the great symbolic foil against which the young rebels defined themselves; business was the force of irredeemable evil lurking behind the orderly lawns and suburbia and the nefarious deeds of the Pentagon (1997: 7).

But, as Frank argues, the counterculture was, at its core, comfortably amenable to and deeply implicated in its own commodification. Furthermore, as Warren Belasco points out, the counterculture (and its sub-expression as countercuisine more specifically) yielded its own brand of business—hip enterprise (also explored, though in a more critical mode, by Frank). As Belasco asserts, "To a certain extent, these businesses were firmly based in the countercuisine and reflected its major [radical] consumerist and [radical] therapeutic tenets" (1989/2007: 100), both of which, as proto-ethical consumerist frames, contributed to the oppositional identity of the countercuisine. Continuing, Belasco argues, for many hip businesspeople "the wider market was viewed not as a zone for intense competition but rather as an opportunity for cooperation, 'sharing,' or 'networking'" (100-101). Indeed, such businesses were often based

on what David Moberg (in Belasco) identified as the SPIN model: "'segmented, polycentric, integrated through network'" (ibid).

In our interview, TRM's manager recognized the counterculture's purported hostilities toward business, stating that this basic rift was at the core of KCFC's limited reach and marginal success. Of the implications, she states, "It was misconceptions about business. For some reason that was a dirty word." Shifting slightly, she issues the rejoinder: "In fact, it's really the best way to be independent—it's to own your own businesses as a community! You can get a lot more done together than you can separately. Also, we want to support the independent businesses that are in our midst because we feel they are part of that same local structure." So TRM, besides supporting local growers and food artisans, also expresses solidarity with other locally owned independent businesses (who are sometimes the same people). Coming back again to Principle 6, what is expressed here is an extension of cooperation among cooperatives to cooperation with a larger community of businesses similarly embedded in the community. TRM supports a branching network of local independent food-related businesses in one other important way—as a training ground.

Before partnering with Market Square Farmer's Market manager Charlotte T. and launching their own grocery/catering/lunch counter business (a "little food shop" they named Just Ripe) a block from Market Square in the heart of downtown Knoxville, Kristen F. worked for five years at TRM. She credits this experience as having introduced her into Knoxville's local food community. Trained as an architect, native Knoxvillian Kristen F. left her natal city after

college to engage in a self-study of sustainable architecture in San Francisco. It was in the latter city that she encountered her first worker cooperative, which provided a lasting inspiration that guided her initial vision for Just Ripe. Charlotte and Kristen credit the failure of the worker cooperative model to a number of factors. These ranged from the simple logistical problem of reaching the critical mass of workers-owners necessary to perform the functions of the business to what Kristen saw as an incommensurably individualized vision (her own). As she explains,

> A lot of this place is of my conception . . . [and because of a lack of dedicated co-participants] I started coming up with all these plans, largely on my own . . . It was very—it was from one source, and I don't feel like that's true to what the cooperative model should be. So we were in this position of 'Hey, we created this thing. Would you like to sign up for it? Rather than, 'What would you all like to see happen?'

So while the vision of a worker-owned cooperative is currently on the back burner, Kristen and Charlotte still entertain the notion of one day selling it directly to the employees.

Even with the disappointment that came from realizing the difficulties in starting a worker-cooperative, Kristen and Charlotte remain steadfastly dedicated to the cooperative model. When I asked Kristen why she continued to be so supportive of cooperatives, she answered, "I just believe in it! I think that the distribution of power and decision making and all that—I think it can make a stronger entity than one person holding the power or a small group of people holding the power. I think that everyone has something to bring—knowledge and

experience." Guided by such convictions, Just Ripe attempts to duplicate many of the services and solidarities associated with nationally networked food co-ops like TRM. Indeed, like TRM, Just Ripe directs its purchasing and retailing decision-making processes around values-based criteria. When stocking items on their store shelves (or using ingredients in prepared food items), Kristen enumerated the following criteria for inclusion:

> Our first interest is to support artisanal and southern foods if we can. So we have a lot of jams and pickles that are made in the South . . . Our second criteria is to try to promote independent producers, so we try to buy from independent companies instead of companies that have been bought up [by multi-national corporate brands]. So we try to buy from companies that are still family owned, privately [independently] owned, or cooperatively owned—we like to support cooperative endeavors where we can.

Through supporting those engaged in similarly transformative projects, Kristen, Charlotte, and other actors in the local food movement hope to build the critical infrastructure necessary to support a sustainable local economy of networked co-producers not unlike that embodied in the complementary nature of the Owenite "Labor Exchange" noted by Karl Polanyi. As this relates to crafts in particular, Polanyi writes, "by providing for one another's needs, artisans would emancipate themselves, it was thought, from the ups and downs of the market" (1944/2001: 177). Charlotte articulated a similar model when she outlined the moral philosophy that guides Just Ripe: "We believe that local food is more sustainable and that offering that to people is more sustainable . . . I've always hoped that as there are more opportunities for growers to be able to sell, more places, then

hopefully their businesses will be more sustainable . . . and then we will be able to flesh out our local food economy." She continues, applying this matrix of valuation to her own choices (as distinct from those she makes as co-owner of Just Ripe), stating, "I want to support people that I know are doing things well. I'm going to support people that I know are trying to support other local producers."

Placing their endeavors and sympathies within a larger antagonistic juxtaposition to the government supported, corporate industrial food system, Kristen offered the following assessment of the larger political project they imagine themselves to be engaged in (though it is important to note that neither she nor Charlotte see such pronouncements as "political"):

> It's been probably close to 70 years or more now that they've been promoting industrial agriculture and nothing else, and putting money behind industrial agriculture and nothing else, and subsidizing it. It's not an accident that we don't have local slaughterhouses anymore and all that kind of stuff. It wasn't necessarily pre-planned that that would happen, but it is the result of all of these stages of planning that have happened. That's not going to change real quickly. But it's also not going to change if there's not any demand for it. So all of the small producers who are doing what they can to make a product and get it to market and get it to the consumer, are moving toward the viability of that decentralization ever happening.

In the continued engagement in and dedication to cooperativism expressed by and through the infrastructural affinity observed by TRM and Just Ripe perhaps they would support de Peuter and Dyer-Witheford's assertion that such

formations "suggest the possibility that within the overall global system of capital a non-capitalist sub-system might grow its counter-power, reduce reliance on the primary system, and potentially render it redundant" (2010: 40). While I doubt any of my research participants would express an explicit desire to subvert the "global system of capital," statements such as Kristen's above certainly express an analogous desire to see the global industrial food system rendered redundant. By extension perhaps they might also find sympathy with de Peuter & Dyer Witheford's proposition to usurp capitalism's cellular commodity form with its non-capitalist equivalent, *the common*. To reach this point, they proposed a "circulation of the common," a process in which interlinked nodes of associative behavior and practices that "reinforce and enable one another," create "a circuit in which the common goods and services produced by associations at one point in the circuit provide inputs and resources for associations at another" (46). This is an approximation of what I intend to imply in employing the phrase infrastructural affinity. While stationary outlets such as those provided by TRM and Just Ripe form critical nodes in this first tier infrastructural network, no other node has been as instrumental in Knoxville's current local food renaissance as the Market Square Farmer's Market. It is there we now turn our attention.

Marketplaces, Market Society, and the New Metro-politics of Food Distribution: Farmer's Markets and Re-localization

Navigating a Maze of Markets

As evidenced by a spate of academic engagements since the mid-1990s, the marketplace and/or the public market (including of course, the farmer's market)

has (re)emerged as an important site and topic of inquiry. This is perhaps due to the resolution it can bring to bear on a number of overlapping cultural and socio-economic formations of concern to scholars in the social sciences and humanities. Late French anthropologist Michele de La Pradelle's *Market Day in Provence* (1996, translated into English in 2006), in a notable example from the 1990s, is a study of the ways in which exchanges in public market contexts form a nexus around which complex ontological performances and narratives are constructed. Other notable book length studies in this vein include Helen Tangires's broad historiographic and material culture studies engagement, *Public Markets and Civic Culture in Nineteenth Century America* (2003); Theodore Bestor's *Tsukiji* (2004), a detailed ethnographic examination of the global/local dialectics inhering in the formation, experience, and maintenance of Tokyo's famed Tsukiji fish market; Rachel Black's *Porta Palazzo* (2012), an ethnography of the title's namesake public market in Turin, Italy; and Allison Alkon's exploration of the racial and class dimensions of farmer's markets in Oakland, California, in *Black, White, and Green: Farmer's Markets, Race, and the Green Economy* (2012). Notable article length studies concerned with public markets/marketplaces as sites for the instantiation of ethical consumerist subjectivities and/or moral economic formations include those of Alkon (2008—the seed study for her book, above), Coles & Crang (2011), and Gagne (2011).

This profusion of studies, not coincidentally, is coterminous with the explosive growth and popularity of farmer's markets over the course of the last two decades. The National Farmer's Market Directory, maintained by the Agricultural Marketing Service division of the USDA, documents growth from

1,755 markets in 1994 (the year the directory was launched) to 8,144 markets in 2013, a 3.6% annual growth rate. Indeed, the coincidence of popular interest and academic inquiry centered around the revival of marketplaces/public markets should come as no surprise, complicating as they do many of the stubborn binary analytics of concern to contemporary inquiry (global/local; public/private; urban/rural, etc.). But as Bestor notes with respect to the propensities of his own disciplinary inheritance, "Anthropological attention to complex social organizations has been attuned more to descent groups and dowry payments than to the kinds of economic institutions now central to modern complex societies" (2004: 12). "Yet," he continues, "corporations, cartels, and markets should be of as much interest to anthropologists as communities, clans, and matrilineages" (13). Similarly, Rachel Black asserts that, "Often tied to a bounded conception of their particular field, anthropologists have marginalized or passed over the modern marketplace" (2012: 6). Like other scholars attracted to the complex social formations adhering in such institutions, and recalling the insights of Polanyi of nearly seventy years ago, this cohort is interested in the ways in which the economic is (re)embedded in the social. For as Black succinctly puts it, "Economic life does not negate social life" (2012: 8).

In unpacking such a proposition, it will be useful to revisit the basic distinctions that differentiate market*places*, and *the* market, or, more accurately the *market economy*. The marketplace is, most simply, a physical meeting place for direct economic exchange governed by customary rules and/or agreements that determine (and restrict) its nature and scope. These are, in the classical economic sense, "regulated" markets. Regulatory intentions have rarely been

despotic, as later free market advocates would represent it, but rather express the endurance of the pre-capitalist moral economy that protected the interests of its local context against the purely economic interests of deregulated markets. The marketplace in such a usage is synonymous with Karl Polanyi's conceptualization of the "local market." As he described it:

> The typical local market on which housewives depend for some of their needs, and grower of grains or vegetables as well as local craftsmen offer their wares for sale, shows as to its form indifference to time and place . . . They are an adjunct of local existence . . . Local markets are, essentially, neighborhood markets, and, though important to the life of the community, they nowhere show any sign of reducing the prevailing economic system to their pattern (1944/2001: 66).

Perhaps remarkably, the kind of moral economy that yielded the pre-mercantilist, protected local markets described by Polanyi found analogous expression in the legal apparatus that similarly protected nineteenth century American public markets, as Tangires (2003) demonstrates (and as the example of Market Square further exemplifies, as we shall see).

In contrast to the marketplace or the local market (or the public market, a designation that will also be frequently used in this section), the market economy is the more abstract constellation of institutions and processes we typically invoke when we refer to *the* market. In Polanyi's formulation, rather than displaying a relation that is adjunctive to local existence, the market economy inverts this relationality, wherein local existence, and indeed society at large, becomes an adjunct of the market. Thus, "Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system" (60).

So while the marketplace is as old as concentrated human settlement (indeed, permanent settlements are most often born of local markets), the market economy refers more specifically to the system of "free market" capitalism (as opposed restricted local markets) that spread around the globe from the late eighteenth century onward. In making this distinction in his study of Tokyo's Tsukiji fish market, Bestor utilizes the simple dualism of "market-as-economic-process [market economy] vs. market-as-social-institution [marketplace]" (20), while fully recognizing that ambiguity and interpenetration necessarily complicates such cut-and-dried distinctions.

The potential for farmer's markets, in the mode of market-as-social-institution, to function as an incubator for emergent ethical and/or moral consumerist subjectivities has been the topic of much scholarly engagement. Alkon (2008), for example, examines such possibilities through a comparative ethnographic study of two distinct Northern California farmers markets—the North Berkeley and West Oakland markets. While the former is an upscale market catering to affluent customers, the latter is located in an economically distressed, predominantly African-American neighborhood. In both instances, however, Alkon finds that market patrons often frame their participation as being motivated by ethical concerns, expressed in each case as a form of morally embedded economic transaction. Gagne (2011) finds similar sentiments among patrons and vendors of Washington D.C.'s Farmer's Basket Market, though she offers a perhaps more sophisticated reading of motivations as being driven by an informed and experiential "ideo-praxis," defined as "explicit and active ideologically charged actions" (282). Utilizing a framework that combines

political economic and phenomenological approaches, Gagne finds that ideologically driven action yields a perceived alterity wherein the market is transformed into an

> alternative space of social, ethical, economic, and ideological exchange—a third place or third space—where participants can suspend the dominant ideology through their ideo-praxis, that is, through enacting their idealized forms of ideology and practice, reversing what they see as dominant motivations and globally pervasive modes of production and consumption through their situated shopping, selling, and socializing (290).

Both Alkon and Gagne express some suspicion of such actions, however, invoking the ever-haunting specter of neoliberal subjectivity that perhaps belies them. Understanding market patronage in Porta Palazzo Market in Turin, Italy as expressive of a deep desire for sociality, however, Rachel Black offers the simple rejoinder, "why should economic and monetary exchange negate the idea of sociability?" (2012: 23).

Indeed, as Tangire's study of the nineteenth century public markets in the Unites States makes clear (and again, resuscitating Polanyi's notion of embeddedness), such marketplaces have historically served as sites for both mundane economic exchange as well as for the perpetuation of a complex sociality realized in the performance of civic culture. As she asserts in the introduction to her study, "More than just public spaces for buying and selling food, public markets were civic spaces—the common ground where citizens and government struggles to define the values of the community" (2003: XVI). Localized manifestations of such functions are not lost on journalist and local

historian Jack Neely in penning the subtitle of the single most comprehensive historical portrait of Knoxville's Market Square (host site of the its namesake contemporary farmer's market), which he is wont to call "The Most Democratic Place on Earth" (2009). Thus understood in the context of their historical development, contemporary farmer's markets can be conceptualized as sites of continuity with such imperatives rather than a disjuncture.

More directly for our purposes, though not unrelated, it is similarly in the mode of market-as-social-institution that farmer's markets (and Market Square Farmer's Market in particular) most saliently embody and realize the ethic of infrastructural affinity that constitutes one of the principle analytic axes of this chapter. Understood as occurring within a context of contrasting and contradictory meanings that attend the negotiations of the place of the local market within the global market society, it is precisely as a result of such ambiguity that contemporary farmer's markets accumulate the surplus of cultural capital that has catapulted them to popularity. For the rise of farmer's markets is also coextensive with the emergence of the mega-store buying club sector represented by Sam's Club and Costco. Indeed, the modern supermarket, the manifestation of a complex historical trajectory of its own, is the antagonistic other against which the farmer's market often derives much its identity as a counter-institution in the realm of food distribution.

From Public Market to Supermarket and Back Again

At the turn of the twentieth century, American food provisioning and distribution was a multifaceted system. Revolutions in advertising, marketing,

production, and distribution coalesced to engender the nascent mass consumer culture patterns that would finally crystalize in the automobile suburbs of the immediate post World War II era (see Cohen 2003, among the most comprehensive historical treatments of this transformation). In retailing, this shift yielded the phenomenon of the chain store. In the food retail sector, this trend was exemplified by the emergence and spread of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, better known as the A & P. From its beginnings in the 1860s as a firm specializing in tea and coffee, by the turn of the century the A & P had expanded into a general grocery retailer with outlet stores all over the country. Though A & P was far and away the largest chain of its kind, competitors soon entered in the grocery chain arena, most notably Kroger in 1902. Up until the 1910s such grocery retailers relied on a complex service system that included in-store assistance, the extension of credit, delivery services, and telephone ordering, all of which was attended by a large staff of clerks and salesmen. In 1913, A & P introduced the simplified cash-and-carry store, wherein the more extensive credit, delivery, and ordering services were eliminated and staff was reduced to a store manager aided by a single assistant (Strasser 1989: 222-224). The next stage in the evolution of grocery retailing was realized in 1916, when Clarence Saunders opened the first Piggly Wiggly store in Memphis, Tennessee, which, utilizing Saunders' patented Self-Servicing System, further eliminating the need for a large staff (Tolbert 2009, Deutsch 2010).

The anonymity and independence encapsulated in the development of chain stores and the self-service model, were part of a larger, calculated consumer discourse emerging in the early twentieth century, argues Deutsch.

For both ethnic minorities and women, the attributes adhering in these new venues of food provisioning promised autonomy and the avoidance of the discriminatory and paternalistic predilections of the traditional neighborhood grocers. According to Deutsch, chain grocers implicitly held out the "possibility of a different form of progress—the possibility that chains could eliminate the high costs, personal scrutiny, and cross-cultural tensions that pervaded conventional grocery stores" (2010: 51). As incredulous as it may sound in 2013, in a 1922 advertisement in the *Chicago Tribune,* promoters claim that, "Piggly Wiggly [with its self-service system] fosters the spirit of independence—the Soul of Democratic Institutions, teaching men, women, and children to do for themselves" (quoted in Deutsch: 57). Lisa Tolbert's (2008) exploration of self-service grocery shopping demonstrates that the model took on a considerably more nuanced tenor in the segregated New South. In a region where the activities of daily food provisioning among the lingering white aristocracy had been the province of black domestic servants, the independent white woman shopper as a paragon of modernity was somewhat more problematic. In this context, promoters of the new self-service paradigm had to do nothing less than recast the nature food provisioning itself. "The new aristocracy of the market basket," writes Tolbert, "redefined the cultural work of food shopping from a menial chore appropriately performed by black domestics to a respectable activity for bourgeois white women" (191).

Promising the stylish modern subject (the empowered female food shopper) a venue for the instantiation of this new subjectivity, chain stores grew through the early decades of the twentieth century. By 1930, the A & P operated

15,700 outlets (Strasser 1989: 224). However, in the 1930s chains came under the scrutiny of lawmakers under the wider rubric of anti-trust concerns. Anti-chain laws deriving from the Robison-Patman Act of 1936 attempted to regulate the "anticompetitive" advantages of chains through a taxing system based on the number of stores operated by a given firm. Chain store owners responded by operating fewer, but bigger, stores. Perhaps anticipating and certainly accelerating the trend toward supermarkets, chain store firms simultaneously found themselves in competition with a new kind of grocery outlet, the proto-supermarkets of independent proprietors. Often located in abandoned warehouses or factories, these early supermarket proprietors frequently subleased spaces or stalls to a variety of independently operating firms or individual entrepreneurs. As such, they were perhaps more closely akin to fairs or flea markets than the contemporary supermarket. In other regards, they bore some resemblance to public markets, described by Deutsch as routinely hosting carnivalesque festivities, a reputation that garnered the "wild animal stores" epithet issued by their staid chain store counterparts (2010: 144-146). Eventually, chain stores adopted the model themselves, however, opening their own versions of the supermarket, which had become fairly well standardized by 1950 (Deutsch 2010).

While wildcat grocers initiated the transition from relatively small outlets to the supermarket, the so-called big box store phenomenon of the contemporary era is often credited to Sam Walton, who opened his first Wal-Mart store in 1962. Enabled by the expanding automobile infrastructure and suburban development that took off in the 1950s, Stacy Mitchell's scathing critique of mega-retailing,

Big-Box Swindle, cites the Wal-Mart prototype as instrumental in launching the big-box revolution. From its 1962 beginnings as a variety department store, Wal-Mart entered the grocery sector with the opening of its first supercenter in 1988, and is now the leading supermarket (by sales) in the U.S. (Lepore 2011). Both the supercenter format and Wal-Mart's ascendency to the top of the grocery retail sector are indicative of larger trends in mega-store development and market consolidation, with the top five grocers controlling 46% of all national sales, more than doubling their overall share since 1988 (Mitchell 2006: 10).

As mega-store retailing has grown, so too has the organic and natural foods sector, in which major retailers such as Whole Foods (founded in Austin, Texas in 1980) have adopted the general supermarket format. Indeed as Michael Pollan notes in his landmark book *The Omivore's Dilemma*, "The word 'organic' has proved to be one of the most powerful words in the supermarket" (2006: 136). In their efforts to be competitive with more conventional supermarket chains, Whole Foods, writes Pollan, "has adopted the grocery industry's standard regional distribution system, which makes supporting small farms impractical" (138). Instead, they leverage purchasing power by buying mostly from the largest corporate organic growers, those who can actualize "economies of scale" necessary to meet the demands of Whole Foods expanding market share. This process has yielded what Pollan refers to as "the organic empire," a segment of the grocery industry that reifies the global industrial food system, in turn raising troubling questions as to the intentions and motivations of the organic foods sector in its entirety (which Julie Guthman takes to task in her important 2004 study, *Agrarian Dreams*).

It is most often against the backdrop of such trends in the food-retailing sector (and, accordingly, the provisioning options represented therein) that the interest in the public market form (the farmer's market specifically) has proven resurgent. This is not to suggest that the latter is perceived as a complete, or even necessarily directly competing, alternative to the former, for indeed as Tangires notes, the two major forms of urban food retailing since the nineteenth century—the public market and the grocery store—have never been mutually exclusive entities (2003: 202). Prevailing sentiments among farmer's market participants, such as those documented by Alkon and Gagne above, and as excerpts from participants in this research will demonstrate, are most often grounded in extra-economic motivations that belie more diversified food provisioning tactics in which both the grocery store and the public market play a role. As Black (2012) notes of parallel developments in the Italian context, while supermarkets have become the dominant mode of food provisioning, such a food system reaps payment in the form of social and environmental costs that are not accounted for in conventional economic calculus. "The supermarket," Black asserts, "is a central site of consumption has played a part in breaking down the social connections between people while distancing them from the source of their food" (5). In contrast, while the logic of the market society may have long prophesied the demise of the public market at the hand of more "efficient" economies of scale (i.e., those of the supermarket), their resilience suggests something other than purely economistic elements at work. In the estimation of Tangires, "Public markets have survived and adapted—in tandem with other forms of urban food retailing—because of their inherent civic qualities" (2003: XX). As the rest of this

chapter will demonstrate, at Knoxville, Tennessee's Market Square Farmer's Market (MSFM), such civic qualities manifest in numerous and overlapping registers. For in Knoxville's local food movement, MSFM is a key site for both a more general affective relationality and a more particular kind of generative infrastructural affinity.

Market Square Farmer's Market and the Metro-Politics of Food Provisioning

Market Square Farmer's Market (MSFM) opened for its first season in May of 2004 as a producer-only, open-air market in its namesake public square in the heart of downtown Knoxville. The previous year the city of Knoxville had undertaken the latest in a long history of makeovers of the square as part of wider efforts in the revitalization of the city's downtown core. Ironically, that year, 2003, was the only year in the square's 160-year history that no agricultural produce was sold there. After MSFM's inauspicious inaugural year, this might have seemed an omen. As Charlotte T., the coordinator and manager of MSFM since its inception, remembers the debut of the market:

> We opened in May 2004 with some amount of fanfare and very little substance. We asked different farms if they would come and almost none of the ones who said they would come actually came. Although we did have a few others—Donald P. and his family had been selling before the closure [in 2003], so they came back. We had a few bakers, [a local] herb farm, and probably ten vendors on opening day. A lot of people came to see it [pause for laugh], and they were disappointed.

Indeed, Charlotte remembers the first five years of the market as a continuous struggle, a period during which the market sought to stake out its identity as a kind of newfangled marketplace that was heretofore unknown to many Knoxville residents. As she recalls her efforts through that formative period:

> The first couple of years there was a lot of education. People were familiar with the regional food hub farmer's markets, where distributors came in and it wasn't necessarily a lot of producer-only [products]—there would be a lot of resale. For myself, I was pretty adamant about the producer-only part of it, which definitely stunted the growth in the beginning, but I think we won out in the end. It's really hard to go back from that . . . There wasn't a grocery store of any kind really—there was a Wiegel's [a Knoxville convenience store chain], and I think Jay's Mega Market was open—but there wasn't even a place for people to buy bananas. So there were some residents who said, 'well maybe we can just have bananas,' and things like that. I said 'that's fine, but it's not going to be this farmer's market. It can be something else, but that's not what I'm signing up for and that's not what I'm going to do."

The "producer-only" orientation of the market was intended to serve as a crucible for the forging of a re-localized food economy based on a direct marketing model, one that demanded the immediacy of direct producer-consumer exchanges to the exclusion of the resale model (wherein a vendor is not necessarily the producer/grower of his or her wares). It was likewise intended to cultivate connectivity between and among producers themselves, encouraging a reticulated peer-to-peer purchasing network that would close the loop of local food production as much as is possible within the given environmental limits of the region. It was in this sense, a restricted local market of the sort discussed

above. As such, many observers and supporters see it as a return to the spirit of Market Square's original intention. As local historian and writer Jack Neely exclaimed in an interview, "I've found it very gratifying that the farmer's market came back— [though] it never completely died. I think every single year there was some kind of something local sold there—but when Charlotte and her friends started it [in 2004] . . . that really brought back the ideals again." Those ideals stretch back to 1853 when two local developers and land magnates, William Swan and Joseph Mabry, deeded just over an acre of land to the City of Knoxville with the provision that the plot "'be used and enjoyed . . . for the purpose of constructing thereon a market house, to be used as such, and for no other use and purpose whatsoever'" (quoted in Neely 2009: 11). Thus was Market Square designated "'a market for farmers forever'" (quoted in Bennet 1984: np).

Thus as was common in the broader development of public markets in nineteenth century America (and as had been the case with their European antecedents), Market Square was intended to promote and protect the interests of local producers and galvanize the local economy. The socio-economic institution of the nineteenth century public market was, in Helen Tangires's estimation, "a compelling demonstration of the persistence of the moral economy despite the disruptive effects of a capitalist market economy" (2003: XVII). In our interview, Jack Neely similarly observed of the early development of Market Square that the moral economic obligation

> . . . was something that by the 1850s and 60s they felt obliged to police a little bit because they wanted Market Square to be just for local farmers and that was always the ideal, sometimes followed, often not followed. They had a market

> master who was employed by the city and one of his jobs was to be sure that everybody was a local guy, because they set it up mainly the help the local economy and so forth.

Charlotte T. is perhaps the contemporary equivalent of the nineteenth century market master, the constable of the local economy. In other ways too, MSFM must be (and is) understood as the latest chapter in the historical narrative of the development of Market Square, a narrative that has implications beyond just the immediate environs of the market itself, or even of city of Knoxville, and projects food localism (wherever it occurs) into the larger metro-politics of post-industrial urban revitalization.

After its designation in 1853, the first Market Hall was erected on the square in 1854. Over the course of its first several decades the square witnessed the coming and going of the Civil War and in its own midst, the accretion of a larger business district that arose around the hall. As Tangires writes of the function of nineteenth century market houses more generally, "It stood at the civic and commercial core of the city, forging relationships between farmers, small businesses, and local financial institutions" (2003: 47). The Market Hall in Knoxville exerted just such a centripetal force in the city's economic development through the end of nineteenth and into the first decades of the twentieth century. Besides its economic centrality, it also served as an unrivaled site of social and cultural convergence. As Jack Neely writes, "Market Square was always familiar to the whole community, black and white, rich and poor, old and young, city and country. For long-time locals who claimed to know everybody, Market Square was the only place where they dependably encountered strangers" (2009: 3).

After decades of service, the original market hall was razed in 1896 and a new and "modern" architect-designed Public Hall was erected in its place in 1897. Market Square continued to thrive at the turn of the century and the Public Hall became a fixture of the urban landscape. As the throng and hum earned the square a reputation among locals as "the most democratic place on earth," it attracted the attention of both passers-through and local literary giants James Agee and Cormac McCarthy. Though fictional, passages from two of McCarthy's early novels offer the most lyrical descriptions of the life of Market Square as we are likely to ever read. Set a decade apart, they offer a fairly consistent snapshot. The first of these, from his first novel, *The Orchard Keeper* (1965), will be offered at length. Market Square circa 1940:

> *He went up the far side of the square under the shadow of the market house past brown country faces peering from among their carts and trucks, perched on crates, old women with faces like dried fruit set deep in their hooded bonnets, shaggy, striated and hawk-toothed as coconut carvings, shabby backlanders trafficking in the wares of the earth, higgling [sic] their goods from a long row of ancient vehicles backed obliquely against the curb and freighted with fruits and vegetables, eggs and berries, honey in jars and boxes of nuts, bundles of roots and herbs from sassafras to boneset, a bordello of potted plants and flowers. By shoe windows where shoddy foot-gear rose in dusty tiers and clothing stores in whose vestibules iron racks stood packed with used coats, past bins of socks and stockings, a meat market where hams and ribcages dangled like gibbeted miscreants and in the glass cases square porcelain trays piled with meat white-spotted and trichinella-ridden, chunks of liver the color of clay*

> *tottering up from moats of watery blood, a tray of brains, unidentified gobbets of flesh scattered here and there* (82, italicized in original).

From *Suttree* (1979), a novel set entirely in Knoxville (and a name taken for a current "high gravity tavern" located on Gay Street), we get a description of the Market Hall in 1951, an imposing edifice "where brick the color of dried blood rose turreted and cupolaed and crazed into the heat of the day form on form in demented accretions without precedent or counterpart in the annals of architecture. Pigeons bobbed and preened in the high barbicans or shat from the blackened parapets." Wandering about the Market House stalls the anti-hero Suttree encounters a scene of sensory excess and a gallery of motley characters, a "lazaret of comestibles and flora and maimed humanity" (67).

The second market house and Market Square more broadly, had become the subject of considerable local debate by the late 1950s. Downtown was steadily losing population to new suburban developments and the supermarket was beginning the render the food provisioning function of the square redundant. Local officials, investors, and promoters were also concerned with the reputation of downtown, and the square more specifically. By mid-century, As Jack Neely writes, in a description that echoes McCarthy's passages as regards the denizens it presents, "Market Square was the crazy aunt in Knoxville's basement. Newcomers remarked on it, sometimes in fascination, sometimes in humor, sometimes in horror, at the rusty trucks and chicken crates and squatters who seemed defiantly out of step with the modern world, and with a city struggling to join the modern world and share America's sleek new lines of postwar prosperity" (2009: 145). So in 1960 the second market house was razed to make way for a

modernist phase in the development of the square, wherein the empty space formerly occupied by the market house would become known as "the mall," which dominated the square for over a decade.

By the time TVA built its modernist, twin-tower headquarters buildings on the north end of Market Square in 1974-76, downtown Knoxville, like other downtown cores in the era of deindustrialization and globalization, entered a period of decline. As Saskia Sassen notes of the uncertainties attending this period more generally,

> The dispersed capacities emerging with globalization and telematics—the off-shoring of factories, the expansion of global networks of affiliates and subsidiaries, the move of back offices out of the central cities and to the suburbs—led many observers to assert that cities would become obsolete in an economic context of globalization and telematics (1994: 2).

Instead, as studies by Lloyd (2006) and Zukin (2008, 2010) demonstrate, such changes precipitated a shift in the nature of economic activity in the global north—from an industrial/manufacturing base to a largely cultural/symbolic/ aesthetic economy—a shift in which city centers would return to the fore. Lloyd offers an ethnographic profile of this transformation as it occurred in Chicago's Wicker Park neighborhood, where, he states, "Rather than being merely anachronistic, neighborhoods like Wicker Park, once predicated on the spatial practices of blue-collar manufacturing, are reconfigured as strategic sites in the new aesthetic economy" (2006: 26). Indeed in the larger national pattern Zukin (2008) notes that what were seen as blighted urban landscapes in the 1950s (and

up through the 1980s in most of the southeast) were recast in the new aesthetic and symbolic economy as epicenters of hip creativity.

This process is often anchored, Zukin argues, by formations attending the movement toward new local food economies. Indeed, farmer's markets, along with complimentary mechanisms like historic preservation ordinances and the promotion of "creative economies," *a la* the prescriptions of Richard Florida (1992), have been instrumental in urban revitalization efforts. The best-known example of this is Seattle's Pike Place Farmer's Market, which often gets the nod for launching the contemporary farmer's market movement. As Lyons writes of the famed Seattle market,

> The successful public vote to 'preserve' Pike Place Market in 1971, and designate it an official Historic District (rather than implement a local government plan to demolish and 'redevelop' the site with a hotel, apartments and a seven-level parking garage) aestheticized aged and neglected edifices in the centre of the city and refashioned them as upscale sites of consumption" (2005: 21).

As the birthplace of Starbucks, Pike Place signals another important dimension attending relocalization efforts—their potential for branding (as in the "place specific commodity biography" of specialty coffee, associated in its early years with Seattle). As Zukin (2010) writes of parallel processes at New York's Union Square Greenmarket (like MSFM, a producer-only market), wherein "An authentic *experience* of local character becomes a local *brand*" (121, emphasis in original). This can perhaps be thought of as part and parcel of the larger processes of civic branding, wherein places begin to reify these discourses as part of a stock of images and icons that signify an authenticity that is then projected in

order to court loyalty among potential consumers. In such a process, favorite places become similar to favorite brands, denoting trust, quality, and other such values. This is not always or inherently bad, however, for as Jon Smith argues, rather than imposing a false binarism, “a brand offers a more inclusive and hybrid range of participation in ‘imagined communities’ ranging from nations to veterans groups to tractor fans to whatever sort of community consumers of such a product imagine themselves to be participating in by buying into it” (2013: 109).

Returning to Market Square, after the completion of the TVA towers in the mid 1970s, Market Square ambled along for another decade primarily as a daytime lunch destination for downtown office workers. The Square was, however, placed on the National Register of Historic Places, the nomination written in 1984. At the turn of the decade the Square got an infusion of life that presaged the hip urban vitality that was to come. In 1990, Iranian born Mahasti Vafaie opened the Tomato Head (originally the Flying Tomato), which has been an anchor of Market Square ever since. In a 2010 profile of Vafaie in the local online news outlet Knoxvillebiz.com, then president of the Market Square District Association (an organization that was instrumental in the founding of MSFM), Jon Craig, is quoted as saying of the Tomato Head, "It's one of those places where people bring their friends to have an authentic Knoxville experience. It really helped set the tone for other businesses that followed - local, independently owned and very focused" (Harrington). While Tomato Head remained a favorite among loyal patrons, Market Square as a whole was still quite moribund through the mid-1990s. Then slowly came signs of change. As Jack Neely writes, “By the

late 90s, for the first time anyone could remember, affluent people were moving into the upper floors of old buildings on the Square, to live." Arts organization became involved as well, and the city started hosting a wildly popular concert series on the Square in 1998.

Throughout much of post-market house period, however, the square was languishing as to its original and intended purposes of food provisioning. That function was held down largely by a single area farmer, Sherrill Perkins, who Jack Neely wrote about frequently, until he finally quit coming to the square after the rebirth of the market in 2004. In a 1997 article titled, "Kohlrabi, Muscadine, and Cushaw," Neely describes Perkins: "He wears clean bluejean overalls and a green Price's Landscaping cap. His grandfather sold here in the 1800s; his father sold here in the 20s. Perkins isn't sure how long he's been coming here himself, three days a week—10 years, maybe 12. Other farmer's sell nearby, but none with selection or regularity that Perkins does" (in the collection *Secret History* 1998: 135). Having read that piece before our interview, I asked Jack about Perkins, and he offered somewhat of an obituary:

> He just wanted to sell enough to make a living. Probably 90% of what he sold was local, but he didn't care that he brought in some produce, wholesale stuff, that he brought from elsewhere. He kind of kept the flame burning for a long time. He was an old farmer—he'd always had bouts with skin cancer and stuff—he was kind of a rough looking character. To him it was just what his family had always done, is sell stuff on Market Square. To my knowledge he and his family didn't come back to market square after the reconfiguring of it, and he was very old and ill already anyway . . . But what is happening now is much more vigorous

> than that. He never had much in terms of quantity . . . He had his customers and probably most other people didn't notice him.

Thus did the new era ushered in by MSFM coincide with the passing of the last of the old-time vendors. There may be something to lament in this convergence (or divergence, as it were), but many believe, Jack Neely included, that the new market has rescued downtown Knoxville and revived a spirit of public democracy that many have long since pronounced dead. As Charlotte stated in our interview, "There are people who say this farmer's market is what saved Knoxville. Well, I doubt it, but I do think it has contributed greatly to the vitality of downtown and obviously, of our food system."

2013 marked the ten-year anniversy of MSFM. While the first five years may have been a struggle, the second five proved successful beyond the wildest expectations of many. With a season spanning from May to November, MSFM assembles biweekly (Wednesday evenings and Saturdays) in its namesake downtown location. On a given Saturday (by far the busiest of the two operating days) MSFM is, like many contemporary urban farmer's markets, a total sensorial feast, teaming with shoppers, vendors (both official vendors, and sidewalk hawkers, selling not only fresh farm produce but baked goods and prepared food of every description), busking street musicians, and the occasional stilt walking theatre troupe. For many patrons and vendors alike, it has become a highlight of their weekly social calendars. It is a place where one can interact directly with the one who grew the food that will be featured at that evening's dinner party; where one can meet up with friends for brunch, letting the kids play in water

fountains while enjoying some live music for a dollar or two in tip money (or, conversely, where one can set out a guitar case and play for tips).

MSFM has become an anchor in the fluorescence of Market Square and adjacent commercial districts in the downtown core, as of which are filled to capacity with hip and trendy indie boutiques and a few regional chains. The market has become a nucleus in the creative economy of downtown as well, linked early in its development with independent art shops, particularly Yee Haw Hand Cranked Letter Press. Specializing in concert and promotional posters and grounded in the southern folk art aesthetic deriving from the expressions of late Georgia outsider-artist Howard Finster, Yee Haw was instrumental in producing the graphic iconography that has become central to MSFM's identity. Unlike the historical market, however, the current iteration has been almost entirely the result of the efforts of the coalition of residents and merchants known as the Market Square District Association, rather than a project of the municipal government. I asked Charlotte specifically about MSFM's relationship with the City of Knoxville, to which she replied, "We have very little relationship, honestly. I mean we have never been treated [as] much more than a special event. We're a special event just like anything else. We work with special events office . . . but it's not sponsored by the city." Even so, the city has seen the value of MSFM in its own efforts at civic branding. As Charlotte notes, "I mean the farmer's market is in every promotional thing that Visit Knoxville does. People are all about farmer's markets."

This status undoubtedly raises the question of privatization and government divestment that has been among the most defining features of the

neoliberal era. The typical teleological narrative is succinctly recounted by Gagne: "Liberal societies were seen as dominated by the hegemonic forces of the market economy . . . sweeping away age-old interstitial places—places that were neither purely private nor purely public and that were free from political and economic forces" (2011: 284). Furthermore, according to Harvey (1993) such processes play directly to the processes of competitive civic branding wherein "Interplace competition is not simply about attracting production . . . It is also about attracting consumers through the creation of a cultural centre, a pleasing urban and regional landscape, and the like" (8). Farmer's markets, at least as far as cities are concerned, become one of many elements that can be utilized in the generation of symbolic representations that serve ultimately economic functions. While for the City of Knoxville, MSFM is an event like any other, for Charlotte and market participants:

> The farmer's market is much, much more than an event. It's a storefront for people, it's their livelihood, and it's much more important to downtown. I had other business owners come up and say the same thing; they'll say 'oh nothing can happen to the farmer's market.' I mean the Biscuit Festival is cool, we'd hate for Dogwood to go, but the farmer's market is just such an important part of downtown. We just can't have anything happen to it. There's not really a non-profit in this region that works with local food, so we're going to take that on . . . We work with so many people we use those resources to start working further, because the farmer's market impacts so much more than just downtown.

In Gagne's estimation, "This recontextualization of the farmers' market, along with a revival of communal consciousness in local urban settings, is promoted by the dual forces of ideological and economic trends at large and their particular

articulations at the local level in globally embedded metropolitan centers" (284). Even despite its quasi-private/quasi-public nature (indeed, their *hybrid* nature), in such a context MSFM and other markets may serve important democratic functions in the context of the neoliberal city.

Indeed, commentators have long extolled the democratic virtues of the public market. In an 1814 poem by Theophilus Eaton that serves as a epigraph Tangires's chapter on "Marketplace Culture," the author muses:

> The place where no distinctions are,
>
> All sects and colors mingle there . . . ,
>
> Nothing more clear, I'll tell you why,
>
> All kinds of folks must eat or die.
>
> Objects of honor or disgrace,
>
> Are all seen at the market-place. (48).

I asked Jack if he thought Market Square and downtown Knoxville had become more or less democratic in the current era of revitalization. He offered the following considered answer, which encapsulates the complexities and class dimensions of the new aesthetic and/or symbolic economy: "I can't afford to live downtown, but a lot of the people I see downtown are desperately poor. You can see everybody—they're not equal—but they're all passing each other on the sidewalk and seeing each other more than they used to." Kristen F., the co-owner of Just Ripe discussed earlier in this chapter, said the following of the democratic potential of the market:

> . . . one of its real strengths in growing the community and potentially the economy, is that, well, [Charlotte] talked about it being [like] main-street. People

> really are going and talking to each other there—they're conversing with all of the vendors, they're conversing with each other—its really building ties that were not there. I think that's a really powerful thing about the farmer's market.

Similarly, Charlotte said of the market, "You can definitely see vendors and customers sort of get to a point to where, [they are] like, 'I know this one's [political] leanings.' . . . It comes out a lot, but people are just kind of like, 'That's okay!' You are actually engaging with people you might not normally engage with and you can learn a lot!"

Critiques of the new farmer's markets are often based around a certain assumed class differentiation, as sites for the cultivation of "distinction" and the status that comes with it, to the exclusion of those without equivalent cultural capital (those who perhaps do not know, nor care to know, the difference between arugula and bok choy, for example) [Bourdieu 1984]. Certainly there are elements of a differentiated cultural capital at work here. Matt G., who frequents the market for raw ingredients for the entrees and appetizers featured in his nearby restaurant, suspects as much of MSFM, wondering if "people are compelled to buy local produce because it's conspicuous consumption. Instead of the BMW and Gucci purse, it's walking around with your bag of greens you got at the farmer's market . . . I think for a portion of the population that might be! It might be a "scene.'" Many involved in the local food movement are keenly aware of these critiques, however, and attempt to compensate through reaching out to non-typical customers (non-middle class white). The MSFM was the first farmer's market in the state of Tennessee to accept payment from those on government assistance. MSFM has established relationships with other charity

organizations as well, including the St. Andrews Society, whose volunteers glean leftover produce at the conclusion of every market day for redistribution to local food banks. At the end of the day, however, MSFM is about enabling the local food economy and the bulk of the market's participants (both shoppers and vendors) are white and middle class.

Though not without its problems or contradictions, the reassertion of the local economy, via its expression in the form of re-localized food systems that are the leitmotif of many contemporary farmer's markets, might be thought of (indeed is thought of by local participants) as but the latest manifestation in the venerably genealogy of the moral economy. Through offering an exchange venue that demands direct relationships between producers and consumers, MSFM and other farmer's markets are creating affective linkages that are commonly believed to have been broken by the anonymity of the supermarket and global economy. Likewise, through connecting producers with one another, through offering critical outlets for local farmers, MSFM serves as a critical node in the networks of infrastructural affinity that is making the local food economy possible.

Chapter 2

"Savor the Earth to Save It!"—Public Culinary Culture, *Cuisine de Terroir*, and the Pedagogy of Sustainable Pleasure

In May of 2013 the students and teachers of the small middle school community of Nature's Way Montessori School (NWMS) in Knoxville, TN boarded busses for their annual, weeklong spring study-trip. Planned around a thematic topic that changes every year, this year's theme was "Farm-to-Table in Tennessee." The first theme-specific destinations and hosts for the trip would be located in Nashville, arguably the epicenter of contemporary food localism and sustainability in Tennessee. The school group's first visit was with Nashville chef, restaurateur, and local food advocate/activist Jeremy B. After a highly successful nine-year run as proprietor and executive chef of Tayst Restaurant and Wine Bar—Nashville's first "certified green" restaurant—Jeremy B. had recently refocused his energies on his newest eco-culinary venture, an establishment he calls Sloco, a considerably less rarified venture specializing in "local and sustainable sandwiches at affordable prices." An October 2012 posting on the website of Nashville's alternative weekly, *Nashville Scene* (Franklin 2012), lists among his honors as an innovator and advocate in the sustainable food world, a place on the Mother Nature Network's 40 chefs under 40 list in 2009, as well as both the 2011 and 2012 Sustainable Food Leader of the Year award from local Lipscomb University's Institute for Sustainability. Building on his considerable experience and reflecting his ambitions in the larger public arena of eco-gastronomic education, in 2011 Jeremy B. published his first book, *Chefs Can Save the World: How to Green Restaurants and Why They are the Key to*

Renewing the Food System. The title is perhaps reiterative of, in Julie Guthman's words, "a messianic disposition [that] has taken hold in alternative food politics" (2008: 436). A signed copy purchased by an NWMS faculty member has taken a place on the shelves of the school's reference library. The signature is preceded by the charismatic declaration: "Savor the earth to save it!"

I couldn't imagine a more fitting title for this chapter, nor a better point of entry than a brief sketch of Jeremy B., for rather than being an anomaly he is in most ways quite representative of the cadre of chefs and restaurateurs working at the forefront of sustainable food localism. This same article mentioned above tells us that Jeremy B. "procures well over 90% of his food from local sources and 100% from sustainable sources." He is, furthermore, a "nose-to-tail chef," making use of every possible part of the whole animal. Even so, he is also, we are insured, "an adept vegan chef, always including vegetarian and vegan options on the menu." The website for Sloco offers readers a five-point "Declaration of Food Independence." The five points are, in abbreviated, paraphrased form: 1. Affordable; 2. Situated/ Community bound; 3. Sustainable; 4. Responsible; and 5. Seasonal. Looking at each point briefly in turn—in raising *affordability* as point number one, Sloco and Jeremy B. start with a challenge: the conceits and vicissitudes of our contemporary industrial food system belie true cost accounting, particularly in the tendency toward externalizing the environmental costs associated with resource intensive production regimes. Awareness of this situation has created a counter-demand for sustainable and transparent food options. While we are often told that such food is simply too expensive for anything like mainstream viability, Sloco intends to prove otherwise,

"[promising] sustainably sourced food at affordable prices." This is achieved in part through what in this chapter I will call a *political economy/ecology of thrift*. In the case of Sloco, this means "nose-to-tail cookery, making everything in-house, utilizing the most sustainable product available" and service-time comparable to that of any "quick service [fast food] joint."

Sloco's second point—a promise to serve as active members/citizens of a situated community—articulates a second node of affinity. This kind of small-business citizenship ranges from claims of job generation, to direct donation, advocacy, accessibility, and ethical practices-modeling. The lattermost category includes a "bike delivery service to keep cars off the road." The intentional reduction of the business's footprint, and the accompanying recognition of closed systems is Sloco's third point. As the website proclaims, "it's all a circle, and no matter where you get on, what matters is that you stay on." The fourth point is a promise to "cook responsibly." This includes another dimension of the edificatory orientation of such enterprises, in this case, educating patrons on healthful eating as embodied in appropriate portion sizes and reduced levels of meat consumption. As the extended discussion under point four asserts: "one pound of meat at lunch is too much meat for any single human being." Finally, point number five is simply the promise (and again the edificatory promise) of seasonality. This does not, we are assured, require a sacrifice in flavor, but simply a recalibration of our natural propensity for seasonal eating. For while Sloco "can't always promise you arugula, [they] can always promise deliciousness."

In subsequent correspondence concerning the NWMS spring study-trip, teachers assured me that their middle school students were duly impressed and surprisingly attentive in the presence of Jeremy B.'s charismatically delivered presentations on local and sustainable food systems and the ethics of small-business ownership. The students' reactions are mirrored in the title of popular food writer Michael Ruhlman's 2006 book *The Reach of a Chef,* which is suggestive of another important dimension of contemporary public culinary culture: the celebrity status of chefs (whether realized or latent) in the current moment of popular cultural production. Although the origins of the celebrity chef might be dated back to the nineteenth century career of French chef Antonin Careme and the late nineteenth and early twentieth century publicly lauded successes of Auguste Escoffier (Spang 2000; Johnston & Baumann 2010; Crowther 2013), the current craze for celebrity chefs (1993-present), a phenomenon driven by an explosion in food-related media, constitutes a new era in the evolution of American culinary culture. Indeed, such developments have prompted British anthropologist Wendy Fonarow, writer of the popular *Guardian* music blog post, "Ask the Indie Professor," to ponder: "Is Food the New Indie Rock?" In response she writes:

> What I find most fascinating is how the modern foodie movement expresses many . . . indie values. The indie music scene finds ownership and means of production to be ethical issues, preferring small independent local operations to large corporations. Indie values include DIY [do it yourself] aesthetics, simplicity, purity, an antipathy to the synthetic and manufactured, a desire for authenticity,

> a longing for the past (be it 7-inch singles or cassette tapes), and the elitist discourse of the art critic (2011).

These so-called "indie values" are indeed analogous to many of the proclamations issued in Sloco's "Declaration" as described above. This shared affinity toward the ethics of indie and DiY, toward the politics of authenticity and antagonism, coupled with the high visibility resulting from celebrity or celebrity-like status, elevates the contemporary chef to a position of pop culture authority heretofore reserved for the likes of rock stars and star athletes. When combined with the edginess and subcultural capital of the "countercuisine" (Belasco 2007), "Chefs," as Mark Ruhlman puts it, "thanks to their celebrity, now have the clout and the passion, as well as the knowledge, to point us back to things that matter—to sustainable farming, to raising animals naturally in fresh air, rather than inside cement barracks pumped full of antibiotics" (2006: 12).

However, the dire seriousness of such environmental catastrophist discourses belies another, equally important dimension to the current localist eco-culinary insurgency: what we can only call the politics of pleasure. As articulated by current cultural studies scholars under a variety of monikers—the "alternative" or "sustainable hedonism" of ethical consumerist subjectivities (Soper 2008, 2009; de Geus 2009), for example—such orientations are pointing to "new forms of desire, rather than fears of ecological disaster, as the most likely motivating force in any shift towards a more sustainable economic order" (Soper 2009: 3). Stated another way, in what is a fitting mantra for the public eco-culinary Avant-garde, again in Ruhlman's words: "We better take care of the earth or we're gonna have shitty food, and shitty food is no fun" (14). Such

discourses and practices are not without their problems and contradictions, however, as Johnston & Baumann (2010), Guthman (2003, 2008) and others, with their tongue-in-cheek invocations of "delicious revolutions" and "Yuppie chow," so adroitly argue (arguments to which we will return below).

Despite whatever degree of celebrity a chef may achieve by luck or hard work (or both), among the chefs interviewed for this project, the vast bulk of their energies were absorbed in meeting the daily demands and challenges of their restaurants. These establishments are, after all, the most quintessentially public manifestations of their creators—the sites where the greatest amount of time and energy (physical, intellectual, emotional) are invested; the most fully developed manifestation of the chefs' philosophy. Given the increasingly visible and instrumental role of restaurants as drivers of urban revitalization, as key sites of the performance of public cultures and the dissemination of alternative discursive frameworks, ". . . restaurants," as Beriss & Sutton (2007) state in the introductory chapter of their edited collection, *The Restaurants Book: Ethnographies of Where We Eat*, "constitute ideal total social phenomena for our postmodern world" (1). Indeed, the authors continue: "Restaurants and the people involved in running them have become powerful cultural brokers and potent symbols for protests against a globalized and industrialized food system" (3). Such an assertion is central to the formulation of this chapter. But before we get into the possibilities and limitations of the counter-culinary politics adhering in the public discourses and practices of chefs and restaurants it will be useful to take a look at how we got here.

A Brief Historical Sketch of Public Culinary Culture in America

Though it has a number of antecedents and close relatives, the origin of the modern restaurant is located amid the shifting urban order of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Paris, a child of the modernist sensibilities and socio-economic transformations accompanying the French Revolution (Spang 2000). What came to distinguish a proper restaurant thereafter, understood as reproducing the form and function of the French prototype, was its dedication principally to the preparation and serving of food on demand (initially for an almost exclusively elite clientele). In other kinds of contemporaneous public eateries, including taverns, inns, public houses, and coffeehouses, the focus was most often providing accommodation to travelers or on drink, with food figuring as enticement at best (as in the "free lunches" offered by saloons), and most often a mere afterthought. As the historical studies of both Spang and Pillsbury (1990) make clear, whether located in Paris or Boston, the comestibles on offer in such establishments were of notoriously poor quality. The distinction at this time between private and public dining options held the former to be inherently superior to latter. The inversion of this system of valuation began to change as new enlightenment-era preoccupations at the intersection of health, science, and modernity yielded the therapeutic entrepreneurialism of the first French restaurateurs, who initially specialized in the preparation and delivery of the "restorative broths" with which the word *restaurant* was originally synonymous. The modern restaurant emerged from this proto-therapeutic origin as the experiments of these earliest culinary alchemists eventuated novel gustatory creations that increasingly captured the attention of the intelligentsia and other

elite patrons. As Spang (2000) notes: "As part of an ongoing debate that encompassed topics from architecture to artillery, [this] nouvelle cuisine was at the heart of attempts to define an enlightened life-style" (47).

While a newly fusing influence of British, African, and Native America elements predominated in American public culinary culture through the first decades of nineteenth century (and continued to do so in domestic and community contexts well into the twentieth century), an emergent urban aristocracy (largely men) soon found a vehicle for distinction (in the Bourdieuian sense) in the adoption of French cuisine. Indeed, by the middle of the nineteenth century, eating out for the sake of gastronomic pleasure was a rarified affair, a salient means of generating cultural capital for those with aristocratic ambitions and sensibilities (Haley 2011). The first French restaurant in the U.S. was Delmonico's, founded by its namesake family of Swiss immigrants in New York City in 1827. By 1848, as recounted in Andrew P. Haley's history of restaurants and class in America, *New York Daily Tribune* reporter George Foster would praise Delmonico's as the "'only complete specimen' of the 'expansive and aristocratic restaurant' in the United States, an 'equal in every respect, in its appointments and attendance as well as the quality and execution of its dishes, to any similar establishment in Paris itself'" (2011: 24). Such praise was echoed on both sides of the Atlantic, and Delmonico's became the model for similar fine dining establishments across the U.S., one whose diffusion was widespread by the 1870s. Indeed, a comment offered in an interview with Knoxville cultural historian and popular writer Jack Neely confirms this trend: "If you look at the

kinds of meals they served at the hotels [in late nineteenth century downtown Knoxville], they were anything but local—lots of emphasis on French cuisine."

These French fine dining establishments, however, were not the only purveyors of prepared food in mid-to-late nineteenth century American cities, and as the middle class expanded throughout this same time period, their dining demands and preferences would soon challenge the hegemony of French elite dining. Again as documented by Haley, changes wrought via the processes of urbanization and professionalization precipitated a shift in public culture after 1870: ". . . the new urban lifestyles that commercial growth imposed on middle-class Americans, as well as the siren song of public entertainments and department stores, encouraged the fledgling middle class to engage actively in the public life of their cities—and to reconsider and reassess the restaurant" (71). Kitchenless apartment living and daytime employment in downtown business districts resulted in increased demand for both dinner and lunch options outside the home. Several alternatives to the French restaurant emerged to meet this growing demand: lunchrooms, chophouses, "American" restaurants, coffee and cake saloons. Offering simple and unpretentious menu options (printed in English rather than French), opening early and/or staying open late, serving women as well as men, such establishments, coupled with growing middle class patronage of ethnic restaurants, changed the public culinary landscape of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

A decisive blow in the destabilization of French aristocratic restaurants came with the passage of the Volstead Act and the Eighteenth Amendment to the U.S. constitution. Given the centrality of wine as both an ingredient in and an

accompaniment to traditional French cuisine, Prohibition resulted in the rapid demise of first generation French restaurants after 1920. With their hegemony as the bastions of elite public culinary culture thus usurped, the void left in the wake of the decline of the French restaurant was quickly filled by a proliferation of new, more populist eateries—train station lunch counters, soda fountains, cafeterias, and tearooms, for example (Levenstein 1988: 183-193). The appeal of French cuisine and the endurance of gourmet sensibilities proved resilient, however, and after the repeal of the eighteenth amendment in 1933 (and particularly after World War II), the French model was newly resurgent, bolstered by such developments as the publication of the first issue of *Gourmet* magazine in 1941. Even so, it would never regain its unchallenged status atop America's public culinary hierarchy, undergoing a process of thorough "desacralization" by the mid-twentieth century as a new generation of "post-French" chefs, notably James Beard (host of the first network television cooking show in 1946), came to recognize the value of uniquely American regional and ethnic food items, a phenomenon aided by an expanding public interest in "exotic" flavors, as were embodied in Italian or Indian cuisines (Johnston & Baumann 2010: 5-14). After it was thus dethroned and demystified, French cuisine next underwent a process of democratization, marked by the momentous 1963 television debut of Julia Child hosting "The French Chef." Child's success was followed by that of Graham Kerr, whose Galloping Gourmet debuted in 1969. Joined by Wolfgang Puck and Martha Stewart in the 1980s, this relatively small group of hosts remained the most prominent television food personalities until the arrival of the Food Network and a new epoch in the evolution of popular food

media, one whose lineage begins with Emeril Lagasse and extends to the present coterie of popular hosts including Rick Bayless, Nigella Lawson, Jamie Oliver, Rachel Ray, Bobby Flay, Mario Batali, and others (Hansen 2008; Collins 2009; Adema 2000).

Another singularly important development in American public culinary culture was gathering momentum in the decade prior to Child's TV appearance. Starting his career as an owner of a series of hotdog stands and later branching into the drive-in restaurant fad born to accommodate the rapidly expanding automobile suburbs of southern California in the 1940s, Carl Karcher was a pioneer in the development of what would become fast food, opening Carl's Drive-In Barbeque in 1945 (the ancestor of Carl's Jr.). But it was the innovations employed by brothers Richard and Maurice McDonald in 1948 at their newly streamlined restaurant that truly launched the fast food boom that followed in the 1950s. As Eric Schlosser notes, "For the first time, the guiding principles of a factory assembly line were applied to a commercial kitchen . . . The McDonald brothers' Speedy Service System revolutionized the restaurant business" (2002: 20). Under Ray Kroc's business leadership after 1954, the McDonald's empire was born. Though his study focuses on a time period before the emergence of fast food, the following quote from Haley illustrates the same processes that ultimately (inevitably?) yielded fast food: "As the middle class began to exert its economic and cultural influence, restauranteurs discovered—in much the same way that Henry Ford embraced mass production—that profits were to be had by lowering standards, increasing efficiency, and catering to the largest number of customers" (2011: 18).

Indeed, fast food—on one hand, a triumph of the populist ascendency of middle class normativity, on the other a symbol of industrial capitalism gone mad—would become the antithesis against which another strain of public culinary culture would define itself. Defined by Warren Belasco (1989/2007) as the "countercuisine," the larger countercultural project of the 1960s and 1970s left a lasting legacy in the world of popular culinary culture, one heavily informed by popular understandings of ecology and the burgeoning environmental movement. For countercultural luminaries and theorists like Theodore Roszak, "white bread [a microcosmic rendering of the fast food concept] was a perfect metaphor for the regime of experts and technocrats who, for the sake of efficiency and order, threatened to rob us of all effort, thought, and independence" (Belasco 1989/2007: 49). In Belasco's (1989/2007; 2005) analysis the cultural politics of the countercuisine revolved around three major themes. The first two of these are the "consumerist theme" and "therapeutic theme." Each served a largely antagonistic function through processes of differential valuation, largely via easily discernable bad/good binaries—white vs. brown; plastic vs. natural; convenience vs. craft. Together the first two themes indexed those products, processes, and behaviors that would come to be associated with "real" food (and later, with such derivatives as "slow" food as well). The final theme in Belasco's tripartite structure is a vaguely conceived "organic motif" more concerned with practical dimensions of food systems organization, such as production methods and distribution networks.

The countercuisine framework yielded important counter-institutional networks realized through various expressions of "hip enterprise." For the

purposes of this chapter, among the most significant such enterprises were a new kind of restaurant, and of course, new kinds of restaurateurs to run them. Most emblematic of this trend is undoubtedly Alice Waters, who opened her now internationally famous restaurant, Chez Panisse, in 1971. Deeply imbricated in the Berkeley countercultural scene of the late 60s and early 70s, Waters was a pioneer among restaurateurs for her sourcing practices: she demanded fresh, local, and seasonal ingredients and direct personal relationships with the farmers and artisans who grew and produced them (Belasco 1989/2007; McNamee 2007; Johnston & Baumann 2010). As Waters' biographer Thomas McNamee writes, "Chez Panisse is a much larger enterprise than a restaurant. It is a standard-bearer for a system of moral values. It is the leader of a style of cooking, of a social movement, and of a comprehensive philosophy of doing good and living well" (2007: 6). He continues: "Her conception of a moral community based on good food and goodwill has helped to spawn a new generation of artisans and farmers" (6). Indeed, among the chefs interviewed for this project, every one acknowledged a debt to Waters. Other notable achievements among Waters' counter-culinary cohort was the opening of the collectively-owned, worker-managed Moosewood Restaurant in Ithaca, New York in 1972, and the 1977 publication of the now-iconic *Moosewood Cookbook*, "compiled, edited, illustrated, and hand-lettered" by founding collective member Mollie Katzen. In the "welcome" section, or preface, to the cookbook, Katzen writes (in hand-lettered script):

> Moosewood is a focal point to which each cook has brought her or his personal culinary heritage from family and friends. (Many grandmother's recipes are

> featured.) Cooking styles are shared and traded at the restaurant. Moosewood's cooks also frequent the library, to read about the foods of other cultures. The result is an eclectic cuisine, with vegetarian and ethnic emphases, using the freshest ingredients available (VII).

This brief excerpt is exemplary in its articulation of the principles and aesthetics that animated the countercuisine. Even as the counterculture morphed and fragmented into various "lifestyle" expressions and discourses, the countercultural culinary legacy found a second life through the highly publicized and televised voices of some among the first generation of celebrity chefs.

The Food Network debuted in 1993, but it wasn't until its reconfiguration in 1996 under new leadership that it might be said to have fully arrived as a force in popular culture. Viewership has grown steadily ever since, spawning other food content television channels and a spate of programs broadcast on widely varied networks. The presence of food in the common media-scape has become ubiquitous in ways that would have been hardly imaginably in the era of Child and Kerr. As Matt G., chef and owner of a downtown Knoxville restaurant featuring local and regional foods, stated: "I think the Food Network, in the last ten years, fifteen years—I think people are watching food a lot more now, people are being exposed to a lot more, people are more interested I think, and that's a good thing . . . People are exposed to so much more now—ingredients, cuisines, techniques—because of TV!" The appearance and success of the Food Network is likewise emblematic of a post-scarcity relationship to food and various other signifiers of commercially mediated "lifestyles" preoccupied with (often alternative) pleasures. As Adema states, "Food Network has little to do with food

as nutrition and survival, and everything to do with pleasure" (2000: 114), a position echoed by Cheri Ketchum (2005).

Food television and celebrity chefs have transformed American public culinary culture in the twenty-first century, a phenomenon that raises all kinds of interesting questions about a range of topics long of interest to social scientists and cultural historians. Johnston & Baumann (2010), for example, note the overwhelming whiteness of contemporary food media: "A quick scan of the glossy photos of celebrity chefs on Food Network.com or a perusal through the pages of *Gourmet* magazine is likely to reveal a sea of predominantly white faces along with the occasional person of color" (16), an observation reiterated in Julie Guthman's study of organic food distribution networks (2008). Parkins & Craig (2011), in an article examining the "commodification of sustainable consumption," assert that "green" food and lifestyle programming like Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall's *River Cottage* series, or any of Jamie Oliver's many shows may unwittingly reproduce neoliberal subjectivities and/or underplay the kinds of class-based privilege and cultural capital underpinning that their shows otherwise present as simple matters of agency and choice. In their own words: ". . . the political and cultural effects of such programmes are often premised upon a subject who has the financial means and the time to engage in forms of sustainable consumption" (2011: 199). As Parkins & Craig are also careful to point out, however, the positionality of these celebrity hosts and the earnestness or their pedagogical agendas is hardly so black and white as such critiques might suggest. In any case, the influence of such programming cannot be denied. The

chefs I interviewed for this project routinely express admiration for such celebrity chefs, as providers of both alternative models and for pure inspiration.

With this cursory examination of the evolution of public culinary culture over the last one hundred fifty years, I would like to turn our attention back to chefs and restaurants shaping Knoxville and Tennessee's contemporary food landscapes and discourses. For as early as 1900, as again recounted by Haley (2011), restaurants were recognized as "colleges of living" (15). Indeed, the chefs and restaurants at the center of this chapter occupy a unique and potentially therapeutic position in the expanding webs of local food networks: as people and places that bridge primary producers and consumers, as sensory-educational venues that promise to lay bare the relationship between what we eat and how we act in the world. But first and foremost the chefs and restaurants encountered in the course of this research see themselves as quietly engaging in experiments on the cutting edge of sustainable and relational living. For, if "instead of running after the impossible," as Zizek asserts, "we must learn to consent to our common lot and find pleasure in the trivia of our everyday life" (1991: 8), where better to start than over a meal?

Legacies, Linkages, and Localism(s)

On-The-Job-Training: Blackberry Farm and the Gospel of the Good Life

While the direct-farm sourcing practices and culinary innovations pioneered by Alice Waters and Chez Panisse indexed the standards and provided a training ground for a new generation of chefs responsible for the national diffusion of the ecologically informed and decidedly nouvelle "California Cuisine"

(mesclun anyone?), today's sustainability-inflected, neo-localist public culinary culture has recalibrated this model to reflect ever more particularistic localisms. In the maturing contemporary Tennessee and southern Appalachian culinary cultures that form the ethnographic subject communities of this research project, an analogous pioneering effort (though one with some important differences) is embodied in the example of Blackberry Farm in Walland, Tennessee. As we discover from its immaculately curated website, the Blackberry Farm enterprise of today started as a "six room country inn" after Kreis and Sandy Beall (ironically perhaps, founder of the Ruby Tuesday restaurant chain) purchased the 4200 acre property in 1976. After growing up here as a child and leaving for a time to attend culinary school, second-generation proprietor Sam Beall oversaw the property's development into a "luxury hotel and resort" with an international reputation. (Although, as the author of an October 2012 article in *Town & Country* magazine tells us, "The word luxury rubs Sam Beall the wrong way." The word he prefers is *quality*). In their own recounting of the Blackberry origin story, the website tells us, "More than 30 years ago, Blackberry Farm was founded on the idea of creating a home with good friends, family, and good food. Blackberry continues to share its southern hospitality and true sense of place with all that visit."

The "good food" that has become central to Blackberry's reputation was likewise guided by Beall finally adhering in the appellation "Foothills Cuisine," a localized iteration that combines elements of nouvelle cuisine with more traditional local and regional specialties. In the romantically nostalgic

introductory enticement in Beall's 2012 cookbook *The Foothills Cuisine of Blackberry Farm*, the reader is offered the following characterization:

> Nestled in the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains in East Tennessee, Blackberry Farm and the people who live and work here embody a way of life that has been all but lost. At Blackberry Farm—one of the most celebrated hotel and culinary destinations in America—and on these pages, you'll discover Foothills Cuisine: a term that is derived from our location, where one ridgeline separates the country mountain cooking to our south from the haute cuisine in the city to our north, Knoxville. Our foothills cuisine is a perfect amalgam of these two culinary worlds—a blend of old and new, rural and urban, rustic and refined.

Indeed, while food is central, it is also part of a much larger transformative project understood to be at the core of the Blackberry experience. In the same *Town & Country* article mentioned above, appropriately titled "American Eden," the author states: "Blackberry Farm has come to represent more than a vacation where you can fetch yourself up in a swanky guest suite or cottage or lodge. *It is something like a workshop*—a very comfortable and deluxe one—*in how to live*" (emphasis added). A "college of living" indeed! The author continues, in a passage that captures much of the internal ethos of the eco-culinary avant-garde—"Blackberry Farm, you could say, represents a new frontier in high-end hospitality, one that is as much Wendell Berry and Conrad Hilton, where *sustainable, local, organic*—all buzzwords of the American food scene—are translated into something that transcends plush" (emphasis in original). Here, we are assured, we can engage directly with the critical cutting edge of the eco-culinary frontier, comfortably—very comfortably.

The kinds of transcendent experiences promised by Blackberry Farm are suggestive of a complicated spatio-temporal framing that has become synonymous with all manner of expressions of "slowness"—slow food, slow living, slow money, slow cities, etc. As Parkins and Craig (2011) argue, while the spatial dynamics associated with ethical consumption and practices of sustainable living are readily recognized (i.e., those that would privilege local places), these same activities and subjectivities are equally invested in the valuation of different temporalities. Simply put, "the practice of consuming ethically requires greater time in contrast to the quick and easy convenience of conventional consumption" (192). Such temporal valuations are often magnified, they suggest, via their representations in popular culinary media, such as in sustainable lifestyle television programs like *River Cottage*. In such programs, Parkins and Craig assert, "sustainable consumption is closely tied to temporality: the length of the working day, the passing of the seasons, and the lifecycle of plants and animals determine not only the activities but the duration of labor and the levels of attention or physical vigor required by the tasks at hand" (196). In such formulations, activities like food procurement, through synchronizing a basic daily life activity with the larger bio-physical realities that constrain and shape them, generate an awareness of time-poverty thought to lie at the core of the modern subject's existence. In laying bear the modernist condition of time-poverty, it's liberatory opposite might be inferred—time sovereignty. Adema (2000) similarly attributes the temporal ambiguities of modernity (the time poverty/time sovereignty tension) as central pretexts not only in the therapeutic pretentions of food media and celebrity, but more fundmentally, as instrumental

in the elevation of food (particularly "slow" foods of all kinds) as a powerful symbol of this very tension. As curators of precisely such a symbolic order, one whose axis revolves around the processes and pleasures of food procurement and preparation ("a way of life that has been all but lost"), Blackberry Farm comes to be conceived, not as a destination for a rather elite class of travelers who plan vacations based on the recommendations and ratings of *Zagat Travel Guides*, *Conde Nast Traveler*, or *Travel + Leisure,* but rather, as a "workshop . . . in how to live."

Aside from the discursive constructions that animate Blackberry Farm's public face and reception as an Edenic retreat of transformative possibility, its culinary innovations, like those of Chez Panisse in northern California a decade or so earlier, have pioneered the sustainable-local food culture of the surrounding region. Blackberry was among the first to both cultivate direct relationships with (and as a result, launch the promotion of) local farmers and food producers, while simultaneously increasing their own on-site food production activities. Most notable in the former category, Blackberry's use and (initially indirect) promotion of the cured pork products of nearby Alan Benton and the dairy products of Cruze Farm (their buttermilk in particular), were instrumental in securing the minor celebrity status of both producers. Indeed, documentary filmmaker Joe York's short features on both Alan Benton (*Cured*, 2011) and Earl Cruze (*Buttermilk, It Can Help*, 2008)—produced in collaboration with the Southern Foodways Alliance at the University of Mississippi—have ensured both men's status as icons in the local food pantheon (and indeed in the pantheon of southern food legends more broadly). Cruze Farm has since been featured in

articles in the *New York Times* ("Got Buttermilk?" 2009; "Buttermilk, Often Maligned, Begins to Get its Due," 2012) and garnered mention in several other articles in both regionally and nationally circulated magazines covering the burgeoning food renaissance of the southeast. Similarly, in efforts to expand their on-site production Blackberry Farm enlisted regionally legendary seed saver and southeastern heirloom vegetable aficionado John Coykendall to serve on staff as master gardener. Coykendall, aided by a series of young apprentice garden managers, has continually expanded Blackberry's on-site agricultural efforts, a project that has secured its position as a leader in the revival and promotion of obscure, highly localized, and often humble garden vegetables (Coykendall is particularly passionate about southern legumes) as well as the foraged foods that together constituted the historic "farm and forest" subsistence economy that characterized much of Southern Appalachia well into the twentieth century (Williams 2002).

While the "Foothills Cuisine" descriptor coined by Blackberry Farm was not used by any of the chefs I interviewed (all of whom are busy creating their own distinct brand of cuisine), it is nonetheless a fitting label for the larger culinary community at the center of this project. Indeed, every chef featured in this research, including Nashville-based Jeremy B., whose brief profile opened this chapter, worked at one time or another for Blackberry Farm. As Matt G., chef and owner of a "new southern" restaurant in downtown Knoxville, states regarding Blackberry Farm's influence on his relationship to and conceptualization of local food:

> John Fleer was the chef who hired me and his intention was to use local producers and just really show off—for him it was the ability to just [say], 'lets show you what's great about this little part of the world,' because we're getting guests from all over the world, all over the country. So, you know, we're going to come to Blackberry Farm in Walland, Tennessee and get the best bacon we've ever had in our lives because Allen Benton is just down the road! I think as a chef and as a Tennessean, having that experience where you can taste something like Allen Benton's bacon, or Cruze Farm buttermilk, and you can taste them against other bacons and against other buttermilks, and be so proud and say without prejudice, say, 'This is the best! I'm not just saying this is the best because it's close to me. This is the best!' That really just bolstered my enthusiasm for eating local.

In the course my fieldwork for this project I realized that Blackberry Farm casts a long shadow over the local food community. The current generation of chefs working at the forefront of this community are taking the knowledge and passion that for many was first ignited at Blackberry, and expanding in new directions. Animated by a palpable spirit of cooperation and driven by an enthusiastic belief in transformative possibility, these chefs, like their mentors at Blackberry Farm, hope to leave legacies of their own.

Passing it on: Gustatory Education and Political Economy/Ecology of Thrift

In his erudite introductory survey of American architectural history, Dell Upton (1998) analyses Thomas Jefferson's Monticello as a symbolic lodestone for the tensions inherent in navigating the confluence of aristocratic pretensions and republican philosophy that characterized the third president's public projections

amid the paradoxical identity formations characteristic of the early American republic. At the core of this tension was balancing the needs of the individual with those of the community. Excessive individualism in such a view was moderated by self-governance through the cultivation of virtue—a quality that recognized the individual's responsibility to contribute to the common good. An autodidact and slave owner of considerably wide-ranging knowledge, equally widely traveled, and as a landowner occupying a position of paramount privilege and power in the emergent oligarchy of American public life, Jefferson was quite condescending when it came to the assessment of the moral and material lives (the two being closely linked in his estimation) of most of his less well-heeled neighbors in the Virginia piedmont and highlands. He referred to the dwellings of his common neighbors as "ugly, uncomfortable, and happily . . . perishable" (in Upton 1998: 23). In such a context, Monticello, as a repository and projection of both the private and public selves of Jefferson, served not only as an expression of idiosyncratic architectural preferences or a marker of status, but also as an extension of virtue. As Upton notes: "In a republic, public education was indispensable in shaping political virtue. Elite citizens, particularly artists with expressive powers, were duty-bound to instruct their fellow citizens. Jefferson took these duties seriously. The public portions of Monticello were devoted to edifying his neighbors" (1998: 38).

Though the political power of contemporary culinary personalities is perhaps feeble in comparison to that of the United States' third president, the greater sentiment nonetheless persists via the axiom that with great power comes great responsibility. However, public notoriety today is so bound up with

commerce and the cult of celebrity (from whence comes such jarring amalgams as "brand Obama") that "the reach of a chef" can indeed be quite considerable. Furthermore, within this cult of celebrity, chefs have become likened to the "artists with expressive powers" for whom the display of virtue is similarly deemed essential. Indeed, in today's popular culinary culture, the complementary project of public education has become a central component linking public personalities and gastronomic institutions to larger goals of the alternative food movement, whether these be related to individual and public health, or the health of the planet (and often both). The Monticello comparison is useful too for the parallels that can be drawn concerning the Othering-contempt that lies at the core of the virtues extolled through public culinary education efforts. While for Jefferson and Monticello the abject other in need of enlightenment manifested in the common (inferior) vernacular dwellings of the majority of his neighbors, for those in the contemporary public culinary culture, the abject other is fast food (which has become something like a metonym standing for all that is wrong with the modern industrial food system). While internationally prominent examples of such efforts are highly visible, like Alice Waters' Edible Schoolyard (ESY) Project and Jamie Oliver's Ministry of Food, the spirit and intent of such endeavors inform and drive the common educational aspirations of many of the chefs interviewed for this project.

Dustin B., a chef who trained formally at the Le Cordon Bleu in Orlando, Florida before working as a chef in restaurants in England, California, Charleston, South Carolina, and Blackberry Farm, recently launched his own catering business (and an associated food truck offshoot that will be discussed in

more detail in Chapter 4) in Knoxville. While deeply invested in his career as a chef, he sees his position within the public culinary arena as opportunity to serve as an educator as well. Commensurate with the model of Alice Waters' ESY project, this includes engaging with children and spearheading larger efforts to integrate "edible education" into school curricula. As he states, "Basic cooking, for our kids and the generations after us . . . should be something that is in the standard curriculum of schools: to know how to make five basic things." This basic strategy of teaching cooking techniques is, for Dustin, part a of a much larger educational effort—part cultural, part environmental—centered on recovering the once common practice of eating in season. As he puts it:

> Fossil Fuels are constantly rising [in cost] and so tomatoes, and all the things people have taken for granted of having on the shelf every single day—their cost is going to continue to go up because we're going to be paying to ship them from Mexico or Peru in the winter time, or wherever it may be. Not to mention the quality of the product at that time . . . I think it's a matter of educating the public, and ourselves even, and passing that knowledge along.

While such campaigns in public education might begin with the efforts of chefs and other culinary professionals, the ultimate hope is that this knowledge becomes common to the public at large. In realizing this goal, according to the internal logic that drives such efforts, the producer/ consumer divide is bridged. So while chefs may occupy a privileged position in the public culinary culture of the moment, many express a desire to demystify their specialized knowledge toward the end of transforming the greater food system.

Dustin's ultimate dream is to one day own and operate a working farm and popular culinary institute modeled on British celebrity chef Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall's original River Cottage concept, which in many ways might be likened to a more populist version of Blackberry Farm (which, having cultivated a kind of singular culinary cultural authority, places it in a position similar to that of Monticello in terms of its self-perceived edifying role). In discussing his vision for such an undertaking, Dustin muses:

> I really want step away a little bit [from the workaday world of cooking] and help educate and be able to bring people to the farm, or bring people out to do cooking demonstrations . . . It's my dream to be able to have something like that [River Cottage] in the United States. To have people come to the farm and learn to cook, learn to farm—whatever they want to learn. To teach and take the mystery away from cooking and farming.

Speaking from a humble yet confident subject-position, Dustin continues, "I really hope to teach and to be able to pass on these great things . . . Hopefully have a model, and pass it on to other places and other small farmers."

Drew M. expressed many similar educational aspirations. Abandoning a career trajectory in the music recording industry to follow his passion for food and cooking, Drew attended culinary school in Louisville, Kentucky. After working for a time at Blackberry Farm, Drew traveled and worked for a short time as a chef in New Zealand, which he cites as a formative experience in his career, particularly in his conceptualization of localism and sustainability. Returning to Tennessee, Drew worked as a chef at Nashville's Hermitage Hotel before opening his first restaurant in a small commercial district within one of

Knoxville's most affluent historic suburbs. Like his friend and former co-chef, Dustin B., Drew feels inspired to share his knowledge and give back to his community. In articulating his own dream, once again aligned with the model of Waters' ESY project, Drew states:

> My dream is to one day be a part of a Knox County school system that gets out of pulling bags and pulling pans, and actually cooking for our kids. Most every school has a little bit of vacant space they could do something with. I don't care if it's only a ten by twenty foot space, but if you can . . . I mean statistics show how our health is declining as a country, as a nation, from diabetes to heart attacks/heart disease, you name it. My grandparents are in their late 80s, my great aunt and uncle are pushing 90 now, and strong as an ox! . . . They probably couldn't tell me, on a certain occasion or on a regular basis, what they ate that came out of a bag, that was processed, that they pulled out of the freezer section. So seeing that, and understanding that, and trying to bring that back into the school system and teaching these kindergarteners, first and second graders, the process of putting a seed in the ground and what reaps from that seed . . . And then not only go from that seed to the fruit, to the vegetable, and then take that into the kitchen, and then eat it! I think showing kids at that age that its really not that difficult of a process—it does take a little bit of sweat—but the benefits on the other end are just so wide open.

Matt G. offered a more concise statement on the educational responsibilities of chefs: "I feel obliged as a chef to be a resource." In this proclamation Matt was speaking not so much about responsibilities to consumers-at-large as about his responsibility to his customers, and especially inasmuch as this means linking customers to the primary producers who supply his ingredients (a point that will be discussed in more detail below). Second-

generation farmers and food truck proprietors, sisters Jennifer N. and Anna B, expressed a similar sentiment. Jennifer stated of their food truck operation: "I think there's an educational aspect, even though it's kind of subtle. We do try to make a pretty big deal out of the fact that we use absolutely no GMO ingredients, even though a lot of people don't even really know what that means." To this, Anna adds,

> There are people who come up to the window and say, "what does GMO mean?" because they see it painted right under the window—"Non-GMO Food." So we get to tell people sometimes: "Well, go home and look this up and read all about it and you're gonna really wish you'd known before now what that is, and maybe a little angry that it has been kept so quiet in this country!"

Yet another perspective is that offered by Dale M., proprietor of a specialty food truck who hopes that her successes in that realm will lead to a more traditional stationary storefront business. Besides serving as an outlet for her wares (fried pies), Dale envisions her kitchen as a shared space for purposes of educating not the public at large, but her would-be peers, especially culinary start-ups who need access to a commercial kitchen in order to launch their businesses. As she states, "I do envision the kitchen with one or two or three other small business at a time that are trying to get a start. And eventually as things move forward I would love to be able to incorporate some kind of mentoring and workshops and stuff, for people who are starting a business."

Another dimension of contemporary public culinary education finds a purchase at the intersection of pleasure and thrift, lodged in the imaginary of Kate Soper's alternative hedonism. Countering claims of elitism and snobbery,

many chefs feel obligated to share their knowledge of cookery toward the end of expanding the "democratic vistas" of otherwise rather opaque alternative foodscapes. This is reminiscent of the "reflexive consumerism" that Julie Guthman (2003) critiques as a reinforcement of regimes of distinction via certain categories of "taste" available only to those with the cultural capital necessary to recognize the status encoded in such haute cuisine staples as mesclun salad mix. Such practices of discernment function on the basis of oppositional binaries, she argues, represented most saliently by the slow food/fast food binary frame. The former becomes the quintessential "Yuppie Chow" for those in the know, while the latter becomes the marker of the feckless consumer of fast food. Perhaps. But as Soper argues, alternatives must be developed and brought into being as counter-possibilities, as new ways of assessing and embodying what it means to live "the good life." Such counter-measures include the elevation of relationships and a discerning sensuality above the self-maximizing interests of the rational actor. Among those interviewed for this project, Guthman's principle analytic of taste is hardly discernable (though certainly the analytic of distinction is quite evident in the example of Blackberry Farm). Rather than taste, it was *skill* (and the recovery of skill) that was most often invoked as the hinge of competency that might lead us *back* to the *pleasure of living within limits*—the essence of alternative hedonism. It is within the formulation of skill that a political economy/ecology of thrift becomes a central pedagogical object. Among those in my study population, this can be linked back to the profile of Jeremy B. that opened this chapter, particularly his use of "nose-to-tail cookery" as a defining hermeneutic in the recovery of a sustainable food system.

The practicality of the political economy of thrift as a popular pedagogical framework is expounded upon by Dustin, who asserts:

> You can buy a whole chicken for $15, which sounds outrageous—but that can feed you for three days! You think about it, then that [$15] is not that much at all. It's just learning a few basic techniques and how to make sure you're not just taking the breast of the chicken and throwing the rest in the trash . . . But if you use the breast one day, you braise the legs the next, and then make stock for the third. I mean $15 for three meals is not that bad!

Drew likewise spoke at length in our interview about the economy of whole-animal utilization and charcuterie. As a chef in a small restaurant, he asserted, it is simply far more cost-effective to buy a whole animal and do the processing in-house, than it is to buy individual cuts. He then goes into a litany of processing terms and processes, from curing to cut-by-cut preparations. This discussion illustrates a certain mastery of knowledge and skill, which when properly applied (and as echoed in Dustin's statement above) translates into both thrift and gustatory excellence (discerning taste after all, perhaps). This is the crux of the affordability issue, not only in small businesses, but at home, according to most of my participants—it is not a matter of pricing so much as it is a matter of knowledge and technique, or rather, recovering that lost knowledge and technique. This, again, is the principal focus of educational aspirations—to teach these skills anew. They are saying unequivocally that it becomes affordable to buy a whole organic, free-range chicken (or whatever else) only when acquire the know-how to stretch the culinary possibilities of that chicken to its fullest extent. This is a corpus of knowledge, my interviewees furthermore suggest, that has

been systematically expunged from most domestic kitchen contexts, indeed, from the totality of popular imagination. This is the result of both the ubiquitous supermarket strategy of fragmented foods (especially meats) and popular dietary and/or aesthetic proclivities—i.e., the ascendency of the chicken breast to the exclusion of the whole animal. As many participants in the localist movement argue, this has led not to dietary improvements, but rather to a kind of dietary illiteracy.

An extended statement by Anna B. offers the best overarching articulation of this concept of thrift, its demise, and the necessity of its recovery:

> Of course a lot of people say, "I can't afford to buy from local farmers," or "I can't afford to buy organic, locally grown food—it's too expensive!" I think if you're taking something—like half of a cow—are you're using every single part of it, you don't waste any of it. You can afford it! Because you can produce so much! Just the bones produce gallons and gallons of really nutrient dense broth. You can take the fat and render down tallow, which people used to use for things like dry skin and making soap! *Not that everybody is going to get into that, this day and age—or even want to—but there are things you can do.* If you buy beets with the greens on them, don't throw the greens out! Eat the greens! There is just a lot that can be done to make your dollar go farther. When you're buying a whole product from a local person, if you look at it in that sense—and stop being so wasteful . . . People take for granted that a chicken breast came from an entire chicken that had skin and legs and a head and everything! It's so weird just to see these rows and rows of a single animal part! You're like, "where did the rest of that animal go?" People don't think about that anymore.

Acknowledging that such practices may not be desirable for everyone is a step toward reconciling Guthman's intractable slow/fast binary. While the framework of the political economy/ecology of thrift constitutes the final dimension of gustatory education analyzed here, the sentiments generative of such sensibilities extend into other arenas as well. If concern—of whatever kind—drives a sense of mission that underwrites the pedagogical efforts of those at the forefront of public culinary culture, it likewise inspires the relationality that is centrally motivating to most of the participants in this research. It is to this topic we now turn.

Dixie Biscuits and Buttermilk Lassis: Local Menus, Global Appetites, & the Inter-Relationalities of Localism

For my interview with long-time Knoxville journalist and cultural historian Jack Neely we met in one of Knoxville's relatively new and stylish small downtown groceries. Besides shelves stocked with products from local and regional growers and producers, the self-styled "Little food shop in downtown Knoxville" boasts a small café and grab-and-go cooler featuring "southern specialties, quality snacks, fresh juices and smoothies, and hand-made baked goods," all of which are produced either in-house and by other local and regional prepared food producers. As the establishment's website describes their kitchen offerings, "We use basic ingredients to make simple, delicious, seasonal food. We often work directly with producers which allows us to know and appreciate where our food comes from." On the particular day of my interview a blackboard menu featuring the day's selections was displayed on the sidewalk in the front the store.

Having met Jack previously, I knew what he looked like and saw him approaching as I stood just inside the store awaiting his arrival. I noticed he stopped to peruse the menu on his way in. After a brief greeting and settling down at a table, Jack excused himself to place an order at the café counter. A little way into our interview a server brought out his food—a seemingly simple and ubiquitous ham biscuit. Becoming an object of interest and relevance to our conversation, Jack pondered its significance as an expression of a new localist public culinary culture: "The biscuit—there's nothing older than that around here—but the biscuit I just ate is unlike anything I ever had as a kid. I guess they like to make it more diverse, or whatever, and add some layers of complexity to it." Taking a closer look at the blackboard menu just beyond our window table, we read the description: "Dixie Biscuit—house-made biscuit with Benton's bacon, house-made pimiento cheese, and house-made pepper jelly."

In its referential evocation of several salient keywords and practices, and its collapsing of these into a single comestible, the Dixie Biscuit serves as a suitable entry point for a discussion of the interactivity between emplacement via food production/cooking/prepared food purveyance and the kind of counter-culinary materiality and subjectivity embodied in such items and their producers. Such culinary creativity is active in (re)defining the places in which it is performed. These productions index the emergent qualities of relationality and performativity (or practice), linking these with a spatio-temporal specificity that, reconfigured as a totality, yields a kind of *terroir* (the taste of place) that is central to processes of emplacement. In a region such as that in which Knoxville is located (the South, the Appalachian south more specifically), there already

exists a deeply embedded historical food culture (although one that has changed considerably recently) that is often nodded to by these producers. How does this new cuisine then integrate the historically local with newer definitions of the local? By this I mean to suggest that the local in this particular context is not strictly "southern" or "Appalachian" in a cultural sense (though it may be), but defined also by more universal determinants such as climate, soil type, land use suitability and so on, but as these occur in particular localities—generating a kind of universal-particularism. It is also and equally, however, defined by the degree to which relationality and practice are made transparent through the disclosure of ingredient sourcing and/or methods of preparation, most often through attribution to particular producers (i.e., the Dixie Biscuit's disclosure of both the source of its ham—Bentons—and its other house-made attributes). The current public culinary culture of the region—while paying homage both to the rich historic food traditions of the past and looking toward a future in which a truly cosmopolitan local food culture may finally emerge triumphant—is firmly rooted in the present. The result might be something like a non-essentialist local cuisine, or as the "little food shop in downtown Knoxville" puts it—"Real Food, Locally Rooted."

Such a strategy is essential to the missionary ambitions of a localist food movement situated in a region that still harbors a strong culinary culture and an affinity for traditional foodways. As Jack put it:

> It's . . . useful to use old-fashioned foods to disarm people's suspicions about something that's really kind of new and maybe even sort of radical. There's nothing like biscuits to do that, because any old Republican granny from

> Campbell County will appreciate a well-made biscuit even if she's suspicious of "vegan" or wouldn't recognize the word "locavore."

This sentiment was common among many of my interviewees, who readily recognize the embeddedness of regional foodways, but see these not as static artifacts but rather as platform from which to create what many understand to be a more daring, contemporary, and hybrid localist cuisine. Dale M. states of her chosen specialty as a food truck/stand proprietor:

> Fried pies—most people in the south grew up eating them, they feel very nostalgic about them. A lot of my pies are really basic and have four ingredients in them and just exactly how people have been making them for a really long time. So I'm not doing anything particularly inventive with a lot of the pies, I'm just using good ingredients and making them all by hand so they taste good. Some of the pies I do do very funky, outside of the box kinds of flavors and some people love that and some people have no interest in that—they just want their apple and cherry and peach pie . . . I would say probably about half of my customers are older people who grew up eating fried pies and have just found that these pies just taste like the ones that they're used to. And then young people who love trying all the different, crazier flavors.

The approval of elders—those who are presumed to possess acute embodied and sensory memories of what locally procured and handmade foods *once* tasted like—registers a sense of nostalgia that serves to validate and legitimate. Inverting the melancholic discourse of loss typically associated with nostalgia, however, such validation is an important catalyst in moving forward, rather than looking backward. In a parallel statement issued by Jennifer N. in discussing the use of chicken she raised and slaughtered herself in dishes served in her food

truck, she exclaims: "I feel so confident because . . . really it's the most delicious chicken. Our grandmother, who grew up in the 30s in Texas, she just goes on and on and on and says she hasn't had chicken like this since she was a young person. Some other old-timers have said the same, and that's just been the ultimate praise!"

But remembrance of culinary heritage is not always in such an unequivocally positive register, however, as the perspectives of Drew M. attest. While grounded in a more modernist food idiom and somewhat contemptuous of the penchant for deep-frying that has become commonly associated with contemporary southern cooking, Drew nonetheless acknowledges a debt to the regional food tradition in which he grew up:

> I was raised on lard biscuits! My grandmother kept bacon fat in a mug on top of her stove . . . but I don't like eating heavy food. It's kind of weird how I see things. I would be much happier cooking on the west coast—in Seattle, or somewhere—just from food philosophy: very clean; I don't like a lot of oil on the plate, I don't use a lot of heavy sauces, I use more vinaigrettes . . . [but] I try to hold respect to where I come from and intertwine the foundations [of southern cooking] that have been duly noted over the last 150 years . . . It's understanding and paying homage to where you came from, cause I am south[ern]. But I think if you want to go back a century ago, I feel like I'm doing the exact same thing that they were doing."

While paying homage to venerable traditions and utilizing familiar southern and Appalachian staples as vehicles for experimentation is one aspect in the contemporary evolution of Knoxville's localist cuisine, another is expressed in the fusion of southern and global foods. While much scholarly attention has been

focused on the potential for localisms of all kinds to morph into exclusionary and reactionary politic projects—"defensive localisms"—the interpenetrating processes of hybridization resulting in what can variously be called "glocalization" or "cosmopolitan localism," provide a more accurate lens from which to interpret what is happening in Knoxville's localist food movements. As Clare Hinrichs (2003) notes of similar processes at work in determinations of what counts as local food in Iowa, redefinitions informed by cosmopolitan localisms like those discussed here may ". . . [signify] a promising opening, where 'local' foodstuffs are combined in new ways reflecting the changing diversity of producers and consumers now living in the region. Indeed, these very cross-fertilizations and culinary hybridities would seem to support a more forward-looking localization politics that makes history the springboard to a more diverse future" (42). To illustrate this point it is worth quoting the insights of Matt G. at some length:

> I guess I'm coming from what I consider a more Appalachian perspective [as a chef]. [On] our menu, we wanted to incorporate dishes that were familiar and accessible, but also, if we decided to stray a little bit and flex our creativity, we're going to do that. But we're going to go in a direction that we're grounded with southern ingredients . . . We'll start with what's available in the market or what's available seasonally and work from there.

Continuing, he adds:

> You know we've had dishes with some Asian flavors in them, only a couple since we've opened, but we can get soy sauce from Kentucky and rice from South Carolina, and broccoli locally, and chicken from Georgia or South Carolina. So we can take all of these things—sesame seeds, benne seeds, from Anson Mills—all

> these things that on paper are very Asian, on your palette very Asian—throw some peanuts in with it—and it turns out this is a locally/regionally sourced dish, it just happens to have Asian flavors.

And in a final example of global/local hybridity:

> At the end of the day we are a southern restaurant, southern Appalachian, but we're able to play a little bit because we can get things like ferro, and ferro verde, from South Carolina, which are artisanal, Italian ingredients, but they're grown regionally . . . These are still southern ingredients [though] it might not be a traditional southern dish.
>
> One of the favorite dishes we've put on the menu: farro from Anson Mills, in South Carolina, we cook it risotto style; we take sunburst trout from Canton, North Carolina and sear that really simply (we throw a little pecans in with the farro); make a squash puree from squash we get here at the farmer's market; then take cultured Cruze Farm buttermilk, till it's thick crème freshe, and then we smoke that . . . We're taking some elements from different regional farms and producers and making a dish that is pretty accessible, pretty recognizable. . . but it's not a traditional dish.

In a recent study, *Grounded Globalism: How the U.S. South Embraces the World* (2007), James Peacock develops a useful framework for understanding the implications of such formations in the emergence of hybrid identities and cultural phenomena that embrace both the local and global, particularly in the historically beleaguered, often maligned, and image-conscious South. He summarizes his thesis thusly: "Globalization has the capacity to fundamentally transform the South—not only economically, demographically, and, perhaps, politically, but also culturally and psychologically—to create an

identity at once global and regional" (x). More broadly, as note by Clare Hinrichs and as is evident in the backgrounds and influences cited by my interviewees, "Foreign travel and exposure to food writers have brought the products and performance of other 'good food' networks into view" (2003: 42). Two final examples from this study exemplify such possibilities. First, Charlotte T. (farmer's market coordinator and co-owner of the "little food shop in downtown Knoxville" mentioned at the opening of this section) offered the following assessment of just these kinds of hybridities:

> When Cruze Farm was doing Indian food, it was the most magical thing! You literally have a southern dairy farmer and an Indian person who have come together to use their dairy to make things like buttermilk lassis [a popular Indian beverage], instead of yogurt [lassis]. Making paneer [a south Asian cheese] out of their dairy, and using collards instead of spinach. Then, serving it with a biscuit! THAT! It's like the total authentic merging of cultures and food . . . That's one of the most exciting things that has happened in our region.

Dustin B., in commenting on the universal particularism of the symbioses of techne and terra firma, or situated traditional knowledge, stated:

> In the Old World countries—cheese is the first thing that comes to mind—sheep were in Italy and Spain, it's what they could grow, it's what survived well there and did well there. So most of the chesses there are made from sheep's milk and depending on what was available in their region—like *formele de noche*: its just a pecorino cheese—they had these beautiful black walnut trees, not unlike what we have here. They would just age the cheese in barrels layered with walnut leaves and it imparted this flavor, through this technique, and so it became its own thing. This community, in kind of looking around and seeing what's available—

> like wild sumac grows everywhere around here and its really fun to play around with. The Indians used to use it as a way to purify their water; so it's fun to go back and build off those traditions and use something that is just completely passed by on the interstate.

Besides these more spatio-temporal (geo-physical/biotic/cultural) references that have expanded the meaning and expression of what constitutes local food, a second axis establishes the quality of relationality as an equally important component. Returning to Clare Hinrichs' examination of similar processes in Iowa, she states that while "Atomized market relations are seen as a defining, but negative feature of 'global' . . . the 'local' will manifest high levels of social capital and relations of care—in short, a more moral or associative economy." Continuing, she adds: "The social embeddedness of 'local' ensues from the possibility of face-to-face interactions and mutual knowledge, creating a 'geography of regard'" (2003: 36). I wish to illustrate this point using two sources. The first will be drawn from a series of statements issued by my interviewees. As this is one of the more recurrent threads in my interview data, these will be presented simply in block format. The second approach will feature the menu of Matt G.'s downtown Knoxville restaurant to demonstrate the associative dimensions of relationality and how they manifest in a public culinary context. First, the quotes:

Dale M.:

> For me, to be honest, the primary motivating factor [for buying local ingredients] is emotional. It emotionally feels good for me to walk around, buy my peaches and my strawberries from local people, go home and make those into pies and

then come back to market and sell them. It just makes intuitive sense. The bottom line is—most people agree—that local food tastes great, it's very fresh; we like having local agricultural economies, and so the simplest thing to do is to buy from those people to support them. And then other people who make other products—I use three bears coffee in a mocha pie; I use Sherry's Garden Salsa in some of my savory pies—you know, *I like supporting my peers, [that] is really the basic reason that I do it*. Surprisingly, I get very few people asking me if stuff is local—some people do—but it's not customer motivated primarily, really.

Jennifer N.:

That's been really wonderful for me . . . I've really gotten to know quite a few—a pretty diverse group of local farmers, a lot of them in this community, this county. I've met a lot of people from the Knoxville area, in the farmer's market group. It's been nice, because they're all ages, and they're all a lot different. I know who to call now, pretty much for anything! . . . Another cool thing is our alliance with our miller, which used to be ubiquitous—everyone had their local miller relationship. That's really just a thing of the past, completely. But we have a good friend . . . who has a family-owned mill . . . We take him our corn and then we pick it up. Its stone ground; its all old equipment. He has figured out how to work with our spelt, which is really tricky. I think it's really a beautiful thing to have that relationship in this time, in this day and age

Drew M.:

We've developed our own little community circle. I know all my farmer's names, talk to them on a weekly, sometimes biweekly basis; know what's going on, generally speaking; check in on their families. I want to know! I want a relationship with you! I don't want you to be a purveyor, just to bring me stuff. I want to invest in your emotions, invest in your time and let you know that I . . . 1).

thoroughly care about your product, but 2). we thoroughly care for you as a person. Human nature is that when you receive that love, that passion for . . . not only a product or a business that you're portraying and selling, but . . . as an individual, it just comes full circle. . . It's paid for itself over and over again! . . . [Like] one of my farmers I use all the time is . . . out in Hines Valley . . . He's thirty minutes to here and occasionally he'll go out of his way to bring me something. And you know, it's little bitty things like that.

Continuing:

My job is fairly easy, to an extent, when you work with farmers like I do, because they write my menu! . . . And once that relationship is fed, it comes back to my clients. I have people—they'll eat here three, four, five times a week; sometimes twice [a day], sometimes breakfast and lunch. I sit with them, I chat with them, I talk with them. We run a market-veg plate—it can be anywhere from six vegetables to, I think I had fifteen on it at one time—and when people ask, 'Well, where did this come from? Can I get this at Kroger?,' I'm like, 'No! You can't get this at Kroger! His name is so and so and he's roughly about here at Market Square . . .'

Matt G.:

I think the relationship—there's a relational aspect when you're buying locally—and that relational aspect is important to me, just on a personal level. I really enjoy interacting with farmers and farms. I've made some great friends through farmer's markets. It's a way for me, as a chef, to get great ingredients, but also to showcase. Like on our menu we always try to showcase which farms . . . like our sweet potatoes today I got Saturday from Mountain Meadows, but my sweet potatoes tomorrow I'm getting from Red Truck Farm . . . The idea is to make sure that as we succeed and as the restaurant is doing well—we're doing well because

> we're getting great ingredients and treating them respectfully and appropriately—but we want them [the farmers] to be represented too, because if we have a guest who loves our sweet potatoes and they know exactly where we got them and they know they can go and get that exact same sweet potato on Wednesday at the Farmer's Market, that's a win for both of us. That's what I want, because we have to grow together, in a lot of ways—small farms and small restaurants have to lean on each other.

To further demonstrate the practical dimensions of this relationality, we will now turn our attention to food items featured on a typical menu (but always shifting, depending on what's available) from Matt G.'s restaurant. From the "Snacks" category (all emphases in original):

--"Skillet of **Fried *Hudson Farm* Kennebec Potatoes** with Housemade *Red Truck Farm* Cherry Pepper Aioli"
--Country **Ham Croquettes**, *Muddy Pond* Sorghum Mustard
--*Sweetwater* **Pimento Cheese**, *Saw Works Beer* Bread, Homemade 'Wicked Pickles'

From the "Plate + Bowl" category:
--Caramelized **Pear Salad**, *Benton's* Country Ham, Marcona Almonds, *Asher Blue Cheese*, Tender Greens, Creamy Rosemary Dressing
--Killed Greens Salad, *Flour Head* Toast, *Riverplains Farm* Egg, Warm *Benton's* Bacon Vinaigrette

From the "Mains" category:

--Seared **Sunburst Trout**, *Anson Mills* Farro Risotto, Local Butternut Squash and Smoked *Cruze Farm* Crème Fraiche

--Roasted *Ashley Farms* **Chicken Breast** with *Allan Benton's* Sausage, *Red Truck Farm* Broccoli, *Carolina Gold Rice* and Peanut Sauce

The italicized text on each menu item indicates the farm, artisan, and/or manufacturer from which the associated ingredient was sourced. Every item listed above features at least one locally sourced ingredient, while many feature one or more regionally sourced ingredients as well (it should be noted that all but one item on the menu features local and/or regional ingredients in various combinations). Matt's menu thus "showcases" numerous local food producers and farms, even as he pays a premium price for their products. Another element that comes to the fore in the philosophy and practices of the two brick-and-mortar restaurateurs interviewed for this project is the centrality of integrity. As Matt puts it, "People care about where their food comes from, and if I say it's a Riverplains Farm egg on my menu, I can guarantee you it's a Riverplains Farm egg. It wouldn't be fair to anybody—especially Riverplains Farm—to misrepresent their product." Drew M. echoes this sentiment, stating, "I will tell anybody anything they want to know about where my product comes from."

Through cultivating partnerships and friendships with local producers, many of the more publicly positioned participants in the local food economy are creating and promoting their own notions of the local. Such a status is determined to a large degree by the relational potential it embodies. Other

components that define the localist paradigm include a contingent sense of *terroir*. In Heather Paxson's documentation of comparable subjectivities among U.S. artisanal cheese makers (and including a partial quote from Arturo Escobar in the process), she writes, "In their [cheese makers'] view, *terroir* encompasses a grass-roots political ecology 'concerned with finding new ways of weaving together the biophysical, the cultural, and the technoeconomic for the production of other types of social nature'" (2010: 451). The same may be said to apply in our case, but with the caveat, of which Escobar (1999) would approve in his calls for an "antiessentialist political ecology," that the nature of the *terroir* as it manifests among Knoxville's localist food community is decidedly non or anti-essentialist, moving rather in the direction of a more cosmopolitan localism. Despite claims of accessibility, however, the localist food movement here, as elsewhere, must be understood as part of a larger aesthetic economy operative only within the context of the postscarcity present of the global industrial north. It is to this concern that we will now turn.

Omnivore Ontologies: Aesthetic Economies and Sensuous Sustainability

A key site for the articulation of the political-aesthetic-moral values lying at the intersection of pleasure and sustainability in the development of national and international contemporary alternative food movements is to be found in the emergence and maturation of the Slow Food Movement (SF). In an origin narrative that itself encapsulates many of the central tenants that have come to define localist food movements everywhere, SF coalesced in Italy in 1987 as an

effort to bring organizational unity to protests against the opening of the first McDonald's in Rome, and was officially launched in 1989 by the signatories of the *Slow Food Manifesto* in Paris. Originally concerned with protecting and promoting small, independent, traditional Italian eateries over and against the vicissitudes of the global-corporate industrial food system, it quickly expanded its goals toward the end of preserving and promoting "Good, Clean, Fair Food" in much more broadly defined terms. Organized around local chapters known as *Convivia* (now in over 150 countries), international members are composed of individuals and communities "who are linking the pleasure of good food with a commitment to their community and the environment" (www.slowfood.org). Slow Food, the website continues, "stands at the crossroads of ecology and gastronomy, ethics and pleasure. It opposes the standardization of taste and culture, and the unrestrained power of the food industry multinationals and industrial agriculture." The subsequent diversification of activities led to a branching-out into several projects and initiatives, including the Ark of Taste (a kind of all-taxa inventory of endangered foods), Slow Food Presidia (a parallel effort to protect the producers' knowledge and resources), and the first Terra Madre meeting, bringing together traditional and artisanal food communities from around the world.

In its attempts to straddle and neutralize the tensions between elitism and equality, between democracy and distinction that are immediately apparent in SF's pronouncements concerning a universal "right to pleasure," SF is perhaps best understood as a quintessential expression of the "omnivorous era" of contemporary cultural consumption. In an exegesis offered by Johnston and

Baumann, we are amid a phase in which highbrow/ lowbrow distinctions are collapsed, and indeed in which "high status is signaled by selectively drawing on multiple cultural forms from across the cultural hierarchy" (2010: 35). The result, in their analysis, is a contemporary gourmet foodscape in which vernacular and elitist food traditions are symbolically and aesthetically equalized, thus yielding an interest among "foodies" (including SF members) in rustic, peasant, and street foods, for example. (Indeed, the 2001 volume *Slow Food: Collected Thoughts on Taste, Tradition, and the Honest Pleasures of Food*, edited by SF founder Carlo Petrini, includes a chapter devoted to "Street Food.") Such an analytic provides a useful framework to explain a post-ironic sensibility that allows for house-made pork rinds and duck confit to appear on the same menu. Thus SF's focus on conviviality and pleasure—interesting here in its collapsing of Bourdieu's "ethic of convivial indulgence," (1984: 179) associated with peasant and industrial workers' manner of eating and drinking, and its antinomy, the bourgeois "habitus of order, restraint, and propriety" (196)—are conceived as bridges to a more universal and authentic eco-gastro-sociality, one that seeks the "enhancement of an 'aesthetic disposition' (see Bourdieu, 1984)—both cognitive knowledge and incarnate taste—that enables consumers to distinguish what 'good food' is and what conditions its production and servicing require" (Sassatelli & Davolio 2010: 219).

In examining the biographies of production and associated "discourses of distinction" that adhere in the global circulation and marketing of extra-virgin olive oil from the Mediterranean, Anne Meneley (2007) identifies a overriding process of aestheticization. In a more instrumental technoscientific discourse,

extra-virgin olive oil is the keystone to the much-touted superior healthfulness of the more natural "Mediterranean Diet." Meneley identifies a parallel mytho-poetic-gustatory discourse, one characterized by the musings of Paula Wolfert in her influential 1977 *Mediterranean Cookbook,* in which she writes: "My approach to the Mediterranean is based on a myth—an ideal, shared by many of us, of a robust, simple, and sensual lifestyle far from the madding crowds of our competitive North Atlantic culture" (680). Both discourses, argues Meneley, even when destabilized by the highly mechanized processes by which extra-virgin olive oil is produced and circulated in global commodity chains, nonetheless maintain both olive oil and the region with which it is associated as emblems of a highly desirable and pleasing geographical-culinary aesthetic. Such discourses are subsequently projected into narratives centered on the wholesome naturalness and the artisanal qualities of olive oil, a "techno-asethetic superiority" that stands in contradistinction to the artificial and industrial proclivities of a monolithic "North Atlantic culture." The larger implication, in Meneley's words, is that "It is [only] when industrial food became readily available and cheap—and viewed with some derision and suspicion— that 'the Mediterranean' became the positive Other for the North Atlantic, largely defined in terms of food that was imagined to be artisanally, instead of industrially, produced: food that was healthful, aesthetically pleasing, and requiring of a discerning palate . . ." (684).

In expanding the traditional Marxist binary of value—that of use value and exchange value—some theorists suggest a third value category is necessary to reflect economic developments since the 1950s in advanced capitalist societies,

particularly the ascendency of the aesthetic economy. In a theoretical consideration of the developments, Gernot Bohme identifies this third value category as that of *staging value*—a category based on the valuation of aesthetic qualities. As explained by Bohme, such values "are certainly not classical use values, for they have nothing to do with utility and purposiveness, but they form, as it were, a new type of use value, which derives from their exchange value in so far as use is made of their attractiveness, their aura, their atmosphere. They serve to stage, costume and intensify life" (2003: 72). Such values emerge, Bohme argues, in a manner consistent with Meneley's assertions, only when the basic material needs of a society have been met, at which point new needs arise in their place, a process that has been largely (though certainly not completely) achieved in advanced capitalist countries of the global north. As this relates to food, Meneley argues, it is precisely at such a point when "questions begin to be raised about what might have been lost in the transition to industrial food in terms of artisanal technes and tastes and the confidence that comes from knowing the origin of one's food" (2007: 684). But do such inquiries necessarily obviate the transformative potential at the root of such questioning? For as Bohme states:

> So far, an obdurate avant-garde has always been able to assert itself, while the quality standards of aesthetic production, far from entering a terminal decline, have proved capable of developing in mass culture as well. And out of that culture, subversive movements have been able to emerge, movements which stand at cross-purposes to dominant social and work practice (80).

Instead of dismissing the finery of the aesthetic economy as always already a symptom of capitalist recuperation, perhaps there are possibilities for the

production of "different meanings . . . within the conditions of capitalism and modernity that surround it" (Escobar 2001: 164). Returning back to the Slow Food movement, one final example will close out this chapter.

Like Meneley and Bohm (and countless others), Miele & Murdoch (2002) likewise recognize the omnipresence of aesthetic economies operative in the global north. They also recognize this is far from a monolithic and even formation. In examining traditional cuisines and slow food in Tuscany, they identity two forms of aestheticization working simultaneously and at cross purposes in the context of contemporary popular culture and food movement activity. The first of these is what they call the "aesthetic of entertainment." The second they label "the gastronomic aesthetic of food." The former, they argue, has generated the secondary phenomenon of "eatertainment" which has precipitated an explosion of standardized theme restaurants (similar in form and function to the theme park, from the name derives) now familiar in the public foodscapes of the global north (and to a lesser extent, the global south). Think Hard Rock Café, Planet Hollywood, Rainforest Café, and so on. Such restaurants are an expression of a larger trend that seeks to integrate the food sector into the leisure and entertainment industry (including such icons as Disney). As Miele & Murdoch argue, "In general terms, the aesthetic of entertainment is but one aspect of the 'detraditionalization' of food. Thus, we find knowledge about typical and traditional cuisines being lost from diverse national contexts" (315).

It is precisely amid the vortex of eatertainment that the gastronomic aesthetic of food has sought to (re)assert itself. In looking in detail at one slow food restaurant, Bagnoli, located in rural Tuscany, Italy, Miele & Murdoch offer a

portrait of the kinds of different meanings that can adhere in such expressions, especially as they stand in explicit contrast to those offered by the aesthetic of entertainment. In contrast to the themed restaurant of the spectacle, Bagnoli displays a dedication to an aesthetic of typicality and slowness. This means that the chef and restaurant staff feel compelled to link their culinary efforts as directly as possible to the actual physical landscape in which they are situated. This means, once again, buying locally from growers and producers with whom the restaurant has direct and ongoing personal relationships. The aesthetic of slowness in this context means simply taking the time to derive active pleasure (rather than passive entertainment) from food. These are intertwined with other aesthetic-ethical processes that yield a high degree of embeddedness in and reciprocity toward the larger community. Taken together, the authors argue, "These [aesthetic] criteria hold some relative autonomy from economic and social criteria, that is, the aesthetic is bound up in economic and social practices but comprises a distinct mode of social action, one that works according to its own modes of valuation and ethical judgment" (325). While operating within the inescapable confine of an exchange economy, such values are nonetheless examples of possible alternative modalities that do indeed challenge the conventional business-as-usual paradigm.

Chapter 3

Thinking Little . . . the Next Big Thing—DiY Legacies and the Frontiers of Mobile, Micro, and Community Supported Food Businesses

When I contacted Erin B. about doing an interview, we agreed to meet up one sunny Thursday morning in the kitchen of her shared apartment-house in east Knoxville's Park Ridge neighborhood. The one caveat, she informed me, was that she would be baking while we talked. As I would soon learn, Thursday's are one of two days each week she bakes items for delivery to the subscribers signed up for her home-based community supported bakery (CSB) business. On Mondays she bakes traditional wheaten loaves and on Thursdays, "something fun," which this particular week was cornbread muffins. Erin's business is inspired by the increasingly popular community supported agriculture (CSA) model, wherein "subscribers" agree to pay a farmer in advance of the growing season for weekly shares of vegetables delivered directly by the farmer. Thus subscribers and/or shareholders both invest in the equity and share in the risks inherent in agriculture. Indeed CSA has proven a highly malleable template for all kinds of "community supported" enterprises that are concerned with re-embedding economic exchange in a matrix of face-to-face relationality (what early advocates of CSA, in a translation of the Japanese term *teikei*, called "food with the farmer's face on it"). In Erin's case, she simply substituted baked goods for vegetables (and the baker for the farmer). As she describes the genesis of this enterprise:

> I started baking bread for myself and I really liked it. So once I started doing it I was like, 'I want to do this all the time.' But if you're going to put that much effort

> into it, why not do it for other people at the same time? So I sent out an email that said, 'Hey . . . I kind of have this idea—it would be kind of like a CSA and you sign up and get what I make each week . . . I sent it to everyone I knew in Knoxville and said, 'Send this to anyone you know.' So many people said 'yes, I'm interested,' I was like, 'Woops! I think I just started a business!

Erin was by this time an acquaintance of several years, the two of us having met through our mutual involvement in local and regional anti-mountain top removal coal mining activist circles. Young, politically aware, energetic, and highly motivated, I had followed Erin's many initiatives and ideas with great interest, informed of her latest projects through both common friends and our connections through social media. Not long after launching her CSB, she became a key participant in an informal periodic market that would go by the name, "Mama's Market." Though the last market was held nearly a year ago, the original intention of the gathering is provided in the description provided on the event's Facebook page:

> The Mama's Market is an open community space for women crafters and artists to exhibit, trade and sell their homemade wares. The primary goal of The Market is to provide venue to area women in which to engage in the development of alternative economy. Organized and operated by both urban and rural crafters, The Mama's Market is an essential component in the larger network of sustainable, radical homemaking endeavors being built in Eastern Tennessee and Southern Appalachia. A particular focus is given to the work of blurring the sometimes prohibitive boundaries between urban Knoxville and the largely rural communities that surround the city. Ultimately, we hope to foster a permanent network of economically viable home-based producers, rooted in family and

> Appalachia as a whole
> (www.facebook.com/events/163983060377241/?source=1).

Her involvement in the Mama's Market articulated with Erin's larger activist undertakings in several ways. One is in her dedication to Appalachian regional issues, particularly those rotating around the paired axes of environment and economy. Central to her engagement in this first arena is active experimentation with new modes and venues through which to reduce the region's historical dependency on the energy economy and its associated extractive industries. Another is her commitment to women's issues, including an interest in women's reproductive health and wellness, which led to her recent certification as a doula (a second independent remunerative enterprise). Imbricated in this latter dimension is also an interest in the constellation of expressions that might be defined under the larger umbrella of "radical homemaking" (invoking the title of Shannon Hayes 2010 book, *Radical Homemakers*, discussed in more detail below). Erin's CSB is an extension of just this ethos.

It is also expressive of the ethos attending the more politically aware forms of the Do-It-Yourself (DiY) movement. As Erin states of the larger orientation that guides her CSB enterprise:

> I really like people knowing where things come from and that they can feel good about the workers and the product and the ingredients . . . I also appreciate it as part [of]. . . well, I don't like the expertness of everything. When I started making bread it was one more thing where it was like, 'Oh! You can actually *do* this! So many things we're told, 'It doesn't matter, don't think about it, someone somewhere else will do that for you.' So realizing that bread was one more thing

> where, if you just learn how . . . there is knowledge—we've lost a lot of the knowledge—but if you find it, you can use it. So it's sort of taking back lost knowledge.

Placed within the lineage of the larger DiY movement ethos that first fluoresced in the context of the Thatcher-era UK (McKay 1998), the political sentiment expressed in Erin's statement exemplifies one of the movement's central tenants, that is, "that you can do for yourself the activities normally reserved for the realm of capitalist production (wherein products are created for consumption in a system that encourages alienation and nonparticipation)" (Holtzman et al, 2007: 44). Thus she envisions herself as directly engaged in processes of reclaiming competence, and with it, the kind of critical subjectivity that facilitates a much larger project of total socio-economic critique and systemic change. In the case of Erin and others profiled in this chapter, it will be demonstrated that these critiques are increasingly manifesting in the form of alternative economic institutions and novel expressions to be found at the intersection of DiY's "culture politics of autonomy" (McKay 1998: 23) and the local food economy.

As to the larger evolution of the DiY movement, it can be usefully conceptualized as an operative mode (perhaps *the* mode) of what might be called a *neoliberal alterity*. It could be, in other words, that within neoliberalism are implanted the seeds of its own destruction. As McKay elaborates such a possibility,

> The right has no monopoly on the rhetoric and practice of self-help . . . –is it not the case that Thatcherism caused the negative conditions that gave rise to DiY culture, which was a reaction to unemployment, boredom, a grasping

> materialism, the denial of alternative pleasures, general social deprivation and alienation, a frowning sense of an establishment looking after its own? (20).

In exploring the emergence of parallel autonomous movements in continental Europe, Marianne Maeckelbergh (2009) suggests that just such a disillusionment with affecting change through government policy in the 1990s resulted in the construction of alternatives based on autonomy and Do-It-Yourself (DiY) culture there as well.

As this may be related to community-supported endeavors of the sort that concern us here, scholarly examinations by Cone & Kakaliouras (1995), DeLind & Ferguson (1999), and Schnell (2007) all indicate that CSA participation and political orientation tend to be correlated. As the first of these asserts, of the CSA farmers profiled therein, "all were engaged in education and community activism prior to starting a CSA farm" (1995: 29). Stating that such findings are by no means absolute, tabulated survey data compiled by Schnell notes a similar pattern of leftist/progressive political leanings among CSA participants as evidenced in voting patterns during the 2004 U.S. presidential election (with the proviso that while "support for Kerry is hardly a perfect surrogate for a measure of progressive politics, in the rancorous political climate of 2004 it is a reasonable substitute" [557]). DeLind & Ferguson go so far as to categorize CSAs as expressions falling under the larger purview of what are often called the "new" social movements of the 1980s and 1990s. In contrast to the typically Marxian revolutionary ambitions of the New Left movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the new social movements "tend to be focused on civil society with the aim of democratizing social institutions and opening up space for the expression of

identity, plurality, and greater social autonomy . . . Rather than being class-based and worker-focused, many of their adherents are drawn from the new middle class and are concerned with lifestyle issues" (1999: 192). DeLind & Ferguson determine that CSAs are themselves, by this definition, new social movements, and more specifically feminist new social movements at that.

Also of interest, and of particular relevance to the current chapter, Schnell finds a high degree of correspondence between the concentration of CSAs and microbreweries. As he asserts with respect to the implications of this co-occurrence, "What unites these phenomena is a desire for, and commitment to, increased connections with place, a process termed neolocalism." Continuing, he states, "There does seem to be a distinctive geography of neolocalism . . . one with a strong relationship to progressive politics. This move to the local is a logical countermovement for those with anticorporate and antiglobalization ideals" (557). In an example that indicates an even greater level of symbiosis between such institutions, while Knoxville microbrewery, Saw Works Brewing Company, is an important site for the instantiation of just such a neolocal formation, it also serves as a drop-off site for the "meat CSA" of Century Harvest Farm. Offering freezer space for the interim storage of frozen meat grown and processed at Century Harvest, Saw Works also partners directly with the farm in other key ways that galvanize their mutual performance of neolocal solidarity economies. This relationship will be examined in greater detail below.

Besides its partnership with Century Harvest Farm, Saw Works serves as a temporary storage and preparation hub for Hoof, a local food truck that forms the third spoke in a triadic relationship whose ultimate ambition is the creation

of a closed-loop enterprise for local meat production. Specializing in local grass-fed burgers made exclusively from beef produced by Century Harvest Farm, Hoof represents the final expression of community-based and/or local micro-enterprises to be examined in this chapter. As a nationally occurring phenomenon, the contemporary food truck movement exhibits tremendous diversity and creativity while introducing often-novel elements into the varied local (and decidedly urban) foodscapes in which they occur. In Knoxville, food trucks have emerged in tandem with the growth and popularity of the downtown Market Square Farmer's Market (MSFM) (see chapter 1). In what appears (as of this writing) to be a distinct variation on the food truck, in Knoxville several are linked directly to particular family farms, outgrowths of innovative marketing strategies often undertaken by the current youthful generation of farm descendants. With the exception of Hoof, among the most prominent of these farm-direct food trucks are the efforts of second and third generation farm daughters. As Charlotte T., manager of MSFM commented on this local development:

> You hear all the time about how young farmers aren't staying on the farm and people are leaving. We have a number of farms that are staying alive because of that next generation. A surprising number to me, and a surprising number that are actually female, like the daughters of the farm. Like Riverplains Farm, or Cruze Farm, Mountain Meadows Farm—they are women who are taking this on. Especially with Mister Canteen or Cruze Farm . . .because they are that younger generation, they are taking the farms to the next step. I mean they're instagraming, they're doing food trucks . . .

> Those food trucks are such great addition to our local food culture. When you have interesting ice creams made from purple sweet potatoes and local dairy, anyone can get into that. Well, maybe not everyone can get to sweet potato ice cream, but everyone can get into vanilla ice cream that is made from eggs and dairy that is from here, whether they care about it really being local or not. So it's a way to for them to expand their business and get to a wider audience without just selling the raw product. In our current society, people don't cook for themselves everyday, even if they cook some. If you can just go and get local food made for you by the farmer's [by whom] it's grown, that cuts out a whole step for people. And then hopefully it's also creating a better business model for these farmers to survive.

To link these varied expressions of Knoxville's local food network back to the efforts of Erin B. and the community supported model, all (to greater and lesser degrees) can be enfolded back into the generative ethos of DiY and linked to a progressive (and even at time, radical) political orientation. That many display gendered dimensions centered around food production and provisioning processes likewise emplaces such efforts within a lineage of political-economic consciousness that seeks to reverse the marketization of, and resultant alienation from, what were once everyday activities in the larger realm of domestic economy. As Erin expressed this referential sensibility: "There was a time when homemade was not political. It was, duh, it was what you do!—you make things!" Or grow things, or cook things, we might add. Thus before examining the particulars of alternative community supported, micro, and mobile food business models and their emergence in Knoxville, we will take a look at the interdigitated

genealogies of deskilling, alienation, and their contestation through an often gendered and antagonistic "cultural politics of autonomy."

From Deskilling to DiY: Home, Hearth, and Farm as Sites of Struggle

An understanding of the processes that have led from deskilling to DiY begins with the archaeology of the home and the farm (together, the homestead) and one of the central historical functions practiced therein—the production, preparation, and consumption of food—and especially the relation of these practices to capitalist socio-economic organization and the accompanying master narrative of modernity and progress. But first, a brief clarification on the theoretical orientation that follows. As Mies (1986), Nash (1989), Dunaway (2001), Graeber (2007), Federici (2004), and no doubt countless others have argued, orthodox Marxist and political economic frameworks (and complimentary ones such as world systems theory) are inadequate for analyzing the role of the home, and in particular the productive and reproductive labor performed therein that fell overwhelmingly to non-wage earning women after the ascendancy of capitalist social relations. This is due largely to the privileging of the industrial workplace as the site of exploitation and therefore also the site of struggle and revolutionary agency, necessarily placing greater significance on the antagonisms adhering in wage-labor relations and thus diminishing the theoretical significance of sites and relations of non-wage work. But as June Nash (1989) suggests, "Revolutionary consciousness is born in the moral community [wherein non-wage relations predominate] as well as the economic awareness of exploitation in the workplace" (6). Thus the liminal spaces and

labor functions that are the preoccupation of the household (liminal at least in the capitalist context) are best analyzed through the complimentary lens of feminist, feminist-Marxist, and ecofeminist perspectives. This theoretical synthesis allows for the consideration of the interrelationship between value, production, and reproduction wherein the homestead and its functions emerge as a central locus for struggle—both historically and in the reclamation efforts of the kinds of localist food movements and alternative economic activities that concern us here. Put another way, as Graeber (2007) articulates it, "when value is about the production of people [and not just material objects], it is always entirely implicated in the processes of transformation" (98).

Thus the history of the home and its functions in capitalist society begins with an understanding and appreciation of its role in social reproduction and as a site (initially) of autonomous productive activity insulated (though precariously, as we shall see) from the vicissitudes of the market economy. Constructing the home as a domain distinct from the workplace, however, marks the first stage in its transformation. As Graeber (2007) elaborates, ". . . one of the most striking things about capitalism is that it is the only mode of production to systematically divide homes and workplaces. It assumes that the making of people and the manufacture of things should properly operate by entirely different logics in places that have nothing to do with each other" (86). It was in this revolutionary division of home and workplace, Silvia Federici (2004) argues, that the stage was set for the devaluation of women's labor and its ultimate relegation to a category of non-work. In the pre-capitalist feudal societies of Europe, Federici (2004) asserts, ". . . no social separation existed between the production of goods and

reproduction of the workforce; all work contributed to the family's sustenance" (25). After men's roles in the domestic economy were expropriated and replaced by wage-labor relations and the factory model of production (men's domestic skills were the first casualty of the home/workplace division), however, this situation changed. Because men's work, now in the remunerative form of labor-power, was transformed into a commodity with exchange value, it became an instrument and expression of the hegemonic capitalist social order. In this emergent system of market hegemony, the use-value of non-wage work (including women's work in the home) was degraded in the social imaginary. As Shannon Hayes (2010), quoting Jonathan Rowe, notes of the implications of this differential valuation of work, "the mentality that underlies our economy 'assumes that only those activities that have reality and value are those in which money changes hands.' If money does not change hands, then the actions 'dwell in a kind of netherworld where they await the beckoning of the market to attain actuality and life'" (41).

While this devaluation of non-market labor solidified in capitalism's industrial stage (and likely even earlier—see Federici, 2004), the household nonetheless retained a considerable degree of competence, vitality, and autonomy in its productive functions. Indeed, as historian Glenna Matthews (1987) suggests, women's domestic labor of this period, especially cookery, should appropriately be conceptualized as a highly competent craft tradition replete with all the knowledge of conceptualization and skill of execution that characterization implies. However, major assaults on this largely female craft tradition began to coalesce around the turn of the twentieth century. The

interdigitation of three emerging socio-economic forces in the United States (and perhaps a number of others) would conspire to render the domestic craft tradition and its agricultural context both redundant and, ultimately, socially deficient. These forces include: 1. the professionalization of the field of Home Economics; 2. advances in manufacturing processes, particularly in food production; 3. the proliferation of advertising and the accompanying rise of a mass consumer culture; and 4. the industrialization of farming. In concert these developments affected domestic craft traditions and farm relations in a way that closely parallels similar processes transforming the industrial work force. In both cases (and indeed ultimately in the totality of the lifeworld), the result was what Braverman (1974) calls an "atrophy of competence" (194) achieved through the twin devices of devaluation and deskilling.

The profession and academic discipline of Home Economics had its beginning in 1899, when a steering group gathered in Lake Placid, New York to formulate the content, concerns, and direction of the nascent field. The development of home economics, argues Matthews (1984), must be understood as part of a larger societal tendency in the late nineteenth century toward the "culture of professionalism." Central to this project was the imperative of establishing definitive authority through institutional credentialing and exclusive training. In such an atmosphere, notes Matthews "Work began to be valued most when it was abstract, most devoid of emotional content, most male-oriented" (143). Specifically as this shaped the texture of home economics, Matthews states, "If their discipline were to be a profession at all, they would do best to emulate existing male professions. The important step was to distance

themselves from that lowly amateur, the housewife" (150). Thus began the devaluation of the vernacular craft traditions of the domestic sphere. The distancing tactic that attended professionalization in home economics served finally to undermine the confidence and credibility of housewives, so that many may have in fact internalized these deficiencies. Increasingly the advice of experts—dieticians, nutritionists, food scientists—came to supplant the craft tradition, especially its intuitive and sensual dimensions (being the least "scientific"), almost entirely. Echoing Erin B.'s stated dislike of "the expertness of everything," (page 153), Shannon Hayes (2010) asserts the implications of this usurpation as profound indeed, writing: "Once our sense of taste had been dismissed as unscientific, we were easy targets for an industrialized food system intent on destroying our local food culture and replacing it with factory-farmed livestock, produce, and highly processed food products" (79). Thus, the expulsion of food from its moorings in a deeply situated cultural context and its transformation from a source of shared sensual pleasure to an instrumental systems-input has yielded what Michael Pollan (2006) calls "our national eating disorder."

Closely attending the development of home economics were advances in food processing technologies and revolutions in advertising, which together opened new spaces for colonization by commodity forms and subsequently the subordination of domestic skills to market values. Commodity substitutions for homemade food items were promoted once again using the language of instrumental rationality that was beginning to become a dominant (and dominating) discourse. As Jaffe and Gertler (2006) state, "The industrial

production of foodstuffs is predicated on the expansion of markets into spaces hitherto at least partially insulated from commercial relations. The profitable employment of wage labor is based, in part, on the ability to turn workers, and their families and neighbors, into new kinds of consumers—those who invest a minimum of time and effort in their food" (145). With home economists vehemently advocating these new products (indeed many came to work directly for food processors), the discourse quickly became reified. As Matthews (1984) asserts, "Before long, advertising copywriters would be telling housewives that food in cans was inherently superior to what the housewives could prepare on their own" (104). According to many engagements in this arena, these developments affected a reconfiguration of women's (and men's) subjectivity from one of autonomy and agency to one of passive consumerism. Emerging from the long process of devaluation and appropriation that began with the onset of capitalism, social and economic processes finally "demoted homemaking from a craft tradition to the mindless occupation of pimping the house, shopping and chauffering" (Hayes 2010, 29).

It should be noted that it is precisely in the indictment of this latter condition that Betty Friedan published her landmark treatise *The Feminine Mystique*, in 1963. Others, especially black and third world feminists, have since challenged her positions as these relate to conceptualizations of home, family, and work among white, middle-class, proponents of first wave feminism—see bell hooks, *Feminist Theory, from Margin to Center* (1984). Furthermore, as Glenna Matthews argues, the instantiation of such an oppressive condition was

conceivable only after the female craft tradition was degraded through the processes of devaluation and deskilling.

In tracing the parallel and entwined developments attending changes in U.S. agricultural production and the solidification of an international food regime between 1947-1973, Friedmann (1990) examines how changes in the scale and policies of U.S. farming, especially in those attending the production of surplus commodity wheat, precipitated political changes in both dietary and wage-labor relations in the developing world as well as domestic relations of family farms in the U.S. While the former largely repeated the primary cycle of dispossession, deskilling, and devaluation recounted above (recapitulating Marx's stage of "primitive accumulation"), on the family farms of the Midwest, this meant a transformation of the small scale, general "mixed farming" regime characteristic of American agriculture until the post WWII period, to large, industrial, mono-cropping operations. In the earlier era, relations of production/reproduction on the farm were integrated and egalitarian (at least in relative terms), with women largely controlling the production of dairy, poultry, and eggs (see Jones 2008 for insight into such productive endeavors as they occurred in the U.S. South). Women in such mixed productive units generated their own, independent incomes. Furthermore, due to the relatively small size of farms in the mixed farming period, they were thoroughly integrated into a larger community structure. As expanded, mono-crop operations displaced this earlier mixed form, the social relations that had linked farm and farming community were likewise displaced. Women's roles became subordinated as their role was transformed

from that of co-producer/consumer and active citizen to isolated private consumer.

Not only women's roles therein, but also the farm as a holistic socio-economic entity in general, became marginalized during this same period. This historical reality is well understood by many participants in contemporary local food movements. As Jennifer N. recalls of her father's assessment of the decline of the farm's embeddedness in the larger local community, it all began with tractors: "Our dad talks a lot about, with the advent of tractors, how that's one of the first really big things that really fatally hurt farmers. For the simple fact that farmers were no longer buying mules from their fellow farmers. They immediately started sending tons of dollars away, to buy tractors. . . ." While this statement perhaps possesses a tinge of nostalgia, Jennifer understands a return to mule or horse powered farming as impractical, but sees how it provides the potential for its reversal, stating: "We can never get back to that, but I think it's a wonderful thing when you can start buying from each other."

As Harry Braverman wrote in 1974, "It is only in its era of monopoly that the capitalist mode of production takes over the totality of individual, family, and social needs and, in subordinating them to the market, also reshapes them to serve the needs of capital" (188). In the years since Braverman wrote these words, the penetration of capital into the realm of social relations has only intensified. Through this process, a pervasive deskilling has occurred across society. Deskilling as a concept has traditionally been applied to analyses of the transformation of skilled craft*smen* to unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the industrial labor force. But clearly the process of deskilling can equally be applied

to loss of domestic skills and practical vernacular knowledge. As Jaffe and Gertler (2006) note of the process, "One of the essential components of the deskilling of labor is the division of tasks and the movement of many of the components of these processes out of the home and into the corporate workplace" (147). Accordingly, the home and farm, once the center of social reproduction and centuries old domestic craft traditions that sustained it, has been reduced largely to a locus of consumption only. Braverman again: "In the end, the population [housewives, workers, all] finds itself willy-nilly in the position of being able to do little or nothing itself as easily as it can be hired, [or] done in the marketplace . . ." (194-195). As Matthews (1984) notes of this dialectical process and its translation specifically into the domestic sphere, ". . . as housewifery became increasingly de-skilled, staying at home became increasingly unsatisfying" (209).

It is in direct antagonism to the kind of complete estrangement from just such quotidian competences that projects in community supported and alternative economic formations have emerged. In an engaging exploration of the potential for what she calls "radical homemaking" (a descriptor invoked by the organizers of Knoxville's Mama's Market), Shannon Hayes (2010) identifies such efforts as those concerned principally with facilitating and prefiguring the transition from our current extractive economy to what David Korten (2003) calls the "life-serving economy." As such, Hayes writes, ". . . Radical Homemaking . . . function[s] in rebuilding a life-serving, socially just and ecologically sustainable economy while honoring the values of feminism" (18-19). Hayes is careful to distinguish these movement practices from more reactionary

parallels through explicating radical homemaker's explicit dedication to systemic social change. Indeed, radical homemakers enact what Richard J.F. Day (2005), in discussing broader contemporary social movement tendencies, calls "affinity-based" theory and practices.

The latter is differentiated from antecedent forms of movement activity whose primary aim is in the realization of demands through recognition by the state-apparatus. In contrast, affinity-based actors ". . . [strive] to recover, establish or enhance their ability to determine the conditions of *their own* existence, while encouraging others to do the same" (Day 2010, 13; emphasis in original). Such practices seek to confront (and often, reject) the reified verities of the current global economic system. This includes a redefinition of the normative categories of productive and reproductive relations perpetuated within the economic and politico-ideological apparatus of late capitalism—especially for our purposes, the categories of work and time. For example, in her ethnographic study of freegans (dumpster divers) and back-to-the-landers ([sub]urban-to-rural migrants), Joan Gross (2009) notes that actors in both groups "embrace labor when it means working hard to secure and process food." In so doing they "are resisting the alienation from our food sources that the global capitalist food system encourages" (75). These practices are at their core concerned with the reclamation of the dignity of everyday life—a previously relatively independent domain that has been thoroughly subsumed by the commodity form and marketized social relations. In articulating one such vision of affinity, Erin B. states, "The world I want to live in is one where people create the things they need and provide for each other, rather than relying on mysterious, outside

sources and factories, and things just appear and you don't really know where [they come from]."

Perhaps engagement in such endeavors can be fruitfully linked to the concept of "commoning." Peter Linebaugh (2010) defines "commoning" as a verb in order to liberate it from its now-frequent conflation (in noun form—the commons) with "common pool resources." Commoning, Linebaugh insists, is an action, a practice grounded in human solidarity and mutuality, rather than a thing. "Commoning," writes Linebaugh, "begins in the family. The kitchen where production and reproduction meet and the energies of the day between genders and between generations are negotiated. The momentous decisions in the sharing of tasks, in the distribution of product[ion], in the creation of desire, and in sustaining health are first made here" (1). Erin B., in speaking of the complex relationship she maintains with her mother and grandmothers in the relation to something like Linebaugh's notion of commoning, states, "My grandmothers are from the era of the microwave being a big deal, and frozen food being a big deal. So any of the members of my family who are still alive are post-food tradition." As for her mother, Erin says "she is still stuck in this mindset of, 'Why would you boil potatoes to mash them?' She still has potato flakes and to her it's like, 'It might be a little better to make it the other way, but you don't have to be in the kitchen!' And I'm like, 'Well, why do you not want to be in the kitchen? Because I love being in here—with you; together!'" Taken together, these two comments reflect something of the implications Glenna Matthews lays bare in the introduction to her aptly titled book *Just a Houswife*: "If such work is despised, it will be performed by someone whose sex, class, or race—perhaps all three—

consign her to an inferior status. If such work is despised, we will be much more likely to allow corporate America to manipulate the nature of homes and housework" (xiv). Just such a sense of social injustice informs Erin's further conceptualization of reclaiming the relationality of productive (and classically reproductive) labor when she states,

> Instead of everywhere I go seeing 20 homeless people on my way—who probably feel like they fucked up, or that they've been fucked over—instead, for everyone in my community to be making something that's useful and offering something; and in return being able to live a life that's satisfying, or at least they have everything they need and can eat well and have a home.

In the conscription of the productive and historically gendered work involved in making food to the service of politically informed alternative businesses oriented toward challenging the global food economy, actors like Erin and the food truck proprietors profiled below are actively creating counter-institutions. Grounded in a DiY ethos that reasserts the dignity of domestic work as well as farm work, their efforts are at the forefront of experiments in creating viable alternative local food economies. These are above all, perhaps, economies of care and connection. Anna B., in situating the gendered expression of such alternatives, states:

> It could be that, like us, daughters of farmers or just women in general are seeing what so many men have led us to—what they did the 70s, even the early 80s, with huge commercial scale farming. That was mostly done by men—mostly done by bureaucrats, I guess. They convinced the smaller farmer to become larger, monoculture and all that. Maybe it's just that things have to shift and the next

> generation has to shift away from what was, and shift into something different, which would be a lot women taking over the farming.

Similarly, As Feagan & Henderson (2009) note of the commonly evoked gendered dimensions of CSAs (and we might add, associated and/or derivative formations): "CSA growers were seen as forming distinct relationships with their land and their customers based on relationships of 'care' and 'caring practice.' These personal and social principles associated with an ethic of concern . . . were also typically associated with the feminine and the domestic, creating a distinct way of farming relative to conventional industrial agriculture" (2009: 204). As the web-based documentary project, *Women Farmers*, states, women are the fastest growing demographic among small farmers (womenfarmers.tumblr.com/) more generally. Women are likewise instrumental in such secondary productive enterprises as are profiled in this chapter. Though not all of the food businesses in this chapter are owned and/or operated by women, the majority of them are. As such, I hope this theoretical detour provides some deeper resonance to the representations that follow.

For it is through a cultural politics of autonomy that the food businesses discussed below locate their own identities, whether explicitly, as in the case of Erin B., or more implicitly, as is the case with several others. In either instance, the business owners that I interviewed expressed ideas that are analogous to what Antonio Negri (2007) calls "the rediscovery of antagonism" (66), which can further be likened to an enactment of "cultural negation" (Scott 1990: 74). As alternative economic institutions and expressions, these businesses derive their political force from what they stand in opposition to: the industrial food system

and the impersonal forces of economic globalization. The possibilities they embody, in other words, arise from their ability to articulate and generate affective (and effective) alternatives to these oppositional structures and processes. To the extent that the recovery of local community and emplaced skill are empowering and emancipatory to movement participants, they remain positive undertakings. Thus the rediscovery of antagonism is conceived as a largely positive project of transforming opposition into constituent power. Autochthonous constituent power is realized, in Negri's estimation, through three elements: 1. the network: "a system of communication in which values of cooperation . . . are formed;" 2. the common: "the inalienable matter on which we can build democracy;" and 3. freedom, the precondition for the previous two (2007: 67). These three elements are in turn employed toward the end of the reclamation of what John Holloway (2002) and Argentine research collective Colectivo Situaciones (2007) refer to as *potencia*: power-to. *Potencia* thus conceptualized is "inseparable from our capacity—indeed, our bodies' capacity—to be affected. This capacity cannot be detached from the moment, place, and concrete social relations in which *potencia* manifests itself" (2007: 75). Community supported and locally grounded micro-enterprises might therefore be seen as attempts to recover communities' and individuals' *potencia* to construct resilience and forge a path of self-determination through the nodes community, innovation, scale, and connectivity. In our case, this begins with a further exploration of the evolution of community supported models.

Community Supported Everything

The genealogical narratives of community supported agriculture (CSA) in the U.S. generally trace their origins back to Old World antecedents in Japan and Europe (Henderson with Van En 1999; Hinrichs 2000; Adam 2006; Schnell 2007). In the post World War II era Japan experienced socio-economic transformations mirroring the trajectory of the U.S., similarly characterized by the processes of industrialization, urbanization, and global economic integration. By the 1960s the effects of these shifts were becoming evident in terms of both the atrophy of traditional rural farming practices (and the associated pattern of rural-to-urban migration) and what was perceived as a general decline in the quality of industrially produced and processed foods. Amid this context the Japanese model of *teikei* was born. As Main & Lawson describe the movement's genesis:

> Consumers, usually housewives, who were concerned about food safety and community problems, began to demand local and organic products and additive free foods. These women, who were primarily responsible for feeding the family, were seeking not only food safety, but also the *kyodatai* or 'community' that was lost in the move to the city (1999: 214, 216).

By 1965 this consumer-led movement yielded the direct farmer-to-consumer distribution system of *teikei*. Literally translated as "cooperation" or "partnership," Japanese participants often preferred the more alliterative translation, "food with the farmer's face on it."

From Japan, this model of farmer-consumer partnership is thought to have spread to Europe (particularly Switzerland) by the late 1960s, where it

followed a parallel course of development via the initiation of women's neighborhood groups (Adam 2006; Schnell 2007). It is in Switzerland that the model was first encountered by Jan Vandertuin, who subsequently brought the ideas back to the U.S., introducing them to Robyn Van En in 1984. Van En, as owner of the Indian Line Farm in the Berkshires of western Massachusetts, and in partnership with Vandertuin and John Root, Jr., is usually credited with starting the first CSA in the U.S. (though the form is also acknowledged to have emerged simultaneously at Temple-Wilton Community Farm in New Hampshire). As Van En describes their initial efforts: "We introduced the 'share the costs to share the harvest' concept to the surrounding community by way of the Apple Project in the Autumn of 1985. People paid in advance for family sized shares of the apple harvest." This initial foray expanded to include vegetable shares the following spring. The approach was novel at the time. As Van En notes, "No one had ever heard of being paid for vegetables in advance, before the first seed was planted . . ." (1999: xiv). Interest grew nonetheless and sensing they were on to something, Van En and company set out to formulate a more formal framework for their undertaking. As she describes it:

> During the winter of 1985-1986, we met each week to discuss and develop the logistics and procedures necessary to accomplish our goals: local food for local people at a fair price to them and a fair wage to the growers. The members' annual commitments to pay their share of the production costs and to share the risk as well as the bounty set this apart from any other agricultural initiative" (xiv).

In the midst of these ongoing deliberations, Van En and her coterie settled on calling their new system community supported agriculture. In setting out to explain the intentions and possibilities of CSA since its inception, in her movement handbook and manifesto, *Sharing the Harvest* (1999), participant and writer Elizabeth Henderson recounts Van En's simple formula: "'food producers + food consumers + annual commitment to one another = CSA and untold possibilities'" (3). From its mid 1980s U.S. origins at two New England farms, CSAs have steadily grown nationwide, to a current total of over 4000, according to Local Harvest.org (http://www.localharvest.org/csa/).

As many scholarly engagements gauging the efficacy and outcomes of the CSA movement from the 1990s onward have asserted, the model does indeed appear to present counter-institutional possibilities of considerable import. As Hinrichs (2000) suggests, CSAs, with their explicit emphasis on community (however nebulous that may sometimes be in reality) and relationality, offer the greatest resolution yet toward the re-embedding of economic exchange and the de-commodification of food. In her otherwise scathing critique of California's organic agriculture sector—particularly its amenability to corporate-industrial co-optation—Julie Guthman (2004) echoes the observations of Hinrichs:

> What is striking, then, about these farms [CSA-style subscription farms], is how the transformative agronomic methods, the re-working of nature that occurs on such farms, are clearly driven by the decommodification of food and land, which opens up an economic space where social divisions can be eroded rather than accentuated. This is an alternative agriculture of substance, because it provides

> an alternative not only to production inputs and method but to the entire system of industrial farming (185).

This critical oppositional identity is well understood by CSA advocates and participants as well. As Henderson writes, "Farmers all along have been shouldering the risks of this increasingly ruthless global market, which has forced millions of them off the land. CSA offers one of the most hopeful alternatives" (1999: 3).

In Tennessee-based alternative food activist, fermentation guru, and writer Sandor Katz's erudite 2006 examination of underground and alternative food movements (*The Revolution Will Not Be Microwaved*), he offers a profile of one the first CSA farmers in the state. Jeff Poppen, also known by his media moniker "the barefoot farmer," operates a CSA from his Long Hungry Creek Farm near the town of Red Boiling Springs in northern middle Tennessee. As Katz observes of Poppen's general disposition, "Jeff is a charismatic fellow who loves to talk about growing food. He views farming as an alchemical art . . . Whenever I've seen him out in the world, he's been giving food away, sharing both his bounty and his passion" (12). Starting out as a back-to-the-land hippie farmer in the 1970s, Poppen began selling food to Nashville health food stores in the 1980s until corporate consolidation closed this avenue. In a 2012 web article by Poppen, he describes how these developments led him to CSA:

> A national corporation bought one of the stores, which had been a major outlet for us, and it made corporate sense to ship California potatoes to Nashville in late July. They still wanted our spuds, they assured me, but when the truck left Los Angeles it needed to be full. It took the wind out of my sails to feel that our

> potatoes were no longer irreplaceable, and our markets were on shaky ground. A box of garlic was turned down not because of quality or price, but because there was no room on their computer for another garlic item. Next, I received a letter requesting a 2 million dollar insurance policy (in case someone got ill eating garlic?), and was instructed to ship the produce to their Cincinnati warehouse, to then be trucked back to Nashville. My ideal of local agriculture was fading fast. When a few folks from the city offered to help organize a CSA, we jumped on it. Now, as we wind up our fourth year, a community of 60 families around Nashville cares about the farm. I'm not concerned about how to market produce, crop failures or budget blues, and I make my decisions based on what is best for the farm as a whole. This doesn't keep me from making wrong decisions-those sweet potatoes ought to have been dug by now. But my farm tells me how much to grow, where and when to plant and what to do. She's a much wiser boss than the marketplace is.

Continuing, Poppen concludes:

> Everyone gains from CSA's. It's a model for reinvigorating the countryside with productive and profitable, small organic farms. Members learn where their food comes from, and eat what is in season. They bear crop losses and bumper crops along with the farmer, and become part of the farm. Rekindling this feeling of caring for the land may be more nourishing than the fresh organic vegetables they get each week (http://www.barefootfarmer.com/?s=our+CSA).

From its beginnings as a model for linking farmers to consumers via the weekly share of vegetables, CSA has expanded into other arenas. Anticipating its broader relevance and adaptability, in 1999 Henderson suggested community supported models for a range of products and services, from clothing and

firewood, to health care, automotive repair, and legal services (223). She also recognized its potential as a distributional model for local fisheries. Indeed, since Henderson's 1999 publication, Community Supported Fisheries (CSF) have expanded to constitute a prominent sub-manifestation of CSA. Beginning with Port Clyde Fresh Catch in Port Clyde, Maine, the CSF movement quickly coalesced around the umbrella web network, Local Catch.org, which lists thirty-five participating fisheries along the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, from North Carolina to Alaska. Local Catch and participating local fisheries groups articulate a model built around the concept of the "Triple Bottom Line," which asserts, "long-term solutions [that] recognize the interconnectedness of ecological, economic, and socio-cultural systems" (http://www.walking-fish.org/context.php). Accordingly, the so-called triple bottom line espouses a dedication to of 1. Local economies, 2. Social improvements, and 3. Environmental stewardship. As the North Carolina CSF, Walking Fish, conceptualizes the larger goals and potential of the movement in light of the palpable achievements of CSA: "Small-scale, local growers are no longer seen as just farmers. More than ever, as we realize the benefits they provide, they are being seen as the foundation of our communities." Similarly, they surmise, "By acknowledging fishermen and fishing communities as valuable members of our local food system, they gain respect and responsibility. As such, we believe that just as the 'community-supported agriculture' (CSA) model can encourage sustainable and profitable farming practices, CSFs have the potential to do the same for fishing" (http://www.walking-fish.org/context.php).

As we have already seen through the example of Erin B.'s CSB, the model has also been successfully utilized for the production and distribution of baked goods. The CSB was already in operation at the time of the publication of Elizabeth Henderson's book in 1999. In it, she profiles On the Rise, a women's collective that integrates the CSB and worker cooperative models. A similar model is utilized by the contemporary Panaderia Bread Uprising Bakery (PBUB) in Durham, North Carolina, whose CSB/cooperative also articulates an explicitly social justice orientation as well. As stated on their website, PBUB is a

> community bakery . . . rooted in queer, people of color, and working class communities. We are a cooperative–workers and members make decisions together about what happens in the bakery. We operate a weekly subscription program where members contribute what they can, and receive the bread that they want and need (http://www.breaduprising.org/about/).

In further situating their vision, the website goes on, stating: "We understand that people's access to food is limited by oppression in all forms, including the exploitative and dehumanizing relationships structured by the capitalist system, the global dominance of a destructive and profit-driven industrial food system, sexism, racism, heterosexism, trans-phobia, ableism and classism." Accordingly, the Bready Uprising collective conceptualizes its mission as one enacted in four general arenas/expressions:

- Knead[ing] relationships of dignity, respect and appreciation centered around food
- Leaven the growing struggle for food sovereignty in North Carolina

- Form a community institution rooted in queer, people-of-color and working class communities
- Bake and eat delicious bread (http://www.breaduprising.org/about/our-vision/).

Perhaps exceptional in their commitment to a radical political agenda, Panaderia exemplifies the malleability of the CSA template.

Occupying a somewhat different position along the continuum of CSA derived ventures is the so-called "meat CSA." Having emerged in tandem with growing demand for local grass-fed beef (a demand galvanized through the popularization of the innovative ecological husbandry practices of Joel Salatin popularized in Michael Pollan's *The Omnivores Dilemma*), the meat CSA has proven one of its principle distribution systems. One such operation in the foodscape of the greater Knoxville area is the Century Harvest Farm (CHF) meat CSA. Like interests in vegetable shares through a traditional CSA, the meat CSA seeks to provide a direct link between producer and consumer. Also like the vegetable CSA, the meat CSA relies on a rhetoric of transparency and relationality. As CHF's website situates its efforts within such a framework: "As a family farm located in Greenback, TN, Century Harvest guarantees absolute purity of product and clarity for the consumer. From the day the cow is born until the day you pick up your beef, our customers take pride in knowing their food was humanely raised on an open pasture in East Tennessee" (www.centuryharvest.com). Unlike CSAs centered around vegetable production, however, the nature of meat processing precludes the kind of direct community investment and participation in farming activities that has been one of the

hallmarks of the original CSA vision (though one that has waned as the movement has matured, as noted by Cone & Kakaliouras [1995]). As such, in many such derivative forms of the CSA, the referent of "community" has considerably less purchase.

In a pattern that has been consistent from the beginnings of CSA movement, consumer-supporters of CHF's meat CSA are largely from urban Knoxville. The farm itself is located in an adjacent county that makes on-farm pick-up difficult for most subscribers. In order to make their delivery system more viable for their urban base, CHF found a willing partner in Saw Work Brewing Company (SWBC), Knoxville's only microbrewery. Adam P. of SWBC explains how CHF's meat CSA has proven beneficial to everyone involved:

> [CHF] processes the 100% grass fed beef and [they] started a membership, where you could sign up to purchase this meat—and we serve as a distribution point. So folks from Knoxville, or people close to town, they can get this processed beef without having to go out to Greenback. They can come right here to the brewery and pick it up. And with that they get a growler and a fill. So we put the two together where we both benefit, but more importantly, the people who want good quality, grass fed beef, they're getting that at reasonable prices and they're not traveling, they're not having to burn a lot of gas to do that.

Yet another element in CHF/SWBC partnership is an ambitious effort to create a closed-loop micro production system. As Adam P. explains the process:

> As a brewery . . . [our] largest byproduct is [our] spent grain. So for us, when we brew we use anywhere from 1200 to 1500 pounds of grain. When we're done with that grain, if we don't have a farmer come and take it, its trash, its garbage! But we partner with Century Harvest Farms . . . What he does is, he takes our spent

> grain and feeds it to his lactating, mama cows. What that does is it enriches their milk, it makes it very protein heavy and the cows that feed on that milk, they're reaping the benefits from that protein-rich milk. Then [CHF] processes the calves once they become of weight. The calves are actually 100% grass fed. That's where we're at right now. The medium range goal—a two to three year goal—is a full cycle plan where [CHF] would harvest the manure from [their] herd and use that to fertilize [their] fields. The fields will be growing barley—and [CHF] is now working on a malting facility so [they] can provide us with malted barley. Then we use the grain, and the cycle starts all over again . . . It will be an exciting day when actually close that loop. So we're all looking forward to it.

This partnership between a farm and a microbrewery is representative of another dimension of solidarity within local food economies—those symbiotic relationships cultivated and maintained among producers themselves (a relationality that is explored in much greater detail in chapters 1 and 2). Though such partnerships and mutualities often generate economic benefits for all involved, they are also grounded in a kind of extra-economic sociality that, like traditional CSA, is oriented toward larger community concerns. The multiple supportive efforts of SWBC, as will be seen, are illustrative of such formations. For as Adam puts it in broad terms, "We partner with people that are doing things the right way, that are making a difference in a positive way, that are helping grow the local economy and not shipping product across the country." As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter the geographical co-occurrence of CSAs and microbreweries has been noted by Schnell (2007). That these two expressions of food localism should be coterminous suggests that they may share some deeper similarities. While microbreweries are undoubtedly qualitatively

different from CSAs—particularly in their generally more neutral and/or apolitical orientations—they nonetheless constitute an important node in the local foodscape, one that expresses an analogous longing for the community and the local. In accounting for the phenomenal growth of microbreweries over the last several decades, Schnell & Reese (2003) suggest it "derives in part from the desire of people to break away from the smothering homogeneity of popular, national culture, and reestablish connections with local communities, settings, and economies" (46).

While micro-breweries derive their designation by way of their antagonistic relation to a handful of large, corporate mega-brewers with national distribution, their status as "micro" enterprises is questionable. SWBC, for example, is a well-established business with a regular staff, office space, and an advertising budget (though SWBC insists this is mostly accomplished through word-of-mouth). In contrast, this chapter will conclude with a look at the truly "micro" scale on which many of Knoxville's contemporary food trucks operate. While they may be micro, they are also mobile (and ephemeral), and this characteristic is a defining feature of both their strategies and their identities. In discussing the evolution of food trucks and their emergence as an increasingly visible and vibrant part of the Knoxville foodscape, this final portion of the chapter will also bring us back to where we started, particularly in looking at the ways in which food trucks have enabled a re-imagining of direct farm to consumer relations as well as engendering new spaces for the negotiating gender and the place of the traditional family farm in the realization of viable (and often urbanized) local food economies.

Micro & Mobile: Ephemerality & the Spatio-Temporal Ambivalence of Neolocalism(s)

Ale-Yes!: Placing the Perfect Pint

As Carroll & Swaminathan (2000) document, 1997 marked a watershed in the post-prohibition evolution of the American brewing industry. That year was the first in two centuries that the total number of the breweries in the U.S. exceeded that of Germany, a country with a long association as the hearth of the modern beer industry. While in 1983 only 43 breweries operated in the U.S. (Carroll & Swaminathan), according to statistics compiled by the Brewers Association, as of June 2013 that number stands at 2,538 total breweries. The vast majority of that growth is within the craft brewery sector, including brewpubs, microbreweries, and regional craft breweries, which together account for 2,483 businesses, leaving just 55 operations falling under the classification of "non-craft" brewers (www.brewersassociation.org/pages/business-tools/craft-brewing-statistics/number-of-breweries). The genesis of the craft-brewing sector can be traced back to the grassroots DiY home-brewing movement of the 1980s. Home brewing, like so many other expressions of the alternative food movement, emerged as an antagonistic alternative to the homogenized commercial beer industry of the time, as an effort to reclaim the diversity, sensory immediacy, and artisanal traditions of beer and beer making. Some among these early home-brewers became pioneers in the nascent craft brewing industry, most prevalent early on in the Pacific Northwest, California, and Colorado. It has since become the fastest growing and most lucrative segment of America's national brewing industry.

In examining the meteoric rise of the microbrewery phenomenon of the last several decades, cultural geographers (Flack 1997; Schnell & Reese 2003) have linked their growing popularity and resonance to larger processes frequently labeled neolocalism. Wes Flack employs Yi-Fu Tuan's theories concerning the manner in which the rootlessness attending the increasing geographic mobility of populations in late capitalist societies, coupled with the simultaneous processes of homogenization, have yielded nostalgic yearnings for a sense of place grounded in the geo-cultural specificities of particular localities. Tuan's theories are supported by David Harvey's observations that "place-bound identities [have] become more rather than less important in a world of diminishing spatial barriers to exchange, movement, and communication (1993: 4). Drawing from such insights, Flack asserts that, "America's rootless angst has a cultural countercurrent 'neolocalism.' Microbreweries are one example of this self-conscious reassertion of the distinctively local" (38). In describing how such sentiments are enacted and explaining the meanings they contain, Adam P. of Knoxville's Saw Works Brewing Company (SWBC) offered the following assessment: "The number one question that our customers get . . . at their bar is, 'what do you have that's local?' [There's] not even a close second. And that's not just Knoxville specific, that's every market that you go to. So people are asking 'what's local?,' and that's what they want—they want the local flavor, the local feel."

Located in an old industrial building on the east side of Knoxville's now-fragmented downtown core, SWBC is the current incarnation of two previous microbrewery ventures that have called the space home. The first was the short-

lived and notoriously inconsistent New Knoxville Brewing Company. After the latter company's closure, the space became home first to Marble City Brewing Company, which after a legal dispute with a New Mexico brewer over the company's name, was renamed Saw Works. Besides the partnership with Century Harvest Farm described above, SWBC has inserted itself into the localist movement in a number of other ways. First among these perhaps is the brewery's desire to "become Knoxville's beer," for SWBC to be synonymous with "the local flavor, the local feel." Situating SWBC's beer (as distinct from the business) within the larger local food movement Adam states, "where we fit into the whole local movement is . . . (It's very important to us) . . . we are the only microbrewery in Knoxville . . . [and] we're finding that [Knoxvillians] take pride in the fact that they have a local microbrewery."

SWBC also engages in a range of non-product related activities and cooperative endeavors that support Schnell & Reese's observations that "In some cases, the brewer's devotion to the local goes beyond the brewpub. Many of the most successful microbreweries are indeed entrenched in their communities and have become avid supporters of other local businesses and initiatives" (2003: 62). For SWBC most such efforts revolve around partnered sustainability initiatives that go beyond just their beer making practices. As Adam explains,

> sustainability doesn't just have to be limited to our product. We are working with a local company to see how we can reclaim rainwater and cut down on the city water we're brining in. We're working with [Century Harvest Farm] and chef Dustin B. to do a rooftop garden. So there [are] other things, other than just

> what goes into our beer, or our beer making practices, that we can do as a company that can help to promote sustainable practices.

Similarly, SWBC maintains an active role in promoting the activities of other local food businesses regardless of whether or not they stand to benefit directly from doing so. Again, As Adam explains,

> If Just Ripe [discussed in Chapter 1] has an event coming up and we hear about it, we may post something on social media just because we support what they're trying to accomplish. And Just Ripe doesn't sell our beer—they don't sell draft beer [at all]. So financially what do we have to gain? Nothing. But from a community standpoint and a support standpoint, we have everything to gain.

In the course of conducting this research, SWBC served as the meeting place for two interviews (one with Adam P., the other with chef and food truck proprietor Dustin B.). These two visits made evident yet another way in which SWBC serves community beyond simply producing beer. This is as a shared, almost communal, and certainly convivial space for a number of different users. During my interview with Dustin, I met him at the rear entrance of the building, where his food truck was temporarily parked. Emerging from the SWBC building with a bushel basket full of fresh peaches, Dustin and I briefly shook hands and he informed me he needed to get the peaches into the truck and would be right back. He reemerged and we exchanged extended introductions.

Dustin then led me up the stairs and into the bowels of SWBC, where he was using freezer and counter space to prep for an evening of cooking in his truck. He introduced me to several other people whose activities seemed to have little to do with brewing beer. One was a young bearded man, who was busy

painting a colorful abstract design on a piece of plywood just inside the loading dock. Upon entering the tasting room where we would conduct the interview, I was introduced to another man dressed in business-casual attire, who, holding an empty pint glass in one hand proceeded to pour himself a draft before disappearing behind an unlabeled door. During our interview, the owner/farmer of Century Harvest Farms showed up at the front door, where he peeked in, waved, and entered. He and Dustin exchanged greetings and we were introduced. What I noticed above all was that the space occupied by SWBC was abuzz with activity and friendly interaction. It was emblematic of a spirit of openness and cooperation that was evident throughout this research. It is perhaps this spirit which animates SWBC master brewer Dave Ohmer when, in an interview for a local news clip he exclaims, "In this industry it's not—well I guess there is some competiveness on the business side—but on the beer side, no. We all root for each other to make a good beer. We want to be able to go everywhere and have good beer!"

Finally, Schnell & Reese (2003) have noted that besides those processes and practices we have already discussed, naming practices among microbreweries constituted yet another critical dimension in their larger strategies of cultivating place loyalty and local embeddedness. Indeed, each of the three companies that have occupied SWBC's current building have in turn utilized names that serve as metonymic referents that signal local embeddedness and loyalties. The first of these, New Knoxville, is perhaps somewhat generic, though it does index local musician Todd Steed's reimagining of the classic American ballad, "Knoxville Girl," in his song "New Knoxville Girl." Marble City

and Saw Works, however, evoke more particular linkages to the city's industrial past. Marble City is a reference to the nickname commonly applied to the city in the early twentieth century, as it acquired a reputation as a central distribution hub for a thriving regionally-based trade in quarried marble (VanWinkle 2004). Similarly, Saw Works is a reference to the more immediate industrial past of the building itself, which originally housed Wallace Saw Works (Butera 2012). The referential functions of such naming practices are consistent with Schnell & Reese's broader observations that, "even in the urban setting, modern city images are rarely emphasized. And even modern lifestyles are almost always slighted in favor of historical . . . or blue collar lifeways . . . People who work with their hands, whose very livelihood is entwined with the geography of where they live, are used to represent the 'true' place" (2003: 59).

Such deployments and performances can be seen as part of a larger process of mytho-poeisis—of storied place making. Indeed, Adam P. understands storytelling to be central to SWBC's success. As he puts it, "People like a story. People like to know where their product is coming from, how it was produced . . . If you can tell a story, people eat that up." As Schnell & Reese suggest, "Such acts effectively enrich the meanings of the 'invisible landscape' . . . as folklore, history, and local knowledge are made visible in the mind's eye. What once seemed an unexceptional backdrop to our daily lives gains multiple layers of history and meaning." Continuing, they assert that "This sort of place creation is precisely what microbreweries are engaging in" through the use of local iconography and evocative naming practices (2003: 57). Perhaps. As these local businesses become key sites for the performance of identities that signify the distinctiveness

of particular places, however, they likewise engage in processes akin to branding that are among the hallmarks of postindustrial symbolic and cultural economies.

As a final expression derivative of the DiY ethos examined in this chapter, the emergence of food trucks in the Knoxville foodscape adds considerable depth to such discussions. In the cultural moment of their gestation, mobility in its older sense of rootlessness has been replaced by a new sense of spatial interconnectivity that has allowed for the fluorescence of novel socio-economic formations and experiments that were heretofore unimaginable. If the place-making efforts of microbreweries are, as Schnell & Reese argue, redolent of antimodernist sentiment, food trucks occupy a position that is decidedly post-modernist. In the case of Knoxville's food trucks, the images and strategies they employ return us to questions concerned with negotiations of gender and the forging of a neo-agrarianism for the digital age.

Down on the Farm Goes Uptown: This Ain't Your Daddy's Food Truck

When this research began I did not anticipate the pivotal position that food trucks would occupy. Before I had conducted a single interview I read with great interest a June 2012 article in Knoxville's alternative weekly, *Metro Pulse*, about the arrival of mobile vendors on the local food scene. Author Cari Wade Gervin begins the piece with a lament for the creative, affordable, yet short- lived Night Owl Café and the city's lukewarm reception toward the kind of culinary innovation it briefly embodied. Compared to other regional cities, Gervin pined—Nashville, Asheville, Chattanooga, even the smaller college towns of Athens, Georgia and Oxford, Mississippi—Knoxville's appetite for culinary inventiveness

was positively anemic. That all changed, she ascertains, with the arrival of the new food truck scene. Gervin turns to John T. Edge, Beard award-winning food writing and director or the Southern Foodways Alliance, citing his new book on food truck cuisine, to convey the gravity of this development. As quoted in Gervin's article, Edge labels the phenomenon the "New Guard" of food trucks, and characterizes them as the province of an "insurgent band of young cooks who now stand at the helm of stepside vans, retrofitted airstreams, and reimagined fiberglass carts . . . Their work is informed, in equal measure, by the farm-to-fork movement, classic culinary matriculation, hard knocks education, punk rock gestalt, and a universal impatience, characteristic of cooks in the twenties and thirties" (from Edge 2012: 4, in Gervin).

Midway through my interviews I began to understand too that Knoxville's food trucks did indeed stand astride an important fulcrum in the development of not only the local foodscape broadly considered, but food localism more specifically. They are interesting yet curious hybrid creations that are making the road by walking, as the old saying goes. They are, by their very nature, mobile. Yet in Knoxville, as elsewhere, they are also rooted in place, serving as pioneers of locally based food economies and networks. As Lok Sui (2013) observes of the difficulty in comparing the food truck scenes of Los Angeles, New York, Seattle, and San Francisco, "Place and locality help determine how the food truck phenomenon transpires in these different cities" (242). They are likewise pioneering new hybrid cuisines that index ethnic, local, and regional contexts, while at same time infusing them with global influences. They are, again noted by Lok Sui (2013), deeply expressive of a new urban hipness (Edge's "punk rock

gestalt"), and situated firmly within the digital culture of the moment. As such, their innovations are as much stylistic as culinary. And they are affordable—rarely with menu items priced over ten dollars (most falling in the five to ten dollar range). In Knoxville, several food trucks are not only *informed* by the farm-to-fork movement, as Edge notes, but are themselves *farm-based*. In this regard, Knoxville's food trucks embody not only the city's most creative culinary undertakings, but represent a new form of direct farm-to-consumer distribution.

The food truck phenomenon might also be understood as indicative of greater trends catalyzed by the post-2008 economic collapse, as people everywhere have turned increasingly toward creative, low-capital business models and new diversified livelihood strategies amid a worsening job market and diminishing prospects. As Erin B. observes of this confluence,

> In an economy like this, lots of people are trying little things on their own and that's what's getting a lot of people through, not finding work elsewhere. But in the process I think people like me are also finding a lot of joy in it. So this is a way I can make a little extra money, but look I have these skills that I wouldn't have known before. People getting to do what they love and also benefit their friends and neighbors. People getting to do what they love creates a world where people are happy and where we interact more positively with one another instead of going to work somewhere and for someone else just to make money.

As Edge notes of the kinds of people behind the food truck movement, "They're the kind of cooks who refuse to bide their time and sock away money in hopes of saving enough to buy a brick-and-mortar palace of a restaurant" (4). Sui likewise suggests that food trucks are representative expressions of post-recession socio-

economic realities. For while food truck proprietors constitute something of a culinary Avant-garde, "Their craving for food diversity and innovation . . . has been tempered by the current economic recession" (Sui 2013:). In a formulation that deepens Johnston & Baumann's (2010) synthesis of sociological theories of omnivorous consumption as this informs contemporary foodie culture (see Chapter 2, 45-51), Sui adds, "In the 1980s and 1990s, when the economy was booming, the cultural ideal of food consumption was to go to an elegant, expensive restaurant. Now, though, it has become socially accepted, even culturally fashionable, to find tasty 'cheap eats.'" In such a context, "food trucks fill the vacuum created by the increased demand for innovative, tasty food and the unwillingness or inability of consumers to eat at expensive restaurants" (2013: 243).

Mobile but situated, offering food that is innovative but familiar, food trucks occupy the mirage-like, ephemeral terrain where old and new, fast and slow, country and city, local and global converge. As Dale M., cook/owner of a fried pie stand and farmer's market regular, ponders the disjunctures that sometimes attend the multi-axial navigations straddling old dualisms and new pluralities:

> There is a part of me that feels connected to food truck owners everywhere, or mobile food people everywhere. There is this sort of larger community that you are a part of. Because I'm mobile, it's much more like mobile digital culture—the pies can go wherever. It's not the traditional storefront. But most people's first question when they come to the stand is "where are you located?" and I'm like, "I'm right here, at the farmer's market."

Dale's reference to digital culture is more than just an analogy, however. A kind of stylish curatorial promotion and image management via digital mediation (especially social media) is common to most of the food business owners encountered in the course of this research. Such practices are integral to the success of mobile food vendors, serving a surrogate function in lieu of permanent storefronts. As Dale notes of the centrality of social media in her marketing strategy, "It's 100% word of mouth and social media. I've never paid for any kind of advertising . . . we're really active in social media, which is nice because we change so much where we are located we need that kind of dynamic platform to be able to tell people that." Similarly, Jennifer N., one half of a sister team who together operate one of Knoxville's farm-based food trucks, in speaking of their efforts to launch their truck, "All we really did was start a Facebook page and go out. That was it!"

Integration in digital media formats, argues Sui, has been instrumental in recasting the image of food trucks, wherein the marginal, convenience food status attributed to first generation mobile vendors has been replaced with an image of the new food truck phenomenon as youthful, hip, urban, and cosmopolitan. In our interview, immediately following the statement issued above, Dale recounted a story involving a friend, now living in Iran, who faithfully followed her pie stand adventures via instagram. Through a chance internet perusal, her friend found and forwarded images of a pie stand in Kuwait that was, in Dale's assessment, identical to her own, right down to the font style and color scheme. Wondering at the apparent unlikeliness of it all, Dale exclaimed, "It was crazy—that that exists, either by coincidence or by some creative borrowing—but then that it would ever

get back to me, this pie stand in Kuwait that looks just like my pie stand! . . . When you put images out there, you don't know who's seeing them, and what's going to come of that." This incident is indicative of the mediated recursivity and concatenation that informs local expressions in a global cultural economy and which lends food trucks much of their cosmopolitanism.

The aesthetics and design of Dale's stand, however, are intentionally referential in style, which, not unlike the naming practices of microbreweries, is an engagement in the active process of emplacement, which bleeds quite readily into the territory of branding. Thus in the southern Appalachian and U.S. Southern contexts in which Knoxville is situated, the style and content of the city's food trucks index perceived geo-cultural-historical referents, albeit in a fashion that is simultaneously hybridized through the interpolation of global influences, yielding what Peacock (2005, 2007) refers to as "grounded globalism." When compared to and/or situated alongside parallel practices among microbreweries, these indexical and referential practices embody the spatio-temporal ambivalence that attends localist efforts at place-making amid the unceasing swirl of what Appadurai (1990) calls "global cultural flows."

Ethnographically exploring the cultural economy of food trucks in Austin, Texas, Lok Sui (2013) notes two conditions that are useful as comparative analytic frameworks for looking at Knoxville's food trucks. The first of these is her analysis of their hybrid character. Indeed, it was her previous interest in the fusion of Asian and Latino cuisines that led Sui to Austin's food trucks in the first place. Expressing this interest in the classroom, a student informed her of the Korean barbeque tacos that are the specialty of the Chi'Lantro food truck. This

led to her discovery of a second truck named the Peached Tortilla, which specialized in a complex fusion of Vietnamese, Thai, and Southern foods. In her estimation, "this new kind of fusion . . . actually reflects the changing demographics of various cities in the United States as well as the cross-ethnic intersections and interactions between Asian and Latino populations" (243). If ethnic hybridization characterizes Austin's food trucks (and those of other cities with similar demographic make-up), in the more ethnically homogenous context of Knoxville this hybridization is characterized by an analogous rural/urban demographic synthesis (though certainly demographic shifts in the ethnic composition in the region are evident as well). Thus Knoxville's food truck fare tends toward regionally familiar items with a (post)modern flair.

In Knoxville as elsewhere, food truck fare is likewise imbricated in a complex politics of authenticity that is coterminous with the current era of cultural consumption sociologists label "omnivorous" (see Peterson 2005 for a review of the concept's evolution). In examining the ascendency of what he calls the "gentrification of taste" in contemporary Japan, Theodore Bestor (2004) situates the trend in a navigational context of a shifting postindustrial foodscape:

> On the one hand, culinary industrialization has shifted the balance away from locally available, rather generic and anonymous foodstuffs to nationally distributed, brand-name commodities; on the other hand, in the postindustrial economy, formerly anonymous local foodstuffs now have cachet as name-brand merchandise (153).

Thus, formerly quotidian regional styles and foods become recast as benchmarks of authenticity. The food truck phenomenon in Knoxville has certainly prospered

as one of the principal purveyors of this kind of new-old-fashioned culinary (re)invention.

In Knoxville's southern Appalachian context, the benchmark of such authenticity is found in both the region's own rural, yeoman food traditions and what are often interpreted as equivalent "peasant" and indigenous cuisines from elsewhere. From their urban-hip and highly stylized (and stylish) trucks and stands and carts, Knoxville's mobile vendors are collapsing spatio-temporal distance and creating a kind of pan-rural, local-global hybrid cuisine (uptown-downhome). As Dale, who grew up in Chicago, explains: "I decided I wanted to do fried pies because I wanted to do something that was of this place . . . My godmother growing up was from Kentucky and she took care of me my entire childhood, so I grew up eating a lot of southern foods. Even though I'm not from the south, I feel I have a real connection to southern food."

In a parallel through more complex example, while looking over a Facebook-posted menu from Mister Kanteen, the farm-based food truck operated by sisters Jennifer N. and Anna B., I noticed a unique item they called a "Navajo Indian Fry-bread Taco." Intrigued, in our interview I asked about the origins and inspiration for the dish. Anna responded first: "My mom used to make something that she called Indian tacos, that came from a woman who worked here at the dairy." At this point she and Jennifer discuss the ethnicity of this woman, both finally agreeing she was Native American, Cherokee they think. Anna then continues,

> So I started googling Indian tacos to see how other people did them and what I found was this fry bread—apparently that's what a true Indian taco is. What our

> mother was doing was delicious but the fry bread made more sense to do out of the food truck. The reason we put 'Navajo Indian,' is because if we just put "Indian" fry bread that could totally be naan, or whatever, from India.

Following Anna, Jennifer links the dish's origins to memories of her travels in Navajo country, recalling "It is something that we had—and I have a beautiful memory of—a delicious fry bread taco from Canyon de Chelley. She was just making it out of a little trailer. If you look at the history of it, it's reservation food."

Shortly following our discussion of the "frybread taco," Jennifer offers an assessment of the inspiration they draw from the yeoman farm food they grew up with. As she explains:

> What we grew up eating—(our mom cooked lunch every single day, I mean breakfast, lunch and dinner, every single day, but lunch was always a big deal because the farm hands would come in and eat too a lot of times, and our extended family)—I'd say eight out of ten times it's beans and cornbread, it's a theme on beans and cornbread. But there is variations of that too—sometimes it would be corncakes, and then all the accouterments, all the condiments: cottage cheese, cottage cheese salad, fresh tomato, onion slices, pickled things, pickled okra and all that stuff. That, if you really look at it, is so similar to what so many peasants are eating in the Americas. That's why we like to mix in tacos, in all varieties, because there's a pork product, there's oftentimes lard, there's corn some way, there's beans, there's some kind of cheese thrown in, and fresh vegetables. I guess what I'm saying is that we were, and are, inspired by the local traditions.

Displaying a clearly reflexive understanding of their food offerings, Jennifer explains, "We love coming up with new things, or different takes on older things." Like the Foothills Cuisine explored in Chapter 2, Knoxville's food truck cuisine is redefining local food. While the city's food truck proprietors exhibit a dedication to regional rootedness, they also acknowledge and incorporate a wide range of distant influences, enacting their own kind of hybridity.

Returning to Lok Sui's exploration of Austin's Asian-Latino fusion food trucks, the second useful framework she offers is her analysis of their status as key sites in the production of urban hipness. Sui finds evidence of this attribute in Chi'Lantro's early linkages to Austin's nationally known South by Southwest music festival (SXSW). Having expanded from a purely musical celebration to one featuring education and technology components as well, Sui states that SXSW has become a site where "Young professionals and artists revel in a youth culture embedded in music and technology" (238). Having received both its greatest single infusion of capital and its greatest media exposure from catering to the event, Chi'Lanto attained national notoriety as well. What is more, food trucks were a natural fit with SXSW, argues Sui. "Known for their food innovation and urban hipness, with a nod to counterculture, food trucks coincide with the general ethos of SXSW's alternative culture" (238).

Knoxville's food trucks constitute a parallel development as pioneers along the frontier in the city's evolving culinary culture in ways analogous to those Austin's food truck scene. Knoxville's food trucks, as evidenced in part by the Gervin article, have generated their own attendant social scenes as well, with each truck cultivating its own faithful following of expectant patrons who produce

regular and sometimes extensive exchanges on their favorite trucks' social media sites. The trucks themselves are likewise highly curated affairs, indicating a great deal of thought and effort devoted to a kind of alternative, countercultural branding. This most often takes the form of highly aestheticized material and rhetorical presentation, extending from the actual trucks themselves on down to the menus. In one local example, the weekly menu boards of Mister Canteen feature carefully hand-written and poetic descriptions of their offerings set amid the striking (and weekly differing) artwork of one of the co-proprietor's husbands (see Figure 1, below).

Figure 1. Mister Canteen Blackboard Menu.

Continuing to look at food through a comparison to developments in popular music, in his varied engagements profiling of the rise of fall of the 1990s alternative (alt) country music as a distinctly generation X cultural phenomenon, Jon Smith (2013) asserts that the scene's linkages to the American South lent a cachet of authenticity to the greater region that diffused nationally. Partly the result of a popular desire to "synthesize postmodern hipness with . . . 'realness,'" the South's historical status as the nation's abject other was transformed into a kind of cultural capital of authenticity. Smith found evidence of this in a 2004 visit to a Brooklyn ("hipster ground zero") record shop where alt country mainstays constituted the bulk of their inventory, and where the most popular arcade game was "Big Buck Hunter." "However paradoxically," asserts Smith, "for much of the past fifteen or twenty years the South, in large part because of its perceived authentic, backward abjection, has been hip: consumed avidly . . . by transnational postmodern urban youth and popular culture as a 'populist world,' even if in sometimes weird forms" (25-26). This popularity, in Smith's estimation, and particularly as manifested in music, appears to have faded by the late 2000s. This is perhaps a premature obituary, however, as the mantle of hip southern-ness has arguably shifted from music to food. As the example the food truck operated by the youngest daughter of Knoxville's now semi-famous local diary, Cruze Farm, aptly demonstrates (who, unfortunately, I could not track down for an interview, due in part to the demands that come with celebrity status).

Featured in two articles in the *New York Times* ("Got Buttermilk?" 2009; "Buttermilk, Often Maligned, Begins to Get its Due," 2012) and in other

nationally and regionally circulated publications, including the Charleston, South Carolina-based glossy-lifestyle magazine, *Garden & Gun*, the Cruze Farm food truck pioneered the mobile food vending scene in Knoxville. The truck is managed and fronted by photogenic Colleen Cruze, christened the new "Dairy Queen" in the 2012 *Garden & Gun* piece that describes her as a "spunky, punky farmer's daughter prone to pairing gingham dresses and vintage aprons." Specializing in highly creative (and incomparably delicious) ice cream made from milk produced by their pastured herd of Jersey cows (including flavors like kale and sweet potato), the same article describes their operation as a "spiffy farm truck staffed by other adorable dairy maidens so upbeat and sweet they make Drew Barrymore look like Cruella de Vil." The Cruze Farm Girl food truck's aesthetic has been adopted by other local vendors as well, including Dale M., whose website includes photos of "pie maidens" similarly attired in ruffled vintage dresses, proclaiming, "We promise to serve you in style" (www.dalesfriedpies.com).

In contemplating the unexpected media attention that some of Knoxville's food truck proprietor's have received, Charlotte T., manager of the Market Square Farmer's Market and dean of the local food scene, offered an animated explanation:

> Southern is in, like everywhere [mentioning connections to friends in New York City and Boston who confirm this] . . . Just put anything is a mason jar and people are going to buy it! It's all southern—it's fried chicken, its cornbread, its biscuits. Biscuits are super cool now! It's all mason jars and aprons. Then you have someone like Colleen Cruze, who's like the coolest thing in the world; but

> she's really that way! She really grew up on a dairy farm, and those really are her grandmother's aprons. They've been making buttermilk for like thirty years, or whatever. It's that authenticity that makes this place special, but then you go to Brooklyn and its all trucker hats and western style shirts and they're making iced tea and cornbread and biscuits.

How does this compare to Chi'Lantro's embeddedness in the alternative culture of SXSW? How does it articulate with the kind of femininity of radical homemaking profiled in the first part of this chapter? Assuredly, these food truck proprietors are not passive or submissive women. They are perhaps simply good entrepreneurs. Nonetheless, such a complicated confluence of images and identity and motivations raise questions as to the limits of authenticity and just what the gingham dresses, cowboy boots, and vintage aprons of the Cruze Farm Girls signify. Could it be an instance in which, as Jon Smith declares, "the working class white South operates as an authentic, anti-modern populist world" (2013: 47), in this case, one that sells the hell out of ice cream?

Perhaps the way in which Knoxville's food truck scene best embodies alternative cultural possibilities is in the promise it represents for a new direct market model for small family farms. It has certainly breathed new life into Cruze Dairy, who, besides their food truck fare, sells milk and buttermilk all over Knoxville to a fiercely loyal customer base (myself included). It also offers new ways for women (mostly in this case, the proverbial farmer's daughters) to insert themselves more firmly into the family farm economy. Jennifer and Anna's story is perhaps indicative of this kind of possibility.

Having grown up on the farm they now work and live on, both Jennifer and Anna left after graduating high school. In their childhood it had been a commercial dairy of the sort that was once common throughout east and middle Tennessee. Like other small family dairies, the farm closed down as such after a 1987 government buy-out that facilitating the consolidation of the dairy industry. Anna went to college in Washington D.C. and harbored no intentions of ever returning to the farm. As she said of her situation, "My parents really beat into my head that I had to be anything but a farmer; because of their experience with commercial farming, it was not a pleasant one I guess . . . They didn't feel like they were contributing to the greater good really . . . and they were always struggling, so they wanted me to be a lawyer." Jennifer too left the farm for college, first at nearby University of Tennessee and then to Belmont, in Nashville. While in Nashville she was focused on a career in music and writing, living in urban East Nashville, the city's latest bohemian quarter. As Jennifer explains:

> I was living in east Nashville, so an urban environment, but I started really becoming obsessed with the idea of homesteading, and figuring out where our food comes from. At that time our mother was milking a Jersey by hand and she was going back into some things. I was learning about raw milk first hand—even though we had the dairy all those years it was all; well, we drank the raw milk actually, but out of the tank. Things were kind of coinciding as far the things my parents were kind of shifting towards on the farm and what I was learning about and researching on my own. Eventually I left Nashville and came back here. Right away my mom had another Jersey cow that came fresh so I got to learn how to hand-milk and just learned how to make everything you can make with milk.

> Really that is something I had missed out on growing up here, even though it sounds strange, because it was a dairy, but it was different

On the irony inherent in Jennifer's comments, Anna asserts, "I think that's what happens with commercial farming. You can grow up on a commercial farm and not learn anything about homesteading, or about how to plant your own garden, or make your own cottage cheese, or anything like that. There is a separation between what you're producing and then what you're bringing into your home." Anna them relays the impetus for her own homecoming story:

> When I was living in Florida . . . I met my husband. His brother had had Crohn's disease since the age of 11. I was baking at a health food store then and I found out about the Maker's Diet, which is based basically on what you would call real food, you know—pastured meats, organically raised whole foods, raw milk . . . preparing your food properly. Our parents always had their own beef. They always knew somehow, and I don't know how—maybe because it went back to the old timers? I'm not sure—but they always knew their cows should be on pasture if they were going to eat them. They never fed them grain, their beef cattle . . . They just had them out in a field. There were all these years they would just take one to the butcher once and a while and have their own beef. We always marveled at how much better the beef was. Then we started learning about the differences in the fat and nutrient content and all that. So I learned about eating differently to help a person with Crohn's disease and I was never able to convince my brother-in-law to do that, but then my husband, before we got married was diagnosed with colitis . . . We went full fledged maker's diet and he's never been back to the doctor since and he's never had to take a single pill since he got out of the hospital that first time.

These health concerns, coupled with having children, finally solidified her decision to return to the farm. Now both married, and reunited on the farm of their youth, they started a catering business and hosting farm-to-table dinners on site. Then a friend proposed the idea for a food truck. Anna and Jennifer were excited by the idea, but wanted to maintain the direct farm-to-table ethos. As Jennifer describes the original conception:

> So the idea was and is, again, to use as many products in the food truck as we can that we actually produce on the farm. It ends up being quite a few things! From one perspective we're providing, we're creating, value added products from our farm. We're taking the cornmeal and turning it into cornbread or corn muffins, for instance. There is a lot of other layers to it—I think there's a educational aspect even though its kind of subtle. We do try to make a pretty big deal out of the fact that we absolutely no GMO ingredients, even though a lot of people don't even really know what that means.

Continuing:

> There is a lot of, kind of political positions within it, and then it's also just a way for us get what we think is really good, real food, and inspired—most of it—inspired by farm food, meaning food that we grew up eating, that our mom made. Everything is from scratch—grass-fed beef, beans and cornbread, fried egg sandwiches. The eggs come from the chickens that are out on pasture [about 50 feet away from us]. I do think a lot of it is probably lost on a lot of our customers, but not on everybody, and that's okay.

Their efforts have met with great success. Though they don't dress in matching dresses and aprons, as the image above indicates, their food truck has plenty of style. Most importantly perhaps, their food truck, like Cruze and like

Hoof, is providing a new model for direct farmer-to-consumer sales. It also offers a way for women to assert themselves into a new kind of family farm economy. Explaining the parallel implications of radical homemaking Shannon Hayes writes:

> Radical homemakers drawn historical tradition to craft a more ecologically viable existence, but their life's work is to create a new, pleasurable, sustainable, and socially just society, different than any we have known in the last 5,000 years. While they learn from history, they do not seek to recreate it in all forms. Women are not second class citizens (2010: 17).

In a corresponding statement concerning her own efforts and what she hopes these will yield for her daughters, Anna proclaims:

> I just want my girls to grow up knowing how to do things for themselves and not having to depend completely on someone else to do every single thing for them. It doesn't necessarily mean they have to go out and kill their own cow once a year! Just that they might know how to butcher their own chicken. I feel like not passing that knowledge on to women—and to men too . . . but those are the things the women used to do around the home—we've fooled ourselves into thinking that we've empowered women somehow. We've really taken a lot of power away from women. We've given them ignorance, in a huge way, and that has taken a lot of their power away.

By way of such a positioning, Anna and Jennifer would find much in common with Erin B., and radical homemakers everywhere.

Chapter 4

Your Localism and Mine: Translocalism and the Politico-Ethics of Import Specialty Commodities

On a recent shopping trip to Target, while looking for pita bread in the food section I stumbled on an end-display of clearance items. What caught my attention were several varieties of coffee under Target's own in-house grocery label, Archer Farms. Among these were two ten-ounce packages of ground coffee identified as Nicaragua El Paraiso. The back label of the package identifies the variety as one of several of Archer Farms' "direct trade" offerings. It reads:

> In the heart of northwest Nicaragua's Matagalpa coffee-growing region, the Montealegre Bendana family's El Paraiso farm is dedicated to innovative, high quality farming practices. This Direct Trade coffee helps support the family's efforts to continually improve their growing practices through research, farm worker support and community building projects.

This description echoes Michael Pollan's (2006) recognition of the ubiquity of "storied foods" that populate the shelves of contemporary supermarket isles. Indeed, he exclaims that this commonality constitutes the emergence of "grocery-lit," a quasi-literary genre filed under "Supermarket Pastoral" (134-137). But in the case of globally sourced import commodities like coffee, the evocative power and allusions central to such a genre index not just a pastoral narrative of small farmers laboring contentedly in bucolic and harmonious agricultural landscapes, but the much more complicated histories of colonialism, international aid and development, and global divisions of labor. Indeed, given these valences and their simultaneity with the maturation of specialty market segments, the literary

dimensions of labeling for coffee and other such imports render them commodities par excellence within the symbolic and cultural economies of the current era.

As an outgrowth of a much broader contemporary history of alternative trade networks and organizations, direct trade is the newest kid on the block. While the back label of our Archer Farms coffee provides the setting and characters that enliven the narrative specific to the Nicaragua El Paraiso variety we hold in our hand, a side label gives us the larger story. "Archer Farms direct trade coffee program," we read, "is about paying fair prices for higher quality beans. Through fully transparent buying relationships, farmers have the incentive and the means to produce coffee using good farming practices." These kind of direct economic relations, we read on, "serve as investments in the farms and their communities . . . [ensuring] your coffee purchase has a positive impact on the lives of those who produce it." This proclaimed transparency (and the good-faith relationality it claims to embody), however, is a good deal more complicated than might be indicated by this rather simplistic narrative. Through a little further research a more complicated commodity chain is revealed. We find that Archer Farms coffees are sourced through Project Direct, an initiative of Portland Oregon-based Coffee Bean International (CBI), "one of the biggest and most respected specialty coffee roasters in the nation" (www.coffeebeanintl.com/about/about). The Farmer Brothers Company, a wholesaler/distributor of coffee related products and services for the U.S. coffee industry, in turn owns CBI. A profile of the company on the "Coffee & Conservation" website, maintained by University of Michigan ornithologist Julie Craves, informs us that CBI "roasts 10

million pounds of coffee annually for restaurants, coffeehouses, and retail outlets via brands such as Panache, Public Domain, and Café Tierra as well as private labels," including Target's Archer Farms brand coffees (www.coffeehabitat.com/2012/07/targets-archer-farms-coffee/).

Project Direct, we read on the initiative's website, "goes beyond every sustainable coffee certification out there—including fair trade" (www.projectdirectcoffee.com/overview.php). Project Direct sources coffees from Nicaragua, El Salvador, Colombia, and Peru. Nicaraguan beans come from one of two farms—El Paraiso, the source of our package, and El Quetzal—both of which are owned by the Bendana family. The Project Direct website contains the following description of the farms:

> On the winding road that approaches the Bendana farms, the scenery is a tapestry of green—every shade and texture. The only clue that you have entered their property is the brilliant orange flowers that line the road, nurtured with the same care as the coffee plants. As the living quarters come into view, there are plots of amazing tropical flowers decorating the foreground—*a small nod to the effort that the Bendana's put into creating an inviting place for the workers*. It's no surprise that the Bendana's are experts at growing coffee and hosting workers since they have been harvesting coffee since the early 70s when Paco Bendana inherited the land from his in-laws. The mountainous region and forest cover is ideal for growing high-quality coffees. In addition to the upmost care and attention in growing coffee, the Bendana family also mills their own coffee in an impressively clean and organized operation—ensuring the highest quality through export (www.projectdirectcoffee.com/thecoffee/coffee-nicaragua.php).

Beside this textual description are two black and white photographs, one of smiling children of varying ages standing in front of a rustic structure clad in vertical wood siding. Some among the children have backpacks on, suggesting they are on their way to or from the school the Bendana family operates for the benefit of their worker's children. On another website entry recounting a visit to the Bendana farms by a CBI representative, we learn that Roberto Bendana, current patriarch of the family estates, is active in national level Nicaraguan politics. The CBI visitor accompanies Roberto to the school and daycare facilities located on the El Quetzal farm, where, we are informed, he has recently added a specialist in early childhood development who is busy conducting a census of the worker families. "Getting a better picture of the children that the daycare will need to serve," we are informed, "will help them get more prepared and make a bigger impact in the development of the children, especially the youngest ones."

Such a snap-shot profile of the altruistic and extra-economic interventions undertaken at the Bendana family farms perhaps belies the paternalistic relations between farm workers and owners which are also embedded in this description. While the website implores that such efforts go "beyond every sustainable coffee certification out there," the description of the Bendana family farms also indicates the ways in which direct trade relations can perpetuate the kinds of inequalities and hierarchies that are direct legacies of colonialism in many producer-countries. Such conditions are limited to neither coffee production or to Latin America. In a relevant comparative example, Sarah Besky (2010) profiles similar developments attending fair trade tea production in Ceylon, India, especially its interdigitation with the exploitative regimes of colonial

production. Besky sets out primarily to interrogate fair trade production as a failed alternative in those instances in which certification extends to plantation scale operations and other "hired labor situations" wherein wage laborers still make up a bulk of the workforce (a direct parallel to the Bendana family coffee plantations). The production of tea in the Darjeeling region is still grounded in an unequal plantation land tenure system, which renders fair trade ineffective at best, exploitative at worst.

Besky argues that fair trade has directly undermined provisions in India's postcolonial Plantation Labor Act of 1951 (PLA), which established legal standards intended to protect the social welfare of plantation laborers. The Act likewise provided for a standardized mode of distribution and accounting embodied in the auction system. Under fair trade standards, plantation owners' accountability to these institutional mechanisms is circumvented. In the first instance, plantation owners often appoint workers from the plantation hierarchy to serve on the required "Joint Body," the constitution of which is intended to reflect a cross section of the labor force for the purposes of determining the use of fair trade "premiums" to be reinvested (theoretically) into community improvement projects. On Darjeeling tea plantations, however, field workers are rarely even aware of the existence of such a committee. Besky argues that the intention of the Joint Body is to serve as a mechanism whereby "fair trade knowledge" is democratically distributed among workers—in effect an "ideological apparatus" that encourages reinvestment in the common enterprise of the plantation. Since participation on the Joint Body is most often limited to

appointees made by the owner, however, it fails to function in this capacity on tea plantations.

In terms of the economic development claims of fair trade, even though fair trade items may fetch higher prices for commodities such as tea, this is a moot point in situations where laborers are still paid a daily wage that does not reflect the overall increase in prices received by the owner. Furthermore, those premiums realized through directly traded tea are not only not redistributed, they are often used by plantation owners to offset the "social costs" of facilities and services mandated in the PLA. In other words, owners are using premiums intended to be applied to community improvement projects to pay for those social costs that would otherwise be deducted from their bottom line. Finally, fair trade tea production fails to address unequal land ownership and associated issues of food security.

In concluding, Besky asserts, "I have argued that Darjeeling tea-plantation owners are co-opting fair trade and using it to solve postcolonial demand problems and get their tea to market at high prices" (117). Indeed, Besky states that many laborers interviewed for her study indicated that times were better under the colonial regime. In the model of direct trade that brings us Archer Farms brand coffee from the Bendana family farms in Nicaragua, the relative accountability demanded under the more monitored fair trade regime is eliminated altogether. Such outcomes have concerned advocates of fair trade since its inception, particularly in the current context wherein such designations represent the fastest growing and most lucrative market segments. Indeed, the most current report from Fair Trade USA (formerly TransFair USA) indicates

that fair trade organic coffee accounted for 62% of the total import volume in 2010 (fairtradeusa.org/sites /default/files/ Coffee_ Impact_ Report.pdf). Such growth has secured corporate interest in a movement that was initially an alternative grassroots effort very much in the vein of the countercuisine documented by Belasco (profiled in Chapter 2) and motivated by a sentiment of solidarity (more following). The subsequent development of direct trade, while originally intended as a corrective to abusive and duplicitous practices in the increasingly corporatized fair trade sector, has perhaps signaled the onset of Murray et al's 2003 prediction that "Once corporations have captured the mantle of Fair Trade certification, they may move on to establish their own criteria, labels, and certification processes" (cited in Bacon et al 2008: 14).

Such is the nature of the often-bewildering world of alternative trade and labeling processes. This state of things is not lost on small independent coffee roasters, many of whom pioneered the direct trade model. Jeff S., sole owner/roaster of Knoxville's Three Bears Coffee Company (TBCC), sources coffees directly, but places a premium on labeling. He sees this context as multifaceted and generally beneficial, though not without its fair share of problems and internal contradictions. In his assessment, "The Fair Trade labels, whereas they guarantee that something is the way it is, it obscures the greater problem . . . Until recently there were criterion to become fair trade certified that maybe weren't easy to get. That certainly is the case with organic certification; and it costs money—and money is in scarce supply [in many producer communities]." One of six of Jeff's major suppliers is a large cooperative producers organization in Rwanda. Jeff uses their recent history to illustrate the

complexity of labeling schemes and the ways in which they can undercut producer communities. As Jeff explained in our interview, The Rwandan co-op attained organic certification recently, but were in jeopardy of losing it. This was not due to any change in farming practices, but simply to negligence on the part of the certifying agency to perform its duties. This reality, however, did not deter him in his support of the coop, but rather simply illustrates the tenuous nature of labeling schemes. He sees labeling as potentially problematic in other ways as well, as he elaborates in the following statement:

> When I'm asked at market, 'is it organic?'—Well, 'yes, but' doesn't get you very far if you're very concerned about a tag or a label . . . There is kind of naysaying editorialization about consumer buying habits as it relates to this kind of stuff, like, 'I just need to feel good about it!' Well, feeling good about it is great. I hope people feel good about what they're getting from me! But if you feel good about it because you've totally farmed out a decision making process to a certifying agency that may be a little bit tough [meaning morally vacuous].

Jeff's statement and the larger issues surrounding fair trade, ethical consumerism, and foodie subjectivity together embody the tensions and complexities that attend that territory lying at the intersection of multiple localisms, where the local *here* meets the local *there*. Such is the distinct nature of the inquiry that grounds this chapter. For coffee and related import commodities (particularly for our purposes, chocolate) are not local in the sense of their origins. But they become salient vehicles of localism nonetheless. Coffee beans (and cacao beans) are roasted and/or processed locally, and are increasingly the province of small, independent producers who are instrumental

players in their local food economies. But they are expressive of localism on another level as well, via the processes and/or positionalities/ subjectivities of *translocalism*. By translocalism I am referring to those commitments and/or formations wherein localism becomes a globally networked phenomenon. In other words, localism here + localism there = localism everywhere. As Knoxville chef and food truck proprietor Dustin B. envisions such a reticulating global network as it relates to food producers more broadly:

> I don't think we're ever going to get away from needing, and I guess, desiring, exports and imports of global products. And I don't think it's necessary. I think we just need to come back a little bit and kind of get our priorities straight. From a health sense, from a monetary sense, from a supporting-community sense—I think we, we in the sense of the [trans-local] community of farmers [and producers] across the world and the country that are trying to do this local movement, all working together we can support and bring a more healthy and sustainable product to the next generation. I think undoubtedly it will have a global effect.

Such interpenetrating affinities take account of Day's (2005) warning that "we cannot forget that global effects arise out of, and depend upon, micropractices of power. It would thus be analytically unsubtle—and politically unwise—simply to privilege the local over the global" (209). Rather, he suggests, alternatives must be networked. Day asserts that by engaging in localism in the global north, we begin the process of rendering the neoliberal order redundant. "To the extent that we succeed in doing this," he continues, "we undermine our privilege and stand in solidarity with those who do not share it" (214-215). A similar

understanding informs the business practices and philosophy of Jeff S., as we shall see.

The title for this chapter is derived from a lineage of usage that is nearly as convoluted as the channels of alternative labeling outlined above. Most directly, it is an adaptation of a 2006 essay in the *American Historical Review* by U.S. based, Latin-American historian Greg Grandin titled "Your Americanism and Mine." Grandin's title is in turn borrowed from a statement issued by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in a speech to the Pan American Union soon after his inauguration. In FDR's usage the phrase signified a new era of U.S.-Latin American relations, one that saw a retreat of interventionist policies and practices (including the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Nicaragua) in favor a more inclusive and equitable "hemispheric pluralism." Grandin's essay is at its core an exploration of the historical emergence and usage of expressions of anti-Americanism, first in the western hemisphere and then beyond. "What is often taken for anti-Americanism in Latin America is, in fact, a competing variation of Americanism" (1047), writes Grandin, one that recalls a sentiment of Pan-Americanism that was shared by leaders throughout the hemisphere in the early years of the nineteenth century. As the century wore on, such an ideal was betrayed as U.S. economic and military interventions bifurcated the hemisphere into two distinct Americas. FDR's position in the 1930s offered to renew the promise of Pan-Americanism, but by the 1950s had proven only a temporary aberration, as the U.S. turned again toward interventionist policies in the Cold War Era. Such a discussion is relevant to our chapter because it too offers a look at the politics of the possible through the archaeology of sentiment, in our case,

shifting the point of inquiry from the promise of Pan-Americanism to the promise of Pan-Localism.

Fair Trade, Specialty, & Single Origin: Coffee and The Tangled Trajectories of Solidarity, Symbolic, (Trans)-Local Economies

The origins of the alternative trade organizations and practices can be traced to several converging and overlapping influences. As Daniel Jaffee (2007) observes, fair trade is a curious hybrid phenomenon that, while rooted in social movement activity, is also a more prosaic conceptual model for alternative market structures. Not insignificantly, Jaffee places the genesis of what would become fair trade in the same historical moment that birthed the nascent infrastructure of neoliberalism embodied in the Bretton Woods institutions (12). The latter structures originated in 1944 when financial and government representatives from forty-four nations met in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire to discuss strategies for rebuilding national economies devastated by the destruction and carnage of World War II and lay the groundwork for an emergent global economic agenda. These goals would be operationalized through a trinity of multilateral institutions/forums conceptualized at the Bretton Woods summit: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and, slightly later, in 1948, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), precursor to the World Trade Organization. The mandates of the Bretton Woods Institutions—the standardization and streamlining of country-to-country currency exchanges (IMF), the issuance of short and long term loans for economic stabilization and

reconstruction/development efforts (IMF and World Bank), and the negotiation and promotion of free trade policies (GATT)—provided the engine and architecture of what would become known as neoliberal globalization, a system intended to initiate an era of global economic consolidation orchestrated largely by (and for the benefit of) the wealthiest nations (Robbins 2005). The predicted trajectory and hegemony of the global economic restructuring facilitated by the Bretton Woods Institutions, however, was complicated and threatened by several interrelated historical factors and the mitigating potential of alternative institutional frameworks converging in the decades following World War II.

Having gained considerable momentum in the 1950s, the colonial territories and protectorates of the European empires located in the global south, especially in the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia, engaged in cascading national independence movements continuing through the Cold War era. These national liberation struggles gave birth to a host of Third World nation-states whose political and economic agendas were initially articulated in direct opposition to both the historical inequities of colonial regimes and the North/South division of global power taking shape in the immediate post World War II era. Though expressing a range of political-economic orientations and agendas, from rapid development to global redistribution of wealth, post-colonial governments of newly independent Third World nations saw common cause in their drive toward self-determination and global equity. This commonality, instrumentalized in the structuralist theories of Argentine economist Raul Prebisch, led to the formation of several international institutional and organizational mechanisms intended to advance the economic interests of global South in the 1960s and 1970s. Among

these were the Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of 77, the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), and the New International Economic Order (NIEO) (Bello 2000). The latter in particular (NIEO) was a clear articulation of an alternative global economic order, one in which Third World nations formulated an agenda of national sovereignty and self-determination over the unilateral free market strategies of the Bretton Woods system.

In this context of competing governance institutions and economic interests, development initiatives and activities from a range of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) began to take shape as well. Among these were the early Alternative Trading Organizations (ATOs) of the 1960s and 1970s, some of them charitable arms linked to U.S. and European churches and others associated with more secular activist movements with leftist political leanings. From their beginning, Jaffee observes, the differing bases of such efforts led to the formation of two strains, one focused on "development," the other on "solidarity." The former grew into organized efforts such as those of the Mennonite Central Committee, which, focusing largely in the arena of handicrafts production, developed commercial outlets in the global north in the form of not-for-profit stores or "world shops" such as Ten Thousand Villages. The solidarity strain, preoccupied initially with creating markets for products from communist countries, access to which was blocked by embargoes and other trade sanctions, adopted the mantra, "trade, not aid." The motto was utilized among solidarity-oriented groups, as Jaffee states, as "an attempt to differentiate its philosophy of local development and empowerment through trade from the paternalism of charity and the inefficiency and corruption of foreign aid by (and to)

governments." What is more, Jaffee continues, "These solidarity groups viewed the creation of alternative trade networks as part of a much larger critiques of capitalism and the global economic system" (2007: 13). It was from these groups, operating through the 1980s, that the phrase Fair Trade was coined.

The first international effort to bear the imprint of what would become fair trade was the development of the Max Havelaar label and certification process in 1988. The result of a proposal initiated by an indigenous Oaxacan coffee-producer cooperative in partnership with the Dutch development organization Solidaridad, Max Havelaar certified that all coffees licensed to carry the label were acquired through purchasing practices insuring the growers received a premium price, or "fair return." As Jaffee notes:

> The creation of this first certification—the structure that allowed fairly remunerated coffee from small-farmer cooperatives to move beyond marginalized world shops into the mainstream market—is arguably the moment when "alternative trade" became fair trade. It was also the point at which the movement's center of gravity shifted away from crafts toward agricultural products (13).

Coffee was the first of such agricultural products and continues to be the most emblematic fair trade product, owing to both its market position as the world's second most traded commodity, and to the nature of its production, which is immanently amenable to the small-producer contexts that it originally sought to bolster and support.

After Max Havelaar, fair trade certifications spread quickly throughout western Europe, yielding German-based Transfair and the U.K.-based Fair-Trade

Foundation. In the United States the fair trade movement was pioneered by Massachusetts-based Equal Exchange, formed in 1986, and still the largest fair trade coffee organization in the country (Luttinger & Dycum 2006: 199). The increasing popularity and market share commanded by fair trade products and driven by the efforts of these first-line pioneers led to the eventual development of an international third party certification apparatus by the mid to late 1990s. The first of these was the Fairtrade Labeling Organization International (FLO), based in Bonn, Germany, and established in 1997. The founding of Transfair USA in 1999 marked the debut of third-party certified fair trade coffee in the U.S. (Luttinger & Dynum 2006; Jaffee 2007).

As the original solidarity expressions of fair trade became refracted through the simultaneous instantiation of a full-blown neoliberal order (encapsulated in Thatcher's infamous There Is No Alternative [TINA] dictum) and subsequent development of post-industrial cultural and/or symbolic economies the movement's original intent was recast. In the introduction to their recent edited volume on the movement, Moberg and Lyon (2010) interrogate the shifting terrain of fair trade amid such developments. Providing a brief history of the ascendancy of neoliberal economic strategies and patterns of economic globalization that have resulted, the authors contend that fair trade, while attempting to mitigate the adverse effects of global economic disparities, is in fact itself reflective of a neoliberal ideology that seeks to locate the vehicle for social change/justice in market-based solutions. Indeed, quoting Fridell, the authors assert that fair trade's "voluntarist, non-statist program has been viewed by public institutions and corporations as being fundamentally compatible with

neoliberal reforms" (7). Thus understood, fair trade's positionality relative to a corporate-dominated, deregulated market system makes the movement a fairly easy target for cooptation.

Moberg & Lyon, mirroring the similar framework articulated by Jaffee (2007), identify three principal perspectives used to frame understandings and articulations of the fair trade movement among both scholars and advocates. The first understands the movement as a means of "alternative globalization" wherein social and environmentally just trading systems operate in parallel to the dominant mode of globalized free trade. The second conceptualizes fair trade as "a form of decommodification" wherein direct relations between producers and consumers are reestablished over and against the anonymity (and commodity fetishism) of neoliberal trade relations. The third identifies fair trade as a form of "shaped advantage," "by which a limited number of producers enter the global market under more favorable terms, utilizing enhanced institutional capacity and marketing skills to tap into a growing niche market" (8).

However it is conceptualized among consumers, Moberg & Lyon argue, citing supporting literature by Appadurai (1990) and Naomi Klein (2000), fair trade's considerable growth as a market segment can be linked to consumption's status as a primary site for enacting agency and establishing identity in the contemporary world. Appadurai terms such a phenomenon the "fetishism of the consumer," wherein agency is often conflated with choice. As Arundati Roy (2009) has similarly said, "Freedom has come to mean choice. It has less to do with the human spirit than with different brands of deodorant." Identity construction in such a context morphs into the consumerist construction of

varying "lifestyles." The implications for fair trade, write the authors, is that "Instead of promoting social justice, fair trade runs the risk of becoming a niche market catering to relatively affluent consumers seeking commodified morality in their purchases" (9).

Such potential lends itself to a complex cultural politics of authenticity as well. Examining the north/south dialectic attending fair trade politics, Matthias Zick Varul (2008) examines just such symbolic discourses, which, he claims, reside at the heart of the fair trade's "moral grammar of capitalist consumer culture." Fair trade consumerism, as an expression of ethical engagement within the circumscribed boundaries of market exchange, suggests Varul, might be thought of as a kind of "conspicuous compassion" that, in the end, reproduces colonial relationships between first and third world citizens. While fair trade is concerned with creating viable alternatives to neoliberal market relations—"the moralization of trade itself"— it does so exclusively through the power of the socially and ecologically conscious northern consumers in the absence of parallel forms of government intervention and market regulation.

Examining the movement's early "trade-not-aid" paradigm, Varul rehashes its intent as a more direct producer/consumer relationship that would restore dignity to the labor processes of primary producers. These integrated goals of moralized market reform and dignity in labor realized through "fairness" in pricing are part of a larger process of de-fetishizing relations of production. At the same time, however, a central mechanism in the marketing of fair trade products has been the addition of symbolic value that often centers on tropes of authenticity attending a kind of "romantic commodification." Authenticity so

constructed is most often grounded in ethnicity (Other) and locality (exotic, distant) differentiated from a normative wealthy, white, northern consumer. This strategy, Varul argues, has effectively commodified both people and place. The symbolic discourse inherent in fair trade marketing campaigns thus reproduces colonial power dynamics wherein the northern *consumer* is juxtaposed to the southern *producer*. This discursive turn dialectically informs the material realities attending the establishment of fair trade pricing, so that the latter, perceived in an essentialized role as primary producer (as peasant), is rewarded with a "fair" return on (manual) labor relative to perceived "bare life" needs associated with the provisioning of physical reproduction. Thus, the mandated requirement of authenticity (often policed through third party certification agencies) demands that fair trade producers must remain just that—producers—to retain their symbolic edge in a fair trade niche market which demands authenticity as part of the product. In other words, what is often commodified in such a fair trade discourse is the producer him/herself.

Moberg & Lyon (2010) explore similar implications of fair trade as a system of control and governance. While premised on the elimination of middlemen, they ascertain, the fair trade system has created its own equivalent in the form of third party certification agents and operational and production standards created by foreign (mostly global northern-based) ATOs. Furthermore, despite stated goals of fostering social equality, fair trade often serves as mechanism in the formation of social hierarchies among producers who have differential access to fair trade markets. Such tendencies are likewise addressed by Jaffee (2007), Mutersbaugh (2008), Dolan (2010), and Doane

(2010), among others. Jaffee concedes that certification processes, particularly organic certifications, can constitute a sort of eco-colonialism. In speaking specifically of the Oaxacan context that informs his study, he asserts that:

> The root of the problem here is that the organic standards were designed with a very different type of producer in mind: specifically, an individual farmer in the United States or Europe with a discrete labor force, full control over inputs, and, arguably, a middle-class lifestyle—and they have not transferred well into the context of interdependent and collectively organized peasant and indigenous producers in the global South (2007: 152).

It is precisely in response to such outcomes that alternatives to the alternative have emerged, or what is known among advocates and practitioners as the "fairer than fair trade" camp. This includes the kind of direct trade models profiled at the outset of this chapter. Such shifts have been precipitated not only by the recognition and criticism of problems inherent to third party certification processes, but also fair trade coffee's confluence with the specialty coffee market.

The fair trade and specialty coffee markets started off as distinct and divergent segments. While fair trade emerged from an older social movement context of international development and solidarity concerns, specialty coffee arose in the 1980s and 1990s as an accessory of affluence and as the turn toward a cultural and symbolic economy defined a proliferation of new consumption practices among a largely urban professional audience. Mainstream coffee consumption in the U.S. reached its all time peak in 1962 (Lyons 2005; Luttinger & Dicum 2006) and declined steadily thereafter, as did the coffeehouse movement that flourished as part of the subculture of urban beatniks, artists, and

intellectuals in the 1950s (Klinger-Vertabedian & Vertabedian 1992). A few small specialty roasters managed to survive, however, including a few New York coffeehouses and most notably, Peet's Coffee & Tea, opening in Berkeley amid the coffee decline in 1966. Both inspired by and supplied with knowledge and equipment from Peet's, Jerry Baldwin, Gordon Bowker and Zev Siegl opened the first Starbucks in 1971 at Pike Place Market in Seattle. Still, at the beginning of the 1980s coffee roasting and processing companies numbered fewer than 200, and over 75% of the trade was still controlled by the four biggest mega-roasters (Roseberry 2005). While general coffee consumption continued to decline during this time, however, the specialty ("gourmet") market expanded steadily. Starbucks bought out its ancestor Peet's in 1984. The companies subsequently split, however, as Starbucks was sold to Howard Schultz in 1987, under whose management the company expanded apace to become the corporate giant it is today.

As Luttinger & Dicum note, "The story of Starbucks is the story of a new way of looking at coffee" (152). They go on to draw parallels between the ascendency and success of Folgers and Starbucks, with each representing a new era in the commodity's evolution in their respective historical-cultural contexts. "[Jim] Folger sold modern convenience to gold miners, and later housewives, in an era when not having to roast and grind your own coffee was a genuine relief in a life of toil. Schultz sold a comfortable, safe gathering place and a status symbol—a club really—in a period of uncertainty and depersonalization" (152). Indeed, this assessment is commensurate with Lyons' (2005), who states that coffee's shifting status exemplifies Bourdieu's concept of the "economy of cultural

goods" wherein it was transformed from a "homogenized, mass market product, to one identified with 'handcrafted quality,' making it, quite literally, an object of discerning taste" (21). Roseberry (2005) places such a transformation within the larger political economic processes attending the transition from Fordist to Post-Fordist (or "flexible") eras of production, and associated subjectivities adhering in the modern (Folgers) to the post-modern (Starbucks).

Roseberry contrasts his own analysis to that of Michael Jimenez, who, looking at coffee production and consumption in the early twentieth century, calls it "the beverage of US capitalism" (135). Unlike coffee's role in this and prior historical contexts, roles that led Sidney Mintz (1979) to characterize it as one of four "proletarian hunger killers" (accompanied by sugar, tea, and chocolate) that provided cheap and/or abundant fuel for workers under systems of capitalist expansion and exploitation. As the beverage of U.S. capitalism under the Fordist mode of accumulation, coffee served precisely this function, argues Roseberry. Under the post-Fordist or flexible mode accumulation, however, it begins to acquire an entirely new set of functions as a product of distinction and cultural capital. Relating such processes to the geographical correspondences and disjunctures they embody, Roseberry cites David Harvey's own interpretation of the contemporary food market under flexible capitalism. As a space of/for consumption, the food market becomes a simulacrum of global geographical space via the surrogate commodity form, but in doing so masks the labor processes and social conditions attending the production of those same commodities. Under the regime of flexible accumulation, specialty coffees are targeted at a particular market segment, one Roseberry identifies as

> urban, urbane, professional men and women who distinguish themselves through consumption . . . If they fashion themselves through consumption, an interesting feature of the movement is that among the commodities in which they demanded variety and quality were the old proletarian hunger killers. In doing so, they almost certainly did not imagine themselves in the connection either with proletarians or the rural toilers who grew, cut, or picked what the yuppies chose to consume (140).

While Roseberry's argument resonates on some levels, his failure to include even a passing mention of the fair trade movement (or other practices of ethical consumption that arose in the 1990s), which predates and overlaps with his period of coverage, is a major omission that impairs the overall efficacy of his analysis. Even so, his utilization of global geography as one register in which such modes of consumption operate articulates well with Lyons' (2005) analysis of the role that place-association played in the success and early marketing efforts of Starbucks, to which we now turn.

While inspired by and assisted by Peet's coffee in Berkeley, by the time of Starbucks ascendency in the early 1990s the specialty coffee boom and the "new coffee culture" had become inextricably associated with the city of Seattle. This was not simply a case of incidental location, however, but was, Lyons argues, central to the promotional efforts of the growing specialty coffee market segment. Such product-place associations were, according to Lyons, "the result of strategic embellishment on the part of Starbucks and its counterparts, in that the attempt to fix a perennially global commodity such as coffee to a singular . . . location required a series of carefully circumscribed narratives of 'origin'" (15). The

success of these narratives is indicative of the resonance of "place-specific 'commodity biographies'" in a symbolic economy where "storied foods" increasingly corner greater market shares (and consumer sympathy) than their anonymous, mass produced counterparts. Coffee's associations with a city in the global North, however, do, as Harvey asserted, mask the labor and social conditions under which the primary commodity is produced. In this regard, specialty coffee shares much in common with the historical development of chocolate's identity, wherein, as Leissle (2013) points out, "somewhere along the way, the place of manufacture became more important to appreciating chocolate than the place of origin of the beans." Such a sleight of hand yielded conditions in which "Belgian chocolate,' Leissle continues, "has more purchase than 'Ghanaian cocoa" (22). This is a trend that has undergone a recent inversion, however, as "single origin" chocolates (and coffees) become more popular.

Indeed, the multiple discourses centered around provenance and transparency is one mode of engagement that signifies the nexus at which the specialty and fair trade markets have become increasingly indistinguishable. Jeff S. of Knoxville's TBCC is representative of this merging. The TBCC website declares that the company is "devoted to the most exceptional coffee available," which is simultaneously sourced from "the most conscientious coffee growers in the world" (http://threebearscoffee.com/). As Jeff understands the larger context of specialty and fair trade coffees in which he operates:

> [Specialty coffee] is what I deal with exclusively. Specialty coffee being delineated from strictly commodity-based coffee only in that it becomes more provenance, traceable. It may have other added premiums, like Fair Trade or

> Rain Forest Alliance [certified] organic. All of these are premiums that are added on to the commodity price of coffee . . . So all of those things I have become concerned with in an interest in knowing what it is that I'm dealing with. I have not been very narrow in, well I'm only interested in this or that—organic or whatever—and the reason is because . . . I learned that is not gospel. There are a lot of different shades that go on here. Basically, I source coffee by doing all of this kind of research and [considering] all of these factors.

The example of Three Bears supports Julia Smith's (2010) contention that, "the fair trade market and the specialty coffee market have over time come to resemble each other, with fair trade sellers emphasizing quality and specialty sellers emphasizing their close relationships with producers and generosity in their financial negotiation with them" (29).

Such convergences have taken on more practical dimensions as well, which have precipitated shifts in the coffee industry at large, as the evolution of Starbucks' fair trade policies demonstrate. By the late 1990s and early 2000s some activists within the fair trade movement launched campaigns directed at a broader mainstreaming of fair trade relations and market share toward the end of normalizing the model (a move that was not without its detractors, as we shall see). Starbucks was a natural target for such efforts. In 1999 Starbucks was still reeling from the anti-globalization protests galvanized around the meeting of the WTO in Seattle, wherein the company's coffee shops were systematically vandalized by protestors who equated the company with the very kind of corporate global economic domination they sought to stand against (Lyons 2005). Shortly after the protests (now remembered as the Battle of Seattle) San

Francisco based Global Exchange publicly demanded that Starbucks integrate fair trade purchasing practices into its corporate strategy. At first resistant, in 2000 the company ceded, agreeing that it would start offering fair trade coffees in all of their U.S. stores. As Jaffee notes of the larger implications of Starbucks' entry into the fair trade arena, "The accomplishment produced a flood of interest on the part of other specialty (or gourmet) roaster-retailers, who saw the need to compete in this new terrain of social justice marketing" (2007: 16). While Starbucks adoption of fair trade has been criticized as a token effort (as of the date of the publication of Jaffee's study accounting for only 3% of their total coffee purchases, which was subsequently enveloped in their own alternative certification system), ironically their greater visibility insured that many consumers would come to associate fair trade with the company. The result, notes Jaffee, is that the "company has achieved maximum public relations benefit with minimal changes in its actual practices" (16).

This event marked a watershed moment in the evolution of the fair trade coffee sector. Now seen by many as a victim of its own success, many smaller roasters sought to distance themselves from a labeling system whose principles and intent were now diluted, if not entirely eviscerated. In the wake of this development companies like Larry's Beans and Intelligentsia emerged, pioneering new direct trade models and extolling their efforts as "fairer than fair trade." Quoted in Smith (2010), Larry Larson of Larry's Beans explains the divergence that resulted: "'We left TransFair in 2004 because we did not want to be confused with companies like Starbucks that only offer a small selection of fair trade coffee" (40). Chicago-based Intelligentsia instituted its own alternative

direct trade model as well. As the company's website explains and differentiates their practices and philosophy: "Others talk about working with coffee producers and in many cases that's all it is, talk. Intelligentsia's buying team cumulatively spends over 365 days each year at source. We do not just buy coffees; we actually develop them while working alongside our growers." Continuing, the site states, "We also want the growers we work with to prosper so we guarantee a price that is paid directly to them, which is set far above international fair trade standards" (http://www.intelligentsiacoffee.com/content/history). Intelligentsia established an idiosyncratic set of criteria that define their direct trade practices, enumerated on their website as follows:

> --Coffee quality must be exceptional.
>
> --The grower must be committed to healthy environmental practices.
>
> --The verifiable price to the grower or the local coop, not simply the exporter, must be at least 25% above the fair trade price.
>
> --The grower must be committed to sustainable social practices.
>
> --All the participants must be open to transparent disclosure of financial deliveries back to the individual farmers.
>
> --Intelligentsia representatives must visit the farm or cooperative village at least once per growing season, understanding that we will most often visit three times per year: pre-harvest to craft strategy, during the harvest to monitor quality, and post-harvest to review and celebrate the successes. (http://www.intelligentsiacoffee.com/content/direct-trade).

Such efforts are perhaps laudable (or lamentable), but they have created great confusion in the marketplace amid a cacophony of competing claims. Indeed, claims are often substituted for the relative certainty guaranteed by

standardized labeling systems. This is a reality acknowledged by Jeff S., who, as his explanation for his unconditional support of the Rwandan cooperative (above) illustrates, sees certifications and labeling as both beneficial and potentially duplicitous. His own criteria for selection, while utilizing certifications and labels in most instances, are also based on more personal moral assessments. As he states, "It is important to me that people see what I'm doing as a reflection of my integrity . . . That's why my criterion for coffee choosing is based on, in my estimation, how hard somebody is trying." Of the larger context in which claims become currency, he explains:

> More or less I'm asking my consumers to trust that I'm doing due diligence. Now in a world of, 'I need to see your certification,' that sounds like a cop out. But in my world of human relations, you're as good as your word . . . I take that very seriously, so my criterion for the coffees that I choose generally have quite a lot to do with how the people are dealing with their finances and their environment. So organic practices are big in that, I believe.

The commerce of claims and counterclaims that reside at the intersection of solidarity and symbolic economies, while perhaps embodying the potential for new kinds of affective relationality (a "world of human relations"), is also an arena ripe for abuse and manipulation. Indeed, the proliferation of "ethical" and "fair" trade marketing labels and claims, suggest Moor & Littler (2008), has created a discursive field in which these can be either extended or exploited. Using the illustrative example of American Apparel and their appeals to the ethical consumer market segment through their self-promotion as a "brand-free" and "sweat-shop free" company, the authors explore the substantial grey areas

attending the maturation of post-Fordist companies and marketing strategies. The company, argue Moor & Littler, must be understood as part of larger post-Fordist economic and cultural shifts in which consumer awareness of exploitative labor practices, the consequences of outsourcing, and consumer "branding" strategies is increasingly acute. Operating within this context the authors ask if American Apparel is extending ethical production strategies or exploiting the climate to increase market share.

In the larger field of fair trade, which as we have seen, has been historically focused on creating equitable trade relations with producers in the global south, American Apparel is something of an anomaly. Its products are produced exclusively in a single factory in Los Angeles—in the heart of the global metropole. Indeed, this "American made" status is central to AA's promotional orientation, one that articulates with placed-based commodity biographies common to coffee production and consumption. The company's advertising campaigns often feature their own employees as models (mirroring marketing strategies in which pictures of farmers are featured prominently on a package of direct trade coffee), and include testimonials from these often otherwise marginalized workers (most often minority women) to bolster its image of fair labor practices and a relaxed and non-hierarchical workplace.

However, Moor and Littler assert that the company and its workforce should be properly understood in light of Manuel Castell's concept of "fourth worlds." Fourth worlds are zones of poverty and exclusion occurring throughout the globalized world—in the north as in the south—wherein the new inequalities of neoliberal globalization are becoming increasingly manifest. American

Apparel workers, largely drawn from these fourth world contexts, become essentialized representations of the company's commitment to social justice though a "missionary discourse" that reproduces, rather than neutralizes, disparities and difference. Thus, while the company actively discourages union organizing among its workers, it promotes itself in the image of a "caring capitalism." American Apparel thus attempts to produce a "transparency effect" common to all fair trade oriented companies. This is an effort to more readily expose the relations of production, an effort toward de-fetishization. However, like Varul's examination of the processes of de-fetishization wherein producers themselves become commodified, the authors similarly find evidence in American Apparel's use of "hip" ethical consumerist discourse a process that produces a "fetishized de-fetishization."

A parallel process has certainly attended the emergence of direct trade coffee, wherein the ability to convey de-fetishized market relations via emplaced and moralized commodity biographies has increasingly been the locus of innovation and differentiation. Alongside the maturation of "fairer than fair trade" alternative market relations, another manifestation of this tendency has been the increased visibility and salience of single source coffees. Indeed, the place a particular coffee comes from has become linked to other criteria of distinction. A similar trend is evident in the development of fair trade and single origin chocolate. A recent article by Leissle (2013) describes the growth in single origin, artisan chocolate manufacture in the U.S. (typically associated with bean to bar producers like the Mast Brothers, profiled in the introduction). "Single origin chocolate," Leissle writes, "names the place where the cocoa grew—an

appealing 'localization' of a food whose origins are generally anonymous" (23). Besides localizing a distantly sourced raw agricultural product, single origin chocolates are also firmly the domain of small artisan producers who are often fixtures in local food scenes. Nashville chocolatier Olive & Sinclair, for example, distinguishes their comestibles through stressing their "southern" ingredients and/or the inspiration derived from traditional southern dishes. Indeed, their single-origin, "southern-artisan" chocolate bars were declared by one reviewer to be "as regional as skillet corn bread" (http://www.oliveandsinclair.com/press).

While globally traded commodities like coffee and chocolate are imbricated in a larger international politics grounded in both recent efforts toward equitable trade relations and in the continuing legacies of colonialism, it is often these very genealogies, in combination with their amenability to the artisanal manufacturing methods of small local producers, that situates them inextricably within the larger context of local food movements whose identity is constructed in opposition to both massification and the detriments of economic globalizaton. In tracing the rise of specialty coffees in the U.S., Luttinger & Dicum situate it as

> Part of a larger trend that includes such developments as microbrewed beer, rustic breads, single-malt scotches, and organic vegetables. In each case, a consumer product has been recast as something more authentic, more traditional, diverse, flavorful, and healthful than the mass-produced product it supplants. In each case, the new 'speciality' product is hyped as the original, traditional item that has been debased by mass production and corporatism (2006: 161).

Food localism is the latest iteration of this general trend. In the case of coffee (and chocolate) localism resonates along the intersecting axes of the local here and the local there. Like artisan bean-to-bar chocolate makers, micro-roasters like Jeff S. and Knoxville's Three Bears are at the forefront of this complex terrain.

From the "Beverage of Capitalism" to the Transparency of Trans-Localism: The Evolving Culture of Coffee in Knoxville's Local Food Movement

Knoxville's evolving coffee landscape is fairly representative of those larger national trends already discussed. Through much of the twentieth century the city was home to JFG Coffee, a mid-size, regional roaster specializing in economical, mass-produced coffee (and unconcerned with sourcing practices). The company's presence in the city left a prominent visual record, including the six-story Jackson Avenue roasting facility that also served as JFG's headquarters from 1926 until it was bought out by Lousiana's Reilly Foods in 1965. It continued to be utilized as roasting facility until its closure in 2005, at which time they moved their operations to a suburban area west of downtown. Indeed, anyone who frequented (or even drove through) downtown in the years before its closure will no doubt recall the distinct aroma that filled the air as a sort of olfactory trademark of the city. In addition to the JFG Building—which has been declared historic and, quite appropriately for our purposes, recently converted into loft apartments—the company's presence in the city was also marked by a large electrically lit sign located on the south bank of the Tennessee River and

visible from many points from both downtown and the University of Tennessee campus. Under the bulb-illuminated letters, JFG, the sign read—Special Coffee (outlined in neon), punctuated by the phrase, "The best part of the meal." Having fallen into disrepair, a recent restoration of the sign was undertaken by local historic preservation organization Knox Heritage, in partnership with Reilly Foods, in 2010. It was re-erected and re-lit in 2012 as part of the city's annual Labor Day firework's spectacle known as Boomsday (http://www.knoxheritage.org/downtown-walking-tour-5).

JFG represents coffee production (and the city's pre-post-industrial economy more generally) under Roseberry's (and Harvey's) Fordist mode of accumulation, wherein the beverage was still firmly ensconced as one of Mintz's proletarian hunger killers. Facilitated by the expansion of markets for cheap Brazilian *robusta* beans (in contrast to the *Arabica* varieties that are the trademark of specialty coffees) and the invention of the first commercial scale roaster by Jabez Burns in 1864, the first nationally successful roaster/distributor of pre-roasted coffee was John Arbuckle, based first in Pittsburgh and later headquartered in New York (Pendergrast 1999). Marketed under Arbuckle's name Ariosa, pre-roasted coffee quickly displaced the prior practice of home-roasting green coffee. By the end of World War I, partly as a result of coffee's status as a favored ration of U.S. soldiers fighting in the war, the beverage was firmly implanted as standard fair at the American table. On the home front the U.S. was undergoing a period of rapid industrialization, urbanization, and commercial growth, a pattern of development that was lubricated in part by coffee, becoming standard fare in factory break rooms as well. As Luttinger &

Dicum note, the U.S. "was becoming a country of factory and office workers. Indoors, away from the rhythm of the seasons, the new America increasingly moved to the rhythm of machines. Here, coffee was the ideal drink: it gave the kick you needed to spend sixteen hours tightening screws on a mind-numbing, dangerous factory floor or pounding away at a keyboard." Indeed, they conclude, "Coffee has always been the perfect complement to dehumanizing industrialization" (2006: 131). Thus by the 1920s coffee was a highly democratized beverage, equally at home in the context of the industrial worker's coffee break or in the CEO's office suite.

In East Tennessee, James Franklin Goodson started a wholesale grocery business in Morristown in 1882. Among the products he was noted for carrying was Arbuckle's coffee, to which his son took a particular interest. Taking over his father's business, Floyd Goodson decided to focus the company's efforts exclusively on coffee roasting, relocated their operation to downtown Knoxville, and took his father's initials for the company's new name. In an interview with a local web news outlet, a direct descendent and namesake of James Franklin Goodson (and proprietor of Goodson Bros. Coffee) recalled that at the height of their popularity, JFG sold as much as 80% of all coffee sold within one hundred miles of Knoxville (Ham 2013). Reflecting larger trends of consolidation, and as noted above, JFG was bought out in 1965, but retained its downtown Knoxville roasting facility for another forty years (and in fact continues to operate in the city to this day). It was during this period following JFG's post-buy out years that national coffee consumption trends began to shift in the directions discussed in the previous section—overall consumption declined, smaller roasters emerged,

and the specialty and fair trade coffee sectors were ascendant by the 1980s. Like the mega-roaster before them, the specialty sector underwent a similar process of consolidation. Amid the shake out that followed on the heels of the Starbucks phenomenon, a few corporate brands came to dominate the specialty coffee market, among them Vermont-based Green Mountain Coffee Roasters (GMCR).

Incorporated as a small café and roastery in 1981, GMCR became a publicly traded company in 1993 and in subsequent years bought out several competitors, including Tully's, Timothy's, Diedrich, and Van Houte. Having been a pioneer in the organic coffee market segment (introducing their first organic blend in 1986), the company entered the fair trade market in 2000, signing a contract with TransFair USA in that year, and began sourcing and roasting certified Fair Trade organic beans for Newman's Own Organics line of coffees in 2002. Introducing several environmentally conscious innovations in the greater coffee industry, including the development of "earth friendly" coffee filters and paper hot cups, biodegradable bulk coffee bags, and incorporating various efforts to offset their carbon footprint, in both 2006 and 2007 GMCR was ranked number one in CR (Corporate Responsibility) Magazine's list of the 100 Best Corporate Citizens (though they were ranked 95th in the 2013 listing--www.thecro.com/files/ 100Best2013_web.pdf) [all information from GMCR website: www.gmcr.com/ about-GMCR/our-history]. In 2008, GMCR opened a 334,000 square foot manufacturing facility in a Knoxville industrial park east of downtown and summarily supplanted JFG as the area' single largest employer in the coffee industry (Gervin 2010).

In a 2010 article in Knoxville's alternative weekly by food commentator Cary Wade Gervin, she offers the following assessment of the city's evolving java-scapes:

> For a lot of people in town, coffee in Knoxville will always be synonymous with JFG, no matter how many employees GMCR has or how much volunteering they do . . . As JFG's spokesperson, Mary-Wanda Fandino, puts it, the city isn't 'steeped in' GMCR's culture; there are no signs or historic buildings or generations of families who have worked at the plant. But as Keurig K-Cups—those single-use, single-cup packs—keep exploding in popularity [an innovation introduced by GMCR], Knoxville's coffee legacy is taking on a new, instant shape.

But, as she counters in a statement immediately following, "The coffee nerds of Knoxville hope to counteract that with their own version of the Slow Food movement." The "coffee nerds" to which she is referring are those who have plied in the city's more intimate coffee countercultures of coffee shops and micro-lot roasters. Having lived in Knoxville from the mid-to-late 1990s, and again during two periods from 2003-2005 and 2008 up to the present, I have witnessed firsthand the evolution of the local coffee shop scene and its current offshoots. As an undergraduate at the University of Tennessee from 1994-1998, I was a regular denizen of campus area coffee shops. Indeed, it was in one of these—the now defunct Cup-a-Joe's—that I would meet my life partner. In these peak years of Seattle and grunge-inspired coffee shops, Knoxville boasted several of its own, including two that survive to this day—the campus area mainstay, The Golden Roast, and Old City Java, located in its namesake district of the city's downtown core. In addition to these formative-period pioneers, the city's downtown-

campus corridor is now home to two other establishments: Coffee and Chocolate and Remedy Coffee.

The latter, a project of the interdenominational Knoxlife Church, traffics exclusively in coffees from Intelligentsia (profiled above) and donates 100% of their after-tax profits to charitable and/or non-profit organizations serving downtown. They are located just across Jackson Avenue from the JFG building. Remedy echoes both the specialty coffee and direct trade philosophy of Intelligentsia, declaring on their website: "We believe in coffee quality and have made a commitment to our customers to offer only truly dazzling Specialty Coffees that speak for themselves in the cup. We believe that to get such coffees we need to work closely with actual producers, not just importers or exporters, so that we can build great coffees from the very start." Besides their investment in direct trade, Remedy declares a similar commitment to synchronizing their non-coffee offerings to support local and trans-local solidarity economies. Again, from the business's website:

> We do our best to source the very finest local, organic ingredients. We partner with Cruze Dairy Farms to ensure sure all of our espresso based beverages are made with fresh, organic milk from happy, grass fed cows right here in East Tennessee.
>
> From baked goods to chocolate, our buying decisions support farmers, co-ops, and local companies that deliver rich, quality ingredients. By purchasing products that are created responsibly and sustainably, we can be sure that our enjoyment of these goods does not come at the expense of the people who work hard to create them (http://www.remedycoffee.com/coffee.html).

Other Knoxville coffee shops, some to greater degrees than others, integrate similar practices. Old City Java (the oldest of the city's crop of post-grunge coffee shops) sources its coffee beans from Durham, North Carolina-based Counter Culture Coffee, whose practices are analogous to those of Intelligentsia. These local coffee shops and related small roaster-retailers intend for their efforts and practices to articulate with those of their peers in the local food movement, even adapting one of the latter's key phrases, farm-to-table, to reflect their own trade jargon, calling it instead farm-to-cup (Gervin 2010).

From this same milieu of "coffee nerds," Jeff S. and Three Bears Coffee Company (TBCC) represent the latest local iteration in the evolution of counter-mass produced coffee and its interdigitation with the larger efforts toward building a viable local food economy. For our interview I met Jeff in his roasting shop, a small affair situated entirely within the upper half-story of his south Knoxville home. The space housed several large burlap sacks of green coffee beans and a nook for his U.S. made, three-kilo capacity roaster (more on this to come). In the neat and spare space of the large main room were a desk, a couch, a few stations for packaging his roasted coffees, and not much else. On one end was a small kitchen and a bathroom, and a wall of shelves full of supplies. Jeff grew up an only child surrounded by extended family on a farm in Blount County, to the immediate south of Knox County. He left home to attend college in middle Tennessee, where he intended to major in Middle Tennessee State University's music recording industry program. Finding he had less interest in the business and recording aspects of music than in music as an art and the craft of making musical instruments, he left the program to apprentice with Ron Gallagher, a

nationally renowned small-shop guitar maker. Of this experience, he recalls it as his introduction to "the idea of craftsmanship and quality hand-work. This was sort of the basis of everything to follow."

Life circumstances led him back to east Tennessee and eventually to Knoxville where he met his partner Kristen F. (profiled in chapter 1). Kristen's involvement in the local food movement captured his interest. Upon expressing an interest in coffee, Kristen put Jeff in contact with a small producer in Nayarit, Mexico, Daniel. As described by Jeff: "He was basically an expat [who] had moved to Mexico, had discovered how coffee was traditionally processed or produced on a very small scale. Basically how the native people dealt with the coffee that grew around them. This is called natural process, or dry-process coffee." After a brief explanation of the patio drying process, he continued, "As you can imagine, from a farming perspective—to be able to experience that, at source, was extraordinary to him, and he was compelled to start his own little business. Now, his background as a hippie expat in Mexico facilitated his notion of the ease of business." Jeff goes on to describe the influence of Daniel's operation:

> What he was doing was fascinating to me from a social and economic perspective as well. He lives in Mexico in a small village. Coffee as it's processed in this old way is more labor intensive but less capital intensive. So you're not as beholden to mills, what are known as wet-mills. Most cooperative organizations in the world of coffee are established around equipment—a mill—that can process coffee. He was less encumbered by that and as a result of offering a premium product, he indicated that most of the proceeds, which were higher anyway

> because he was asking a premium for the product—more of that was staying in the village. The reason being that it employs more people . . . So all of that was very intriguing to me too, because I thought, especially growing up on a farm, well, that's pretty great! That puts people a whole lot closer to the revenue stream, and that's a big plus.

This fascination led Jeff to start buying coffee directly from Daniel, which quickly morphed into a buying club.

His relationship with Daniel continued to grow until Jeff was invited to visit him in Mexico on the occasion of the village's *coronacion* observance. Jeff and Kristen stayed with a host family while in the village (not a resort, he is compelled to stress) and as Jeff describes the experience:

> The whole thing was amazing to me. The culture was amazing. The work they were doing down there was really amazing to me. The curtain was pulled back and I was like, "Oh man!" I had just never considered all of this aspect. So down there I started to formulate an idea. I'll honestly say my original thought in this was to very directly help him expand his market . . . But he had no intention of expanding his market. And the reasons are based in scale. He does really pretty well with the amount of business that he does, and to do more, for better or for worse, is more trouble for him and he'd rather not.

Contemplating how the visit galvanized his own resolve, he continues:

> One of the things in going down there and seeing that was . . . I started realizing, 'hey wait, I bet other people are doing this all over the world. This can't be unique' . . . From there I just started putting the pieces together. Quite literally it was, 'Well, I wonder how people do this?' and I'd do a little research and figure it out, all the way down to finding a company that made coffee roasters.

And in such a way was TBCC launched in 2011.

Jeff's business approach was from the beginning conceptualized as a small and slow affair. Not having the capital to rent a brick-and-mortar shop space and storefront, Jeff took the increasingly common route of fashioning a food truck (covered in detail in the chapter 3) and setting up at the weekly downtown farmers market (MSFM, discussed in chapter 1) to sell coffee by the cup directly to customers. He soon expanded into the wholesale of roasted whole coffee beans to a handful of local food purveyors, including his partner Kristen's downtown food shop (Just Ripe) and Knoxville's oldest local, organic grocery, the cooperatively structured Three Rivers Market (both profiled in chapter 1). Other local businesses have since started buying TBCC coffees and adopted it as their own in-house brew of choice. Like other small local producers featured in this research, Jeff relies primarily on word-of-mouth and social media as his two principle marketing devices. As he explains, "I really don't focus so much on marketing, which is probably to the detriment of the overall business, but I have proceeded with the idea that I need to always make sure that the product is quality."

Jeff is passionate about coffee and a consummate student of its history, culture (in both an agricultural and anthropological sense), and politics. Jeff, with some exceptions, fits the general demographic and social profile of the Midwestern craft roasters at the center of Molly Doane's (2010) study of "relationship coffees." These roasters tended to be, in Doane's words,

> thirty to forty-something men . . . all at the very least college educated, some with advanced degrees . . . Coffee roasters tended to like the coffeehouse culture, to be

> inquiring and educated, and to enjoy a certain amount of adventure . . . They are innovative, risk taking individuals with a strong belief in the power of personal efficacy to change the world (235).

Citing Roseberry's study (1996, above), Doane likewise confirms his observation of a generally prevailing pattern of specialty roasters as industry neophytes. While this may be statistically borne out, specialty roasters bring to the industry a new kind of historical sensibility that attempts to reposition coffee as more than a mere commodity. Importantly, it is often understood as a product with a problematic history that necessarily informs the roasters' relationship to it. This is often a relationality that seeks to ameliorate or otherwise mitigate the inequalities and injustices that adhere in the residues of coffee's colonial past. For as Michael D. Smith (1996) notes, "The cultural meaning of coffee cannot be dissociated from its place within the history European overseas expansion, conquest, and colonization." "Indeed," he continues, "it is arguable that it is precisely in the quotidian objects of everyday life—coffee, chocolate, tea—that imperialism insinuated itself into the popular imagination" (515).

As Jeff articulates his motivations as a roaster-retailer, "Ultimately, to be able to take any given dollar spent on a cup of coffee and to let that pass through peoples hands that are doing good work was really key to me." In a more studied assessment, he states,

> The people who consume the world's coffee are the well-to-do nations . . . These are places that do not grow coffee. That means their demand for that crop is having effects in the places where it does grow. And almost universally the places where it does grow are challenged by economic drivers. It sounds like if you're

> sitting on a crop of coffee you ought to be doing great! It doesn't work out that way. And there are social drivers too, because there is political, racial upheaval. So coffee can be misused; but it can also be a bootstrap for these people, wherever they are. Rwanda is a good example. I get coffee from a big coop in Rwanda. Well, there is well-documented history of genocide and all the trouble that happened in Rwanda. So how do you come back after something like that? You have to figure out what's important and how you're going to grow . . . for better or worse, money's it. So how do you generate income?

It is instructive to consider this statement alongside one from a more academic register:

> World trade in coffee is overwhelmingly controlled by the New York and London futures markets, which determine global prices. The inevitable result of the price fluctuations endemic in this global marketplace is the serious consequences for the economies of producer nations, particularly those such as Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda, countries for whom coffee can represent up to 80 percent of total export earnings . . . When combined with the purchasing power wielded by the coffee 'roasters'—a small cluster of northern hemisphere multinational agro-food corporations (Nestle´, Philip Morris, Proctor & Gamble, Sara Lee) who control the overwhelming share of the global marketplace—the capacity of current conditions to perpetuate the longstanding structural inequalities in the international trade in coffee comes sharply into view (Lyons 2005: 19).

Jeff clearly displays a sophisticated understanding of the political economy of coffee similar to that of Lyons. While he sees himself and his business in oppositional relationality to the kinds of mega-roasters Lyons lists above, however, neither is he sanguine about current alternatives, particularly those

parading under the banner of direct trade. Recognizing the potential disingenuousness therein, Jeff excoriates such practices with a keen understand of the neocolonial structures they stand to reproduce. As he puts it, "There has been a big push for American, or developed world companies going to help people at source. I think that that can be a wonderful endeavor. I think that it can also be a thinly veiled excuse to go places and see people. At worst, it can be colonialism."

It is instructive to return to a phrase within Jeff's statement above for another dimension it reveals. This concerns his rather realist perspective on the necessity of money, "for better or worse." Such a sensibility recognizes certain structural realities which (for better or worse) shape and limit the nature of our participation in the world we have all inherited. Jeff's perspective, however, allows for agency to be affective even within such limits. This is akin to Jane Bennett's (2001) assertion, formulated amid contemplations of her own negotiations of the world wrought under the evolution of capitalism--"For me," she writes, "the issue is not whether to live with commodities but how to participate in commodity culture, for there is no vision of capitalist or noncapitalist economy today that does not include some role for the commodity form" (113). Again, as Jeff understands the recursivity of such a practicality as it manifests in his own endeavors as a small coffee roaster:

> We've got to have money to live, as do people everywhere else, but it's important for me to remember that my business, and whatever compensation I *glean* from my business, is rooted in my business's ability to help the whole chain. And it helps on both ends, because it helps the people—again if I sound like I'm being

> heavy on the folks that are growing coffee, it because they need it! The help that I offer to the people in my community here is they get a good cup of coffee. In America we have the luxury of picking and choosing like that. So that's what I look at Three Bears as doing—it's, hopefully a good turnstile for resources to get to people who are doing good stuff and who need it.

For Jeff and TBCC such expressions of solidarity with producer communities reticulate with comparable commitments at home. No small part of that commitment is edificatory. As Jeff states, "There's a lot of education that goes on in coffee culture now. [This] counterculture is real big on transparency and their supply chain, and to another purpose, in brewing methods and this kind of thing. All of that is good because it is informing people about what it is [we] are doing." It is also about drawing connections that resonate, through a process of translation, often through a kind of translocal analogy. In an illustrative example, Jeff discussed his efforts to de-mystify coffee for those who ask: "Coffee can grow in a natural understory. It looks kind of like rhododendron . . . I usually explain it to people—It's sort of like rhododendron around here. It's under the canopy, it's an understory type plant."

Mutuality transfers to Jeff's peer-to-peer relations as well. To dress up his by-the-cup coffees, Jeff, like Remedy Coffee, keeps a stock of locally sourced ingredients—cream from Cruze Farm, locally produced honey. On the other end of his production cycle, Jeff gives spent coffee grounds from his farmer's market sales to small-scale local mushroom growers, to use as a substrate for mushroom cultivation, which they can in turn either consume themselves or sell at the market. Such inter-relationality works at multiple scales, as Jeff explains:

> This is why I've really focused on local sales, I've really focused on around here for two reasons . . . I didn't want to be overwhelmed with . . . web sales, this and that, distribution, etc.—but also, because I want to favor my neighbors rather than those further flung. The further I've gotten into to business, I've realized that the ripple can go out without totally rocking my own boat. There are opportunities to do some of that a little further afield, but still, that's not as important to me as providing some worth here. I think it's kind of like—it's sort of backwards thinking—but it's sort of like I appreciate that people buy coffee from me because then I've got money to spend with them again. So it's less that I'm providing local products for Dale to use [of Dale's Fried Pies, see chapter 3], but I'm able to buy her pies! And that closed circuit is super important too.

As Jeff understands the larger machinations of such closed-loop relationships as they come to manifest across spatial boundaries:

> I think it's important to acknowledge that within your local community, the more content people are—I was going to say comfortable—but the more content people are, the better for the bunch. So the local economy is important because it's going to provide more contentment to those closer to you. It should anyway. And you can't totally know that that's happening when you start dealing with entities that are further flung that you really can't follow.

Conversely, he explains, on the other end of the coffee chain, (translocally): "From a local perspective, the way coffee cooperatives are organized, some of these groups or institutions are organized, that should be their primary motivating factor—helping to improve contentment, to draw the [connecting] line between the two."

After the recorded portion of our interview concluded, Jeff was excited to show me his roaster. In choosing it, he had employed the same kind of care and careful research that informs all of his decisions. In his research he stumbled upon a small fabricator in Oklahoma City specializing in beautifully crafted hand-machined roasters. They paid for his expenses one way to come visit their factory, he explained. He settled on the 3-kilo shop roaster, an impressive all stainless steel unit with more than a few decorative touches that dress it up. This machine is likely dwarfed by the industrial scale roasters across town in GMCR's 334,000 square foot facility at the Forks of the River Industrial Park. Before the recorder was turned off, the last question I asked Jeff was what he thought of GMCR and their presence in Knoxville. He answered:

> It's just a reality of the world that we're in. It doesn't affect me one iota! . . . Except as a—it functions a little as a barometer to me on the rest of the world . . . Knoxville's always been a market, and it always been very appealing toward much larger business. So JFG coffee started here . . . So why is Green Mountain even here? Well, it was made appealing—this is how municipal economies work in the national-global world now . . . I mean, Green Mountain is paving more roads around here than I am, revenue speaking. Is that good or bad? Hell, I don't know.

Such are the ambivalences that inevitably inform and unsettle the transparencies of trans-localism laboring in the shadows of the trans-national global economy.

Conclusions

Yes, When all the world from Paris to China,
Pays heed to your doctrine, O divine Saint-Simon,
The glorious Golden Age will be reborn.
Rivers will flow with chocolate and tea,
Sheep roasted whole will frisk on the plain,
And sautéed pike will swim in the Seine.
Fricasseed spinach will grow on the ground,
Garnished with crushed fried croutons;
The trees will bring forth stewed apples,
And farmers will harvest boots and coats.
It will snow wine, it will rain chickens,
And ducks cooked with turnips will fall from the sky.
~Langle & Vanderburch, *Louis-Bronze et le Saint-Simonien*
(Theatre du Palais Royale, February 27, 1832)

The above epigraph is taken from a footnote in Christian Thorne's (2003) essay on the apocalypse and the retro craze as the diagnostic antipodes of a postmodernist popular culture referentially grounded in an enabling simultaneity of a bleak and uncertain future and a more optimistic recent past. The poem was in turn extracted from Walter Benjamin's posthumously edited and published *Arcades Project*, considered by many to be one of the more incisive, if incomplete, early engagements with the processes of commodification and the instantiation of consumer culture. The poem's imagery invokes the medieval genesis of a humorously imagined utopia of abundance, plenty, and ease, where a poetics of virtuous gluttony and indulgence temporarily salved the more prosaic realities of scarcity and struggle. It represents an unbroken lineage of the popular imagination linking the *Land of Cockaigne*, as depicted in the famous 1567 painting by Pieter Breugel, to the "Big Rock Candy Mountain," a North American folk song written by Harry McClintock, first recorded in 1928 (Rammel 1990) and kept in circulation ever since in American popular culture, most

recently as featured in the Cohen Brothers film and accompanying soundtrack, *O' Brother Where Art Thou*.

What all of these depictions of the mythical land of plenty share in common is a magical ease in the acquisition of food and drink and the related desire to indulge in the sensory immediacy and convivial pleasures to be found uniquely therein. It is an old dream then—the community of abundance—one originating in the beleaguered imaginings of the toiling peasantry of Europe and extending to those of dispossessed hobos of an industrializing United States. As Graeber (2007) writes, "When peasants, craftsmen, and the urban poor tried to imagine a land in which all desires would be fulfilled, they tended to focus on the abundance of food." In such representations, he continues, "the predominant imagery always centers on sausages, hogsheads, legs of mutton, lard and tripes and tubs of wine" (69). Furthermore, as the basis for such real occasions as the excesses of carnival or the occasion for communal feasts, such tendencies were almost always expressed collectively. Such an exegesis points toward the singular power of food to serve as a nexus of unification and collectivity. Accordingly, food and farming have become ever-more visible vehicles for all manner of contemporary social (and alternative socio-economic) movement activity, a development exhibiting links to more general movement trends toward a networked transnational character. This nature is one that has sought to link varying trans-local struggles for food sovereignty and self determination with an accompanying critique of broader global economic processes whose ambitions for the consolidation of food production, distribution, and consumption are often articulated (sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly) as a unifying threat.

Indeed, Phillip McMichael (2000) suggests that food is among the most powerful forces inflecting contentious global politics and the hegemony of market fundamentalism in the contemporary world. He states that owing to this potential, "the power of the food question is imminent" (21). In order to understand the magnitude and implications of the food question, McMichael places the politics of food within a larger socio-political and historical context he calls "the crisis of development." In doing so, the current politics of food and food-centered movements can be seen as having developed along a parallel trajectory that directly challenges the market universalism of economic globalization (neoliberalism), a process that seeks to convert every facet of social life into a market segment amenable to capital colonization. Food (and the constellation of activities, institutions, and meanings that accompany it), long understood by social scientists as among the most fundamental, symbolically loaded, and tenacious of all cultural expressions, is perhaps thus uniquely positioned to resist to the impositions of external conditions that seek to subordinate choice, variety, and autonomy for an increasingly standardized and corporatized market in global food items. Indeed, as McMichael states, "for the majority of the world's population, food is not just an item of consumption, it's actually a way of life" (2000: 31-32). This positionality is hermeneutically situated by McMichael within a two-fold conceptualization of the crisis of development.

In the first of these parts, development is synonymous with the rise of national-level urban industrialization and its attendant modes of productive organization. As this regime was extended globally into the arena of agricultural

production, it came to mean the displacement of traditional food production processes and rural populations with large-scale industrial practices oriented toward an integrated market based on export agriculture and propelled by the forces of industrial rivalry (competition). This trend has translated into a process that subordinates not only culturally and ecologically embedded traditional farming practices and the localized socio-economic relations therein, but also and more fundamentally, local food sovereignty (understood as the ability to secure one's own sustenance through productive relations independent of the exigencies of global market demands). Secondly, as the credibility of national-level development has come under scrutiny, its continued expansion has simply been relocated to the transnational global arena and its primary agents—transnational corporations (TNCs), the WTO and its predecessor, the GATT, wherein agricultural production has been codified through such legal mechanisms as the Agreement on Agriculture and Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights. Transnational movement responses to these institutional developments in the evolution of developmentalist regime, argues McMichael, are the counter-expression of the crisis of development, and should be understood as equally constitutive.

Jaffee, Kloppenburg & Monroy (2004) similarly discuss the ways in which north/south linkages in alternative food production and distribution chains can be marshaled as a challenge to the global agribusiness paradigm. Looking specifically at the emergence and development of fair trade markets, the authors suggest that as an alternative market, fair trade seeks to instantiate a new moral economy to displace the inequalities attending the purely monetary market

calculus of the corporate global economy. Understood largely as a system that links producers of primary commodities in the global south with progressive or socially responsible consumers in the global north, the authors suggest that fair trade can be a more useful analytical construct if understood more broadly as it can be applied to alternative agro-food movements both within and across national borders. Accordingly, the authors examine north-north and south-south initiatives which, while embodying the principles and practices of fair trade, have not been conventionally understood as such. Included among such north-north initiatives are those linking disadvantaged, minority, or otherwise marginalized domestic producers of such items as seasonal vegetables, apples, cheese and dairy products, to desirous domestic markets. South-south initiatives seek a similar integration of primary producers with consumers who wish to enact solidarity through direct market relations.

Such movements for/toward food sovereignty are attempting to redefine the hegemonic discourse of market fundamentalism in terms that enable an expression of alternative moral and solidarity economies. It would seem that such movements share certain key characteristics—they are all seeking to assert autonomy in the arena food production and consumption; they are marshaling resources from within, seeking to resuscitate and/or sustain local productive capabilities and resources; they are enacting forms of solidarity that, while perhaps still grounded in market exchanges, attempt to recover a sense of grounded mutuality and interdependence. These are the very characteristics that have formed the basis of this project's examination of Knoxville, Tennessee's local food movement expressions. As the foregoing chapters illustrate, the

infrastructural nodes and secondary producers active in forging Knoxville's local food movement are negotiating the complex and interlinked terrain of a local/ global food dialectic in a spirit of cooperation and mutuality that goes beyond the instrumental market logic commonly believed to underwrite neoliberal subjectivity.

Furthermore, inasmuch as such subjectivities are commonly understood (in the analytics of neoliberalization) as interpellative formations emanating from a hegemonic, top-down neoliberal governmentality, projects such as those examined in this research support Barnett et al's counter-assertion that, "the key site of interventions into consumption are just as often the infrastructures of consumer choice as they are direct injunctions to individual consumers" (2008: 638). Therefore, one implication of these kinds of producer-led interventions is that while they may aspire toward re-shaping the possibilities of consumer action writ large through the development of alternative infrastructures of choice, they may nonetheless "be relatively indifferent to the subjective motivations of individual consumers" (638). Indeed, Dale M., in speaking of the affective dimensions adhering in the mutualistic practices of producers in Knoxville's local food networks stated that supporting her peers served as the principal motivation. "Surprisingly," she added, "I get very few people [consumers] asking me if stuff is local. Some people do. But it's not customer motivated primarily."

In reducing the significance of the motivations of such actors as diagnostic of the political rationality of a totalizing process of neoliberal subject formation, Barnett et al suggest that "what . . . gets lost is a 'range of normative rationales' that matter greatly to actors, as they are implicated in their commitments,

identities and ways of life" (640). Such rationales are central, they suggest, to a more nuanced understanding of contemporary expressions generally falling under the analytic of ethical consumerism. Utilizing Foucault's four-part model of "ethical problematization," the authors suggest that we can begin to uncover motivations and subjective praxes that render problematic many common exegeses of a derivative and monolithic neoliberal subjectivity. The first of these four elements is termed "ethical substance," a mode of moral conduct that, when refracted through the lens of ethical consumerism and alternative economies, renders choice not a mere conceit of market hegemony, but rather a critical node in the exercise of ethical judgment. Indeed, for many of the producers interviewed in the course of this research, choosing ethically-sourced inputs (and extending that choice to consumers) was framed as a central ethical imperative, one that stood to tip the scales of the global-industrial food system in favor of the local and the sustainable. The second element of ethical problematization was labeled by Foucault, "the mode of subjectivation," understood as "the way in which people are invited to recognize their moral obligations" (Foucault 1997, quoted in Barnett et al 2008: 641). In the arena of ethical consumption and production (and the solidarity economies realized therein), this translates as a kind of "consequentialist reasoning governed by the avoidance of harm or the alleviation of suffering to distant others" (641). Or, to restate a quote by Jeff S., who in elaborating his motivations stated, "It can be reduced to a simple, heart-felt axiom—am I doing the right thing?" The third element is "ethical work," or those actions undertaken toward the end of becoming ethical subjects, an element that is self-evident among those interviewed for this project. Finally, the

fourth element is identified as the "*telos* of ethical practice," or the "kind of self that the ethical subject wishes to become through this combination of actions" (642). Taken together, these elements constitute the process and practice of ethical problematization wherein "people are encouraged and empowered to problematize their own conduct, to make a project out of various aspects of their lives" (641).

Such a formulation articulates well with Sheri Ortner's (2006) attempts at working out a new role for a revised (and revitalized) practice theory, especially as it relates to the employment of agency as an analytic construct. As such Ortner distinguishes three areas of inquiry in which agency might be formulated, expressed, and negotiated. These are: 1. agency as an expression/practice of intentionality; 2. the cultural construction of agency; and 3. agency and power. She is primarily concerned with plumbing the implications of the latter—the interface of agency and power. Ortner begins by distinguishing two fields of meaning by which agency has been normally understood. In the first, typically articulating the agency-as-intentionality position, agency is understood as the "pursuit of (culturally defined) projects." In the second, agency is conceptualized as being principally about power. Agency, in Ortner's estimation however, never operates discreetly in one field or the other, and it is precisely in the dialectic of agency-as-project and agency-as-power that the concept's greatest potential lies. Using several ethnographic examples, as well as one textual one, Ortner illustrates this potential. Articulating something very similar to concepts of autonomy utilized by recent social movement theorists (but never using that term), Ortner asserts that agency-as-projects is a process by which self-

determination is negotiated, but always within a specific structural context that shapes the range of possibility. Again paralleling recent theorization on autonomy, Ortner writes, "the point of making the distinction between agency-in-the-sense-of-power and agency-in-the-sense-of-(the pursuit of) projects is that the first is organized around the axis of domination and resistance, and thus defined to a great extent by the terms of the dominant party, while the second is defined by local logics of the good and the desirable and how to pursue them" (145). Recognizing the political dimensions of agency-as-projects, in other words, requires the simultaneous recognition of the resistive agency embodied therein. Thus understood, resistance becomes ubiquitous, even within hegemonic structural constraints. The insight thereby yielded is articulated thusly by Ortner: "the entire domination/resistance dialectic itself makes sense as a clash of people's projects, their culturally constituted intentions, desires, and goals" (151). Indeed, one could say this conflict-of-projects (as in imposed vs. autochthonous) is precisely the idea articulated by many contemporary social movements themselves. Or as the Zapatista's have now famously stated (and as has been repeated by several other subsequent movements), what they are demanding is not a power-sharing arrangement, or a singular unifying community, but instead, "One world in which many worlds fit"—the right to pursue their own projects under conditions of their own choosing.

Such an agency-as-project can certainly be said to animate the small food business owners who were interviewed in the course of this research. Returning again to the example of Brooklyn-based chocolatiers, the Mast Brothers, their recently published "family cookbook" provides an autochthonous articulation of

the "intentions, desires, and goals" that guide their enterprise and shape the kind of artisanal politics expressed throughout this project. As the Mast brothers write,

> Early on, we knew that we were onto something. Something that had the potential to inspire and change the way a lot of people thought about chocolate, about food, about community engagement, and about building a business. We determined that great businesses are built on more than just outstanding products; they are built on an outstanding sense of culture and principles. So we set out to articulate our ideas, facilitating and guiding our growth, a principled growth (2013: 5).

These ideas are what the brothers further enumerate as "the seven crowns." They include: 1. "Love, respect, and serve family and community;" 2. "Master your craft;" 3. "Make everything delicious;" 4. "Waste nothing;" 5. "Connect customers to the source;" 6. "Innovate through simplicity;" and 7. "Be honest and transparent" (ibid). In such an articulation, one whose underlying concerns are widely shared among local food movement actors, economic imperatives are themselves actively redefined and re-embedded in a larger social and ethical matrix.

Similarly, in the interpellation of localist food movements, the socio-economic imperatives of such reckonings become subordinate to the processes of place-making, inasmuch as this is understood as a process that demands fidelity toward the particularities of the local (wherever that may be). That fidelity attains its ethical-political resonance among local alternative food movement participants as a commitment to cultivating the interlinkages and

interdependencies of community, conceptualized as the critical operative locus differentiating such projects from the structurally dominant global industrial food system. In such projects, community is a potential totality consciously juxtaposed to impersonal global economic forces, the homogenization of space, place, and taste, and the acceleration of time that renders enjoyment and conviviality less possible. Thus local food movement actors' deployment of community cannot be understood as a merely unreflexive, romantic, or nostalgic projection of some ideal type, or as an exclusive kind of defensive localism, but rather as reflective of the movement's demand for specificity, for a place-based, *trans*-local politics of self-determination. Thus, this dissertation acknowledges that while positive and negative forms of localism are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the former embodies tremendous possibilities in which a broader sense of place, one that perhaps expresses a new kind of socio-ecological understanding, is coupled with the ethical-political imperatives of mutualism which subordinate the more instrumental demands of conventional market logic.

Through a multi-sourced examination of the skills, knowledge, experiences, and perspectives of small, food-related business owners in Knoxville, Tennessee—and more specifically the affective networks and solidarity economies adhering therein—this project explored the possibilities that lie at the threshold of diverse solidarity economies and the attendant experience/ expression of an artisanal politics (as itself further indicative of symbolic and/or cultural economies). Such formations, as economic, political, social, and cultural formations, were examined precisely in their complex relationality to the conventional economic logics of globalization and neoliberal capitalism (i.e.,

profit maximization, cost-benefit, rational actor, etc.). They are also, however, possible only amid the proliferating cultural/symbolic economies increasingly characteristic of urbanized cultures of consumption in the global North. Thus exploring the implications of socio-economic formations at the intersection of solidarity and cultural/symbolic economies has been central to this project.

The research approach that guides this dissertation has been one that proceeds along a trajectory that actively parallels the formations that are the subject of study, one that embraces the "moral optimism of anthropology" and is guided by the inquiry: "What would it mean for our research and politics if instead of only paying attention to the power of capitalism and constraints on revolutionary transformation, we chose to work alongside our research subjects to help build shared knowledge around non-capitalism, help locate areas of convergence among different social actors for non-capitalist production, help tease out ideological lacunae, teach about, write and perform non-capitalist possibility?" (Shear & Burke 2013). Part of such an engagement has demanded the recognition that auto-ethnographically produced digital locations and productions, arguably the single most defining characteristic of cultural production in the contemporary era, are not only legitimate arenas for the collection of “data,” but are indeed essential to any anthropological project that seeks to replace the project of representation with a one of co-production.

In being so guided, the project seeks to realize a model of research suggested by David Graeber--one that "looks at those who are creating viable alternatives, try to figure out what might be larger implications of what they are (already) doing, and then offer those ideas back, not as prescriptions, but as

contributions, possibilites--as gifts" (2004: 12). Through shifting the focus of such a study from the consumer-subject to the producer-subject, the current project offers a heretofore under-explored point of entry and an anti-essentialist theoretical orientation that, taken together, yield a novel contribution to the literature on alternative economies, social movements, and the anthropology of food.

In so doing, this dissertation has sought to focus analytical attention on those quotidian and affective spaces and practices, enacted amid the "complex temporality of the present" (Smith 2013: 32), that bridge the abstract theoretical subject (in the form of the neoliberal subject) and the actuality of the lived experience of those who might be so classified. It is an effort to avoid the totalizing tendencies of pure theoretical constructions that too often, in the words of Jeffrey Stout, "end by explaining away, instead of entering into conversation with, nearly everything that real people think, say, and feel" (2005: 178). In other words, this dissertation has sought to problematize the intellectual project of theorizing an inexorable neoliberal present through an examination of the "structures of feeling" (Williams 1977) that animate small, food related business owners in their efforts to realize alternative econo-socialities (Gibson-Graham 2009) that transcend purely economistic rationalities precisely to the extent that they are expressions of a complex negotiation of the ethics of market engagement within a predominant neoliberal cultural/symbolic economic order. This research provides an account of those socio-economic and political ambitions, those networked affections that serve as primary motivation among actors in Knoxville's localist food movement, sentiments that mirror Jane Bennett's

assertion that "For me, the question is not whether to live with commodities but how to participate in commodity culture, for there is no vision of capitalist or noncapitalist economy today that does not include some role for the commodity form" (2001: 113).

As Barnett et al (2008) state of their own difficulties in locating the "elusive subject of neoliberalism," particularly as such a subjectivity might intersect with contemporaneous interpellations of ethical consumerism,

> When we talk to people about what they make of these injunctions to buy fair trade coffee or organic vegetables or boycott Nike or recycle their beer cans or wear white wristbands, we do not find heroically 'active' or 'creative' consumers or perfectly virtuous citizens. We find people with busy lives and torn loyalties and multiple commitments and scarce resources who do what they can, and who respond positively to initiatives to make them into more 'responsible consumers' when this can be made to fit into their ongoing elaborations of the self (649).

Such a statement has perhaps even greater resonance among producers of such initiatives, as these efforts are indeed central to their own "elaborations of the self" even while the limitations of such transformative personalistic projects are readily recognized. As Charlotte T. expresses the ambivalences and complexities that attend her own such efforts, "Weirdly, I equate my passion for local food to my religion. That's just what I inherently believe to be true. But I don't want to force it on other people—you kind of have to go where they are." Such negotiations, as structures of feeling, adhere "precisely [in] the precarious balance between the forces of structure and agency, between the forces of the

social process and the willing, intending, experiencing subject" (Best 2012: 194). In Knoxville's localist food movements, one manifestation of such a balancing are the efforts of local producers in realizing affective linkages that attempt to revive the moral economies of place(s). As Jeff S. states of his personal commitment to such an experiment, "One of my big personal goals is to be a good individual, because a good community is made up of good individuals." Indeed, this dissertation has argued that it is precisely this affective ethical dimension that, more than any other single element, defines the communities of abundance that Knoxville's localist food producers are striving to realize.

Bibliography

Adam, Katherine L. 2006. Community Supported Agriculture. *ATTRA—National Sustainable Agriculture Information Service*.

Adema, Pauline. 2000. Vicarious Consumption: Food, Television and the Ambiguity of Modernity. *Journal of American Culture* 23 (3): 113-123.

Aleman, Stephanie W. 2012. Technology, Representation, and the "E-thropologist:" *In Human No More: Digital Subjectivities, Unhuman Subjects, and the End of Anthropology*, edited by Neil L. Whitehead & Michael Wesch. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Alkon, Allison Hope. 2008. From Value to Values: Sustainable Consumption At Farmer's Markets. *Agriculture and Human Values* 25: 487-498.

----------. 2012. *Black, White, & Green: Farmer's Markets, Race, and The Green Economy*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Disjuncture and Difference in Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture, and Society* Vol. 7: 295-310.

----------. 1996. *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bacon, Christopher M., V. Ernesto Mendez, Stephen R. Gliessman, David Goodman, & Jonathan A. Fox. 2008. *Confronting the Coffee Crisis: Fair Trade, Sustainability Livelihoods and Ecosystems in Mexico and Central America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Banker, Mark T. 2010. *Appalachians All: East Tennessee and the Elusive History of an American Region*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Barlow, Jeremy Chase. 2013/2011. *Chefs Can Save the World: How to Green Restaurants and Why They Are Key to Renewing the Food System*. Copyright by author.

Barnett, Clive, Nick Clarke, Paul Cloke, and Alice Malpass. 2008. The Elusive Subjects of Neoliberalism: Beyond the Analytics of Governmentality. *Cultural Studies* 22 (5): 624-653.

Beall, Sam. 2012. *The Foothills Cuisine of Blackberry Farm: Recipes and Wisdom From Our Artisans, Chefs, and Smoky Mountain Ancestors*. New York: Clarkson-Potter.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. New Delhi: Sage.

Bello, Walden. 2000. Building An Iron Cage: Bretton Woods Institutions, The WTO, and The South. In *Views From the South: The Effects of Globalization and The WTO on Third World Countries* edited by Sarah Anderson. Oakland, CA: Institute For Food and Development Policy.

Beriss, David & David Sutton, eds. 2007. *The Restaurants Book: Ethnographies Of Where We Eat*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Belasco, Warren J. 2007 (1989). *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Berardi, Franco "Bifo." 2009. *The Soul at Work: From Alienation to Autonomy*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Berry, Wendell. 1972. The Regional Motive. In *A Continuous Harmony: Essays Cultural and Agricultural*, Wendell Berry. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Besky, Sarah. 2010. Colonial Pasts and Fair Trade Futures: Changing Modes of Production and Regulation on Darjeeling Tea Plantations. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon & Mark Moberg, 97-122. New York: New York University Press.

Best, Beverley. 2012. Raymond Williams and the Structure of Feeling in Reality TV. *International Journal of Humanities of Social Science* 2 (7): 192-201.

Bestor, Theodore C. 2004. *Tsukiji: The Fish Market at the Center of the World*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Binkley, Sam. 2009. The Bohemian Habitus: New Social Theory and Political Consumerism. In *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*, edited by Kate Soper, Martin Ryle & Lyn Thomas, 1-24. Basingstroke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Birchall, Johnston. 1994. *Co-op: The People's Business*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.

Black, Rachel E. 2012. *Porta Palazzo: The Anthropology of an Italian Market*. Philadelphia: University Pennsylvania Press.

Bohme, Gernot. 2003. Contribution to the Critique of the Aesthetic Economy. *Thesis Eleven* 73: 71-82.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984 (1979). *Distinction: A Social Critiques of the Judgment of Taste*. New York: Rutledge Kegan & Paul.

Braverman, Harry. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degredation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Butera, Steve. 2012 (May 24). Knoxville Based Marble City Brewing Company Is now Saw Works Brewing Company. *WBIR.com* [web post]. Retrieved From: http://www.wbir.com/news/article/220834/2/Knoxville-based-Marble-City-Brewing-Company-is-now-Saw-Works-Brewing-Company.

Carlsson, Chris & Francesca Manning. 2010. Nowtopia: Strategic Exodus? *Antipode* 42 (4): 924-953.

Carroll, Glen R. & Anand Swaminathan. 2000. Why the Microbrewery Movement?: Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry. *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (3): 716-752.

Center for Cooperatives, University of Wisconsin (UWCC). ND. Cooperatives in the U.S. Madison, WS: UWCC online: [http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/whatisacoop/History/].

Chambers, Clarke A. 1962. The Cooperative League of the United States of America, 1916-1961: A Study of Social Theory and Social Action. *Agricultural History* 36 (2): 59-81.

Cohen, Lizabeth. 2003. *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Post-War America*. New York: Vintage Books.

Coles, Benjamin & Philip Crang. 2011. Placing Alternative Consumption: Commodity Fetishism in Borough Fine Foods Market, London. In *Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Tania Lewis & Emily Potter, 87-102. London & New York: Routledge.

Cone, Cynthia Abbot & Ann Kakaliouras. 1995. Community Supported Agriculture: Building Moral Community or an Alternative Consumer Choice. *Culture & Agriculture* 15 (51-52): 28-31.

Crewe, Louise & Jonathan Beaverstock. 1998. Fashioning the City: Cultures of Consumption in Contemporary Urban Spaces. *Geoforum* 29 (3): 287-308.

Crowther, Gillian. 2013. *Eating Culture: An Anthropological Guide to Food*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Curl, John. 2010. The Cooperative Movement in Century 21. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4 (1): 12-29.

Day, Richard J.F. 2005. *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.

de Geus, Marius. 2009. Sustainable Hedonism: The Pleasures of Living Within Environmental Limits. In *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*, edited by Kate Soper, Martin Ryle & Lyn Thomas, 1-24. , Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

de La Pradelle, Michele. 2006 (1996). *Market Day in Provence*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

de Peuter, Greig & Nick Dyer-Witheford. 2010. Commons and Cooperatives. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4 (1): 30-56.

DeLind, Laura B. & Anne E. Ferguson. 1999. Is This a Women's Movement?: The Relationship of Gender to Community-Supported Agriculture in Michigan. *Human Organization* 58 (2): 190-200.

Deresiewicz, William. 2011. "Generation Sell." *The New York Times*, November 12.

Deutsch, Tracey. 2010. *Building a Housewife's Paradise: Gender, Politics, and American Grocery Stores in the Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Dickens, Peter. 1996. *Reconstructing Nature: Alienation, Emancipation, and the Division of Labour*. London & New York: Routledge.

Doane, Molly. 2010. Relationship Coffees: Structure and Agency in the Fair Trade System. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon & Mark Moberg, 229-257. New York: New York University Press.

Dolan, Catherine S. 2010. Fractured Ties: The Business of Development in Kenyan Fair Trade Tea. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon & Mark Moberg, 147-175. New York: New York University Press.

Dorst, John. 1989. *The Written Suburb: An American Site, An Ethnographic Dilemma*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dunaway, Wilma. 2001. "The Double Register of History: Situating the Forgotten Woman and Her Household in Capitalist Commodity Chains." *Journal of World Systems Research* VII (I): 2-29.

DuPuis, Melanie E. & David Goodman. 2005. Should We Go "Home" to Eat?: Toward a Reflexive Politics of Localism. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21: 359-371.

Dyer-Witheford, Nick. 1999. *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle In High-Technology Capitalism*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Edge, John T. 2012. *The Truck Food Cookbook: 150 Recipes and Ramblings From America's Best Restaurants on Wheels*. New York: Workman Publishing

Escobar, Arturo. 1999. After Nature: Steps to an Antiessentialist Political Ecology. *Current Anthropology* 40 (1): 1-30.

----------. 2001. Culture Sits in Places: Reflections on Globalism and Subaltern Strategies of Localization. *Political Geography* 20: 139-174.

Fanorow, Wendy. 2011. Is Food the New Indie Rock?

Feagan, Robert & Amanda Henderson. 2009. Devon Acres CSA: local struggles In a global food system. *Agriculture and Human Values* 26: 203-217.

Featherstone, Mike. 2011. Foreword. In *Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Tania Lewis & Emily Potter, xvii-xxviii. London & New York: Routledge.

Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.

Flack, Wes. 2009. American Microbreweries and Neolocalism: "Ale-ing" for A Sense of Place. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 16 (2): 37-53.

Frank, Thomas. 1997. *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, And the Rise of Hip Consumerism*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Franklin, Dana Kopp. 2012 (Oct. 1). Chef Jeremy Barlow to Shut Down Tayst at End of Year. *Nashville Scene* [web log post]. Retrieved from: http://www.nashvillescene.com/bites/archives/2012/10/01/chef-jeremy-barlow-to-shut-down-tayst-at-end-of-year.

Freeman, Carla. 2007. The "Reputation" of Neoliberalism. *American Ethnologist* 34 (2): 252-267.

Gagne, Nana Okura. 2011. Eating Local in a U.S. City: Reconstructing Community—a third place—in a Global Neoliberal Economy. *American Ethnologist* 38 (2): 281-293.

Gervin, Cari Wade. 2010 (December 15). Revenge of the Knoxville (Coffee) Nerds. *Metro Pulse* [web article]. Retrieved from: www.metropulse.com /news/2010/dec/15/revenge-knoxville-coffee-nerds/.

----------. 2012 (June 27). Knoxville's New Wave of Food Trucks. *Metro Pulse* [web article]. Retrieved from:www.metropulse.com /news/2012/jun/27/knoxvilles-new-wave-food-trucks/.

Gibson, George R. N.D. Gourd Banjos: From Africa to the Appalachians. *David Hyatt: The (Almost) Definitive History of Gourd Banjos* [web article]. Retrieved from: www.dhyatt.com/history_4_frontier.html.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2003. Enabling Ethical Economies: Cooperativism and Class. *Critical Sociology* 29 (2): 123-161.

----------. 2008. Diverse Economies: Performative Practices for Other Worlds. *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (5): 1-20.

----------. 2009. "An Economic Ethics for the Anthropocene." *Antipode* 41 (S1): 320-346.

Giddens, Anthony. 1999. Risk and Responsibility. *Modern Law Review* 62 (1): 1-10.

Glock, Allison. 2012. Meet the Locals: Knoxville. *Garden & Gun* (August/ September) [available online]. Retrieved from: http://gardenandgun.com/article/meet-locals-knoxville.

Goodman, David. 2008. The International Coffee Crisis: A Review of the Issues. In *Confronting the Coffee Crisis: Fair Trade, Sustainable Livelihoods and Ecosystems in Mexico and Central America*, edited by Christopher M. Bacon et al., 3-26. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gorz, Andre. 1999. *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Wage-Based Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Graeber, David. 2004. *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

----------. 2007a. The Very Idea of Consumption: Desire, Phantasms, and the Aesthetics of Destruction from Medieval Times to the Present. In *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire*, David Graeber, 57-84. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

----------. 2007b. The Twilight of Vanguardism. In *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire*, David Graeber, 301-311. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

----------. 2007c. Social Theory as Science and Utopia: Or, Does the Prospect of a General Sociological Theory Still Mean Anything in the Age of

Globalization? In *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire*, David Graeber, 313-328. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Grandin, Greg. 2006. Your Americanism and Mine: Americanism and Anti-Americanism in the Americas. *American Historical Review* (October): 1042-1066.

Gross, Joan. 2009. "Capitalism and its Discontents: Back-to-the-Lander and Freegan Foodways in Rural Oregon." *Food and Foodways* 17 (2): 57-79.

Guthman, Julie. 2002. Commodified Meanings, Meaningful Commodities: Re-thinking Production-Consumption Links Through the Organic System Of Provision. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42 (4): 295-311.

----------. 2003. Fast Food/Organic Food: Reflexive Tastes and the Making of 'Yuppie Chow.' *Social & Cultural Geography* 4 (1): 45-58.

----------. 2004. *Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

----------. 2008. Neoliberalism and the Making of Food Politics in California. *Geoforum* 39: 1171-1183.

Haley, Andrew P. 2011. *Turning the Tables: Restaurants and the Rise of the American Middle Class*, 1880-1920. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Ham, Abby. 2013. Your Stories: The JFG Family. WBIR.com [online]. Retrieved from: http://archive.wbir.com/rss/article/126396/2/Your Stories-The-JFG-Family.

Hamilton, Lisa M. 2002. The American Farmer's Market. *Gastronomica* 2 (3): 73-77.

Hansen, Signe. 2008. Society of the Appetite: Celebrity Chefs Deliver Consumers. *Food, Culture, and Society* 11 (1): 49-67.

Harrington, Carly. 2010. Tomato Head's Mahasti Vafaie: Leading with her heart. *Knoxvillebiz.com* [online]. Retrieved from: http://ht.ly/2dSQa%29.

Harvey, David. 1993. From Space to Place and Back Again: Reflections on The Condition of Postmodernity. In *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, edited by Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, Tim Putnam, George Robertson, and Lisa Tickner, 3-29. London & New York: Routledge.

Hayes, Shannon. 2010. *Radical Homemakers: Reclaiming Domesticity From a*

Consumer Culture. Richmondville, NY: Left to Wright Press.

Heath, Deborah & Anne Meneley. 2007. Techne, Technoscience, and the Circulation of Comestible Commodities. *American Anthropologist* 109 (4): 593-602.

Heller, Chaia. 2006. Post-Industrial 'Quality Agricultural Discourse:' Techniques of Governance and Resistance in the French Debate Over GM Crops. *Social Anthropology* 14 (3): 319-334.

Hinrichs, C. Clare. 2000. Embeddedness and Local Food Systems: notes of two Types of of direct agriculture market. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16: 295-303.

----------. 2003. The Practice and Politics of Food System Localization. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19: 33-45.

Holloway, John. 2002/2005. *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London & Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.

Holloway, Pippa, ed. 2008. *Other Souths: Diversity & Difference in the U.S. South, Reconstruction to the Present*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Holt-Gimenez, Eric. 2009. From Food Crisis to Food Sovereignty: The Challenge of Social Movements. *Monthly Review*, July/August 2009.

Holtzman, Ben, Craig Hughes, & Kevin Van Meter. 2007. "Do It Yourself . . . and the Movement Beyond Capitalism." Pp. 44-61 in *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations/Collective Theorization*, edited by Stevphen Shukaitis & David Graeber. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.

Howard, J. 2010. Solidarity Food Cooperatives? *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4 (1): 151-154.

Isenhour, Cindi. 2010. Building Sustainable Societies: A Swedish Case Study on The Limits of Reflexive Modernization. *American Ethnologist* 37 (3): 511-525.

Jacobsen, Rowan. 2013. From Farm to Table. *Orion* (November/December): 18-25.

Jaffe, Daniel, Jack Kloppenburg Jr., & Mario B. Monroy. 2004. Bringing the Moral Charge Home: Fair Trade Within the North and Within the South.

Rural Sociology 69 (2): 169-196.

Jaffe, Daniel. 2007. *Brewing Justice: Fair Trade Coffee, Sustainability, and Survival*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jaffe, Joann & Michael Gertler. 2006. Victual Vicissitudes: Deskilling and the (Gendered) Transformation of Food Systems. *Agriculture and Human Values* 23: 143-162.

Johnston, Josee & Shyon Baumann. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction In the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York & London: Routledge.

Jones, Lu Ann. 2008. Gender, Race, and Itinerant Commerce in the Rural New South. In *Other Souths: Diversity & Difference in the U.S. South, Reconstruction to Present*, edited by Pippa Holloway, 67-87. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2008. *Networking Futures: The Movements Against Corporate Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kanna, Ahmed. 2010. "Flexible Citizenship in Dubai: Neoliberal Subjectivity in The Emerging 'City-Corporation.'" *Cultural Anthropology* 25 (1): 100-129.

Katsiaficas, George. 1998. *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Katz, Sandor Ellix. 2006. *The Revolution Will Not Be Microwaved: Inside America's Underground Food Movements*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Ketchum, Cheri. 2005. The Essence of Cooking Shows: How the Food Network Constructs Consumer Fantasies. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 29 (3): 217-234.

Klinger-Vertabedian, Laurel & Robert A. Vertabedian. 1992. Media and Discourse in the Twentieth Century Coffeehouse Movement. *Journal of Popular Culture* 26 (3): 211-218.

Lawless, Greg. 2003. Historic Foundations of Cooperative Philosophy. UWCC/*University of Wisconsin Extension: Bulletin No. 7.*

Leissle, Kristy. 2013. Invisible West Africa: The Politics of Single Origin Chocolate. *Gastronomica* 13 (3): 22-31.

Lepore, Meredith. 2011. Here's How Wal-Mart Became the #1 Grocery Store

In the Country. *Business Insider* [online]. Retrieved from: http://www.businessinsider.com/walmart-biggest-supermarket-2011-2?op=1.

Levenstein, Harvey A. 1988. *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Tania & Emily Potter, eds. 2011. *Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction*. New York & London: Routledge.

Liechty, Mark. 2005. Carnal Economies: The Commodification of Food and Sex In Kathmandu. *Cultural Anthropology* 20 (1): 1-38.

Lind, David & Elizabeth Barham. 2004. The Social Life of a Tortilla: Food, Cultural Politics and Contested Commodification. *Agriculture and Human Values* 21: 47-60

Linebaugh, Peter. 2008. *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

----------. 2010. "'All For One and One For All:' Some Principles of the Commons." Counterpunch [online]. Retreived from: http://www.counterpunch.org/ linebaugh01082010.htm.

Livingston, Tamara E. 1999. Music Revivals: Towards a General Theory. *Ethnomusicology* 43 (1): 66-85.

Lyon, Sarah & Mark Moberg. 2010. *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*. New York: New York University Press.

Lyons, James. 2005. 'Think Seattle, Act Globally:' Specialty Coffee, commodity Biographies and the promotion of place. *Cultural Studies* 19 (1): 14-34.

Luttinger, Nina & Gregory Dicum. 2006. *The Coffee Book: Anatomy of an Industry from Crop to the Last Drop*. New York & London: The New Press.

Maeckelbergh, Marianne. 2009. *The Will of the Many: How the Alterglobalization Movement is Changing the Face of Democracy*. London & New York: Pluto Press.

Mast, Rick & Michael. 2013. *Mast Brothers Chocolate: A Family Cookbook*. New York, Boston, & London: Little, Brown, and Company.

Matthews, Glenna. 1987. *"Just a Housewife:" The Rise and Fall of Domesticity In America*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McClary, Ben Harris. 2009. George Washington Harris. In The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History and Culture, Version 2.0 [online]. Retrieved From: http://tennesseeencyclopedia.net/entry.php?rec=607.

McKay, George. 1998. DiY Culture: Notes Toward an Intro. In *DiY Culture: Party & Protest in Nineties Britain*, edited by George McKay, 1-53. London: Verso Press.

McMichael, Phillip. 2000. The Power of Food. *Agriculture and Human Values* 17: 21-33.

McNamee, Thomas. 2007. *Alice Waters & Chez Panisse: The Romantic, Impractical, Often Eccentric, Ultimately Brilliant Making of a Food Revolution*. New York: Penguin.

Meneley, Anne. 2007. Like an Extra-Virgin. *American Anthropologist* 109 (4): 678-687.

Miele, Mara & Jonathan Murdoch. 2002. The Practical Aesthetics of Traditional Cuisines: Slow Food in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42 (4): 312-328.

Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labor*. London: Zed Books.

Miller, Ethan. 2013 (forthcoming). Community Economy: Ontology, Ethics, And Politics for Radically-Democratic Economic Organizing. *Rethinking Marxism*.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mintz, Sidney. 1979. Time, Sugar, and Sweetness. *Marxist Perspectives* 2: 56-73.

----------. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin Books.

Mitchell, Stacy. 2006. *Big-Box Swindle: The True Cost of Mega-Retailers and The Fight for America's Independent Businesses*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Moberg, Mark & Sarah Lyon. 2010. What's Fair? The Paradox of Seeking Justice Through Markets. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Lyon & Moberg, 1-24. New York: New York University Press.

Moor, Liz & Jo Littler. 2008. Fourth Worlds and Neo-Fordism: American

Apparel and the Cultural Economy of Consumer Anxiety. *Culture Studies* 22 (5): 700-723.

Murphy, Patrick. 1992. Rethinking the Relations of Nature, Culture, and Agency. *Environmental Values* 1: 311-320.

Mutersbaugh, Tad. 2008. Serve and Certify: Paradoxes of Service Work in Organic Coffee Certification. In *Confronting the Coffee Crisis: Fair Trade, Sustainable Livelihoods and Ecosystems in Mexico and Central America*, edited by Christopher M. Bacon et al., 261-288. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nash, June. 1989. "Nonwage Work and the Crisis of Capitalism." *Anthropology of Work Review* X (1): 5-10.

Neely, Jack. 1998. *Secret History II: Stories About Knoxville, Tennessee*. Knoxville, TN: Scruffy City Publishing.

Neely, Jack. 2009. *Market Square: A History of the Most Democratic Place On Earth*. Knoxville, TN: Market Square District Association.

Neustadt, Kathy. 1994. The Folkloristics of Licking. *The Journal of American Folklore*. 107 (423): 181-196.

Ortner, Sherry B. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and The Acting Subject*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Osterweil, Michael and Graeme Chesters. 2007. "Global Uprisings: Towards a Politics of the Artisan." In *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorizations*, edited by Stevphen Shukaitis & David Graeber, 253-262. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Page, Linda Garland & Eliot Wiggington, eds. 1984. *The Foxfire Book of Appalachian Cookery: Regional Memorabilia and Recipes*. New York: E.P. Dutton, Inc.

Papavasiliou, Faidre. 2010. Fair Money, Fair Trade: Tracing Alternative Consumption in a Local Currency Economy. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon & Mark Moberg, 202-228. New York: New York University Press.

Parkins, Wendy & Geoggrey Craig. 2011. Slow Living and the Temporalities of Sustainable Consumption. In *Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Tania Lewis & Emily Potter, 189-201. London & New York: Routledge.

Paxson, Heather. 2005. Slow Food in a Fat Society: Satisfying Ethical Appetites. *Gastronomica* 5 (1): 14-18.

----------. 2008. "Post-Pasteurian Cultures: The Microbiopolitics of Raw Milk Cheese in the United States." *Cultural Anthropology* 23 (1): 15-47.

----------. 2010. Locating Value in Artisan Cheese: Reverse Engineering *Terrior* in New-World Landscape. *American Anthropologist* 112 (3): 444-457.

----------. 2013. *The Life of Cheese: Crafting Food and Value in Americ*a. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Peacock, James L. 2005. The South and Grounded Globalism. In *The American South in a Global World*, edited by James L. Peacock, Harry L. Watson, And Carrie Matthews, 265-276. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

----------. 2007. *Grounded Globalism: How the U.S. South Embraces the World*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Pellow, David N., Allan Schnaiberg, & Adam S. Weinberg. 1999. Putting the Ecological Modernization Theory to the Test: The Promise and Performance of Urban Recycling. In *Ecological Modernization Around The World: Perspectives and Critical Debates*, edited by Arthur P.J. Mol & David A. Sonnenfeld, 109-137. Ilford (UK) & Portland, OR: Frank Cass & Co.

Pendergrast, Mark. 1999. *Uncommon Grounds: The History of Coffee and How It Transformed Our World*. New York: Basic Books.

Petrini, Carlo, ed. 2001. *Slow Food: Collected Thoughts on Taste, Tradition, And the Simple Pleasures of Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Pierce, Dan. 2009. Great Smoky Mountains National Park. In *The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History of Culture, Version 2.0* [online]. Retrieved from http://tennesseeencyclopedia.net/entry.php?rec=570.

Polanyi, Karl. 2001 (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Out Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Pole, Antoinette & Margaret Gray. 2013. Farming Alone?: What's up with the "C" in community supported agriculture. *Agriculture & Human Values* 30: 85-100.

Pollan, Michael. 2006. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin Press.

Poppen, Jeff. 2012 (Oct. 2). CSA Beginnings at Long Hungry Creek Farm. *The Barefoot Farmer* [web log post]. Retrieved from: http://www.barefootfarmer.com/?s=our+CSA.

Raynolds, Laura T. 2000. Re-embedding Global Agriculture: The International Organic and Fair Trade Movements. *Agriculture & Human Values* 17: 297-309.

Reece, Eric. 2009. "The New Old-Fashionism." *Orion* (September/October): 80-82.

Reed-Danahay, Deborah E. 1997. *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and The Social*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Reid, Herbert & Betsy Taylor. 2010. *Recovering the Commons: Democracy, Place, and Global Justice*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Robbins, Richard H. 2005. *Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism, Third Edition*. Boston, New York, and San Francisco: Pearson.

Romine, Scott. 1999. *The Narrative Forms of Southern Community*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Roseberry, William. 2005. The Rise of Yuppie Coffees and the Reimagination Of Class in the United States. In *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*, edited by James L. Watson & Melissa L. Caldwell, 122-143. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Routledge, Paul. 2005. "Grassrooting the Imaginary: Acting with the Convergence." *Ephemera* 5(4): 615-628.

Roy, Arundhati. 2009. "Introduction: Democracy's Failing Light." In *Listening to Grasshoppers*, Arundhati Roy. New York: Penguin Books.

Rozzo, Mark. 2012. American Eden. *Town & Country* (October): 106-114.

Ruhlman, Michael. 2006. *The Reach of a Chef: Professional Cooks in the Age Of Celebrity*. New York: Penguin.

Ryle, Martin. 2009. The Past, The Future and the Golden Age: Some Contemporary Versions of Pastoral. In *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*, edited by Kate Soper, Martin Ryle & Lyn Thomas, 1-24. Basingstroke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Sanders, Scott Russell. 1999. Setttling Down. In *At Home in Nature: Becoming Native to Our Place*, edited by David Landis Barnhill, 77-92. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sassatelli, Robert & Federica Davolio. 2010. Consumption, Pleasure, and Politics: Slow Food and the Politico-Aesthetic Problematization of Food. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10 (2): 202-232.

Schlosser, Eric. 2002. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All American Meal. New York*: Perennial (Harper Collins).

Schnell, Steven M. & Joseph E. Reese. 2003. Microbreweries as Tools of Local Identity. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 21 (1): 45-69.

Schnell, Steven M. 2007. Food with a Farmer's Face: Community Supported Agriculture in the United States. *Geographical Review* 97 (4): 550-564.

Seager, Joni. 2003. Rachel Carson Died of Breast Cancer: The Coming of Age of Feminist Environmentalism. *Signs* 28 (3): 945-972.

Selfa, Theresa & Joan Qazi. 2005. Place, Taste, or Face-to-Face?: Understanding Producer-Consumer Networks in 'Local' Food System in Washington State. *Agriculture and Human Values* 22: 451-464.

Seyfang, Gill. 2009. Growing Sustainable Consumption Communities: The Case Of Local Organic Food Networks. In *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*, edited by Kate Soper, Martin Ryle & Lyn Thomas, 1-24. Basingstroke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Shear, Boone & Brian Burke. 2013. Beyond Critique. Posted in *Beyond Capitalism*, a special *In Focus* section of *Anthropology News*: [Url: http://www.anthropology-news.org/index.php/2013/01/10/beyond-critique/].

Shukaitis, Stevphen & David Graeber, eds. 2007. *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations/Collective Theorization*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Siu, Lok. 2013. Twenty-First-Century Food Trucks: Mobility, Social Media, And Urban Hipness. In *Eating Asian America: A Food Studies Reader*, Edited by Robert Ji-Song Ku, Martin F. Manalansan IV, and Anita Mannur, 231-244. New York: New York University Press.

Smith, Jon. 2013. *Finding Purple America: The South and the Future of American Cultural Studies*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Smith, Julia. 2010. Fair Trade and the Specialty Coffee Market: Growing Alliances, Shifting Rivalries. In *Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies*, edited by Sarah Lyon & Mark Moberg, 28-46. New York: New York University Press.

Smith, Michael D. 1996. The Empire Filters Back: Consumption, Production, And the Politics of Starbucks Coffee. *Urban Geography* 17 (6): 502-524.

Snyder, Gary. 1990. The Place, the Region, and the Commons. In *The Practice Of the Wild*, Gary Snyder, 27-51. Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint Press.

Sohn, Mark F. 2005. *Appalachian Home Cooking: History, Culture, & Recipes*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Soper, Kate. 2008. Alternative Hedonism, Cultural Theory and the Role of Aesthetic Revisioning. *Cultural Studies* 22 (5): 567-587.

----------. 2009. Introduction: The Mainstreaming of Counter-Consumerist Concern. In *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*, edited By Kate Soper, Martin Ryle & Lyn Thomas, 1-24. Basingstroke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Soper, Kate, Martin Ryle, & Lyn Thomas. 2009. *The Politics and Pleasures of Consuming Differently*. Basingstroke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Spang, Rebecca L. 2000. *The Invention of the Restaurant: Paris and Modern Gastronomic Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stout, Jeffrey. 2005. *Democracy and Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Strasser, Susan. 1982. *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York: Pantheon Books.

----------. 1989. *Satisfaction Guaranteed: The Making of the American Mass Market*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Tangires, Helen. 2003. *Public Markets and Civic Culture in Nineteenth Century America*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thompson, E.P. 1963/1966. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books.

----------. 1971. The Moral Economy of the English Crowd. *Past and Present* 50: 76-136.

Thorne, Christian. 2003. The Revolutionary Energy of the Outmoded. *October* 104: 97-114.

Tolbert, Lisa C. 2009. The Aristocracy of the Market Basket: Self-Service Food Shopping in the New South. In *Food Chains: From Farmyard to Shopping Cart*, edited by Warren Belasco & Roger Horowitz, 179-195. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Trubeck, Amy. 2007. Tasting Wisconsin: A Chef's Story. In *The Restaurants Book: Ethnographies of Where We Eat*, edited by David Beriss & David Sutton, 47-64. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Upton, Dell. 1998. *Architecture in Unites States*. Oxford University Press: Oxford & New York.

van Ede, Yolanda. 2009. Sensuous Anthropology: Sense and Sensibility and the Rehabilitation of Skill. *Anthropological Notebooks* 15 (2): 61-75.

VanWinkle, Tony N. 2004. National Register Nomination for Candoro Marble Company Showroom & Garage. Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission.

Varul, Matthias Zick. 2008. Consuming the Campesino: Fair Trade Marketing Between Recognition and Romantic Commodification. *Cultural Studies* 22 (5): 654-679.

Vieta, Marcelo. 2010. Editorial: The New Cooperativism. *Affinities: A Journal Of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4 (1): 1-11.

Wallace, Benjamin. 2012. "The Twee Party." *New York Magazine*, April 15.

Weeks, Kathi. 2011. *The Problem With Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

West, Carroll Van. 2009. WNOX. In The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History And Culture, Version 2.0 [online]. Retrieved from: http://tennesseeencyclopedia.net/entry.php?rec=1526.

Wheeler, W. Bruce. 1998. Knoxville. In *The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History & Culture*, editor-in-chief Carroll Van West, 507-509. Nashville: Rutledge Hill Press.

Williams, John Alexander. 2002. *Appalachia: A History*. Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2003. *Empire of Capital*. London & New York: Verso.

Zizek, Slavoj. 1991. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

VITA

Tony Nathan VanWinkle was born in Crossville, Tennessee, the oldest child of Tex and Loretta VanWinkle. Tony has one sibling, Leah VanWinkle. After graduating from Cumberland County High School Tony attended Roane State Community College and subsequently transferred to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, where he earned a bachelors degree in anthropology. After graduating from UTK Tony worked for two years with the National Park Service in both Florida and Texas. He returned to graduate school at Western Kentucky University, earning a Master of Arts degree in folk studies. After his MA studies, Tony worked for a six years in the public history and cultural resource management fields, employed by public agencies in both North Carolina and Tennessee. Tony returned to UTK for doctoral level studies in cultural anthropology with a cognate specialization in environmental sociology. This dissertation is a culmination of that effort.