

Urban Agriculture: Using Community Systems of Agriculture as a Solution to Homelessness and
Unhealthy Food Sources

Ian Mearns

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

University of Washington

2012

Committee:

Steven DeTray

Emily Ignacio

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

© Copyright 2012
Ian M Mearns

Table of Contents

Dedication	1
Introduction	2
Chapter One: Urban Sprawl	3
Solution for Industrial Agriculture.....	4
History of UA	6
UA's Municipal Barriers	7
Solutions to Municipal Barriers.....	9
Further Research: What's Next for UA.....	10
Research Methods.....	12
Definitions of Terms.....	12
Chapter II: Economic Inequalities.....	14
Debunking Free Market Economics.....	16
Irrational Logic.....	18
Chapter III: Nonexistent to Existent is Not Success.....	22
Urban Agriculture: A solution to Homelessness.....	25
Chapter IV: Urban Agriculture in Tacoma:.....	27
TUFS Goals and Programs.....	30
1) Basic Resources through Farming.....	30
2) Educational Outreach through Community Development.....	32
3) Create A Flagship Center.....	34
4) Creating a network of UA gardens within vacant urban spaces.....	36
Chapter V: Creating a Network of 21 st Century Capital.....	39
Renewing Resources.....	40
Chapter VI: Coming Full Circle.....	46
Conclusion: Privatizing Academia.....	53
Bibliography	55

Dedication

I dedicate my thesis work to my parents, family and many friends. A special feeling of gratitude to my mom, Karin Mearns, whose words of encouragement before her untimely passing inspired me to continue on in education. I also dedicate this thesis to my many friends who were always by my side throughout this process and I will always appreciate all they have done. Finally I would like to extend my professional and personal gratitude to Professor Stephen DeTray, without your guidance over the past four years, I would have never been able to accomplish the things I have today.

Introduction

As a child I never thought of urban growth as being “bad”. At first, I thought of this growth as a key indicator of positive equally distributed socioeconomic growth. Over time, this growth would eventually destroy all of the forested areas, vacant lots, and farmlands in my neighborhood , and be replaced by big box retail outlets, cul-de-sacs and football field sized parking lots. It would not be until after I had left high school and served two tours as a Marine in Iraq that I would come to the realization that this growth was only supporting one objective profit.

Chapter I: Urban Sprawl

Within contemporary urban discourse, the negative effects of unsustainable urban development processes, categorized as urbanization, have contributed to the creation of a variety of unsustainable urban communities (Davis, 2006; Lawson, 2007). Within our own nation, these urban areas have been categorized as “urban sprawl”. According to David C. Soule “urban sprawl” is defined as “low density processes of land development that occur on the edges of urban centers” (2006 p. 3). Additionally, Soule argues that the use of these processes have remained valid by supporting their existence as “upholding the constitutional right” of the inherent “freedom to expand” (Soule, 2006, p. 5).

Over the past fifty years, trends of sprawl have caused urban populations of the United States to expand beyond their traditional rural boundaries. According to the 2010 Census over 80% of the US population currently resides within metropolitan regions (Census, 2010). Even though systems of agriculture still provide the majority of food to urbanized areas contemporary development, discourse has shown that systems of corporate industrial farming have continually replaced local community based farms. Metropolitan areas that were once supported by locally grown food sources now have to rely upon food sources transported from thousands of miles away. One area that focuses on the existence of this trend is Margaret Armar-Klemesu’s article, “Urban Agriculture and Food Security, Nutrition and Health” (2000).

Armar-Klemesu argues that a primary reason for the creation of these food sources can be linked to the sustained existence and continued use of industrial systems of agriculture (IA) as primary urban food systems (2000 p. 100). In basic terms, systems of IA promote the use of cheap, processed, unhealthy food sources sold in stores and restaurants owned by large corporations and development groups supported by industrialized shipping and production

processes (Armar-Klemesu p. 101). Therefore current systems of industrial agriculture (IA) have been supported as providing urban citizens with a convenient and reliable food source.

Although these systems may be construed as being convenient, their continued use has ultimately lead to the creation of areas devoid of nutritious food sources referred to as “food deserts” (Reynolds, 2005). Another critical reception of IA has been associated to the use of genetically modified organisms (GMO’s) and processing methods that primarily rely upon nonrenewable fuel resources. As oil reserves continue to dissipate, the price of fuel, food and every other resource distributed by industrial transport will rise accordingly causing an unwanted decrease in access to basic resources. If rudimentary changes are not made within contemporary urban food systems, the inexpensive “convenience” associated to its use could potentially be replaced by an “inconvenient” absence of food altogether.

Solution for Industrial Agriculture

One development model that has been supported as providing multiple solutions to the continued emergence of resource gaps created by IA has been linked to the use of “sustainable urban development methods”. For the purposes of this paper “sustainable” will be defined as development processes that create and support ecological balances between natural, urban, and economic environments. The specific aspect of contemporary sustainable development discourse that my own research is currently focused on is replacing systems of industrial agriculture (IA) with systems of urban agriculture (UA). Systems of UA are comprised of traditional farming practices being used within or around villages, towns, cities or peri-urban areas.

In addition to traditional forms of agriculture, systems of UA also utilize, agro-urban forestry, aquiculture, bio intensive farming, beehives and greenhouses (Bezemer, 2008;

Broadway, 2009; Bryld, 2003; Davis, 2005; Flisram, 2009; House & Ikiria & McCkormick, 1993; Lupala, 2003; Mannion,2009; Mendes, 2008; Mougeot,2006; Whitford, 2010). The physical areas where systems of UA can be implemented include schools, backyards, vacant lots, empty boats (on and off land) local parks and the rooftops of gourmet restaurants and high-rise luxury condos((Bezemer,2008; Broadway,2009: Bryld,2003; Davis,2005; Flisram,2009; House & Ikiria & McCkormick,1993; Lupala, 2003; Mannion,2009; Mendes,2008; Mougeot, 2006; Whitford, 2010). The sustainable attributes of UA include efficient energy usage through the use of solar energy and wind power, low transportation costs and the distribution of organic produce. (Broadway 2009, Mougeot 2006, Mendes 2008, Flisram 2009).

Some of the sustainable changes that UA can make to current systems of IA include the composting of organic food waste from urban markets, restaurants and households to be used as soil fertilizer. The relocation of food waste from landfills to garden plots will not only help to enhance soil fertility but it will also help to diminish the waste of community's while simultaneously cutting down on the costs of transporting food waste (Klemesu, 2010). The reconfiguration of municipal systems from open systems to closed system also has the potential of creating a closed loop system where organic food waste changes from unwanted material to beneficial resources.

Due to the growing concerns associated to the future of food and energy security, contemporary urban planning discourse has shown a "renaissance" of sustainable UA development policies emerge within infrastructural development program. Of course the "embracement" of UA is not the theoretical breakthrough that will allow UA to remain as a permanent urban system (Broadway,2009; Mougeot,2006: Mendes,2008: Flisram 2009). Even though UA's most recent emergence within urban development discourse may be supported as a

“new” solution to the development of sustainable urban communities, the history of UA depicts a different story. Over the last century UA has made continual resurgences during times of economic and social recession as a solution to food shortages (Broadway 2009, Flisram 2009).

History of UA

Over the course of the last hundred years UA has made continual resurgences during times of economic and social recessions as a solution to food shortages (Broadway, 2009; Flisram, 2009). During WWI and WWII Victory Gardens were used to support the “war effort” by allowing more food sources to be grown on large-scale farms that were then shipped to American troops. Systems of UA were also used during the Great Depression, categorized as relief gardens, to help provide urban citizens with access to food sources that weren’t able to afford them otherwise (Broadway, 2009). As such UA has remained as a secondary food system only used as a primary system during periods of socioeconomic recession. If UA is continually used to provide temporary solutions for temporary problems, some experts see the future of UA to remain as a “novelty” (House & Ikiria & McCKormick, 1993).

To ensure its sustained existence, UA must be incorporated as a systemic element within the process of urban development. But urban policy makers and development theorists have yet to create legislation and policies that jointly promote the use of UA as a primary food source. Economic infrastructural policies, both nationally and internationally, have also helped to exclude UA as a viable element within both urban policies and economic development policies. (Barrett 2005, Bezemer 2008, Broadway 2009, Bryld 2003, Davis 2006, Flisram 2009, House & Ikiria & McCKormick, 1993, Lupala 2003, Mannion, 2009 Mendes 2008, Mougeot 2006, Whitford 2010).

UA's Municipal Barriers

In order for UA to remain as a fundamental system of the urban environment, municipal governments must promote the needs of UA and other urban systems as symbiotic within the creation and implementation of these systems. If not, barriers can emerge when the needs of specific municipal systems are deemed as priority. One example of this can be found within Tanzania's capital city of Dodoma (Lupala 2003). Since the city is located within a semi arid climate, its small rain season only produces 567 mm (22.32 inches) of rain per year. Due to the intense heat and dryness associated to Dodoma's summers, plans were made to increase the amount of accessible green space within Dodoma's Central Business District (CBD).

In order to expand Dodoma's green spaces within a timely manner, city planners decided to rely upon fast growing foreign trees. During their initial growth phase, the trees required constant protection from sunlight and large amounts of water. Since Dodoma's summer water resources are already limited, the city's newly acquired plant life put increasing pressure on this already dwindling resource. In order to equally distribute the city's water resources Urban Farmers were given shared access to water sources during the preliminary development phases. As the summer heat increased, the availability of water resources also continued to dissipate. Once the water resources reached a critical level, Dodoma's city planners decided to give the newly acquired trees legal precedence over the remaining water supply.

Even if water resources were located on land that was currently being used for UA, said activities were then deemed as being illegal immediately putting the land under city control. The process of rezoning local water aquifers and reservoirs ultimately made the sustainment of UA within Dodoma's city limits unavailable. Another example of municipal barriers can be found within the development of fiscal land taxation and zoning laws. Each year municipal

governments earn tax revenues taken from landowners that fall into specific zoning categories: residential, industrial, retail, commercial and agricultural. Even though some urban areas may be vacant, the taxes and land use codes associated to areas found within the urban interior are primarily zoned for industrial or residential use (Broadway 2009, Mannion 2009).

Another barrier to UA has emerged when urban landowners are able to zone and rezone their land areas as they see fit. This processes is only available within urban municipalities that have given their citizens permission to determine what does and does not happen on his or her property in terms of how it can be used. Landowners are not allowed to rezone land areas unless these areas have already been categorized multi-zoned land areas.

Land use tenure laws can also impact the longevity of how long a certain piece of land will be used if landowners decide to use the land for something different (Broadway, 2009; Mannion, 2009). If development models are available that provide larger profit margins than systems of UA, landowners are within their legal right to remove these systems unless there are laws that uphold the sustained existence of specific tenant land rights. Therefore, the practice of UA within specific land parcels can be categorized as being outright illegal if landowners are offered better prices for the use of their land. In addition even when UA is allowed within residential or industrially zoned areas the fiscal land taxes required by municipal governments are usually too great for the owners of newly created systems of UA. These two examples of urban land use laws provide huge barriers for the inception and sustained existence of UA within land use development discourse. The inception of federal legislation without a physical representation of the prescribed legal agenda can also help to quell the progression of UA.

One example of this can be found within the creation of labor laws and the tangible elements required to support the intended effects of each policy. In an effort to lower its

unemployment rate the country of Kenya introduced a plan that supported the creation of self-employed urban businesses. One of these proposed business models was centered on the use of UA (House, 2009). According to House & Ikiria & McCKormick, the “enabling environment” required to support self-employed businesses was nonexistent. Kenyan citizens were not given access to the financial, physical and legislative resources required to start their own UA businesses.

When persons would quit their jobs to start their own businesses, the incentives that were supposed to be distributed by the government were never granted. The continued use of self-employed business models within Kenya’s public discourse, lacking essential supporting resources, caused an unintentional increase in Kenya’s unemployment rate. This misdirection of Kenya’s administrative policy creation can be slightly attributed to the misguided prioritization of Kenyan resources to the external elements of their job development programs. The existence of this research also helps to support the argument that systemic economic barriers, found within both the urban and national context, have repeatedly inhibited the inception of UA as a primary food system. But these barriers have been continually created through misrepresentation of priorities intrinsically linked to their institutional importance.

Solutions to Municipal Barriers

One method that has provided legislative support for UA has been to promote its use at a grass roots level to the point of satiety (Mannion 2009). Within the urban contexts of Milwaukee and Miami this is just what has happened. UA activists were able to gain enough momentum and community support through the proliferated usage of UA at a community level that city officials decided to readjust their land ordinances to better help support preexisting systems of UA. Through this process city officials created public policies that ensured urban farmers sustained

access to vacant plots of land as well creating land tenure policies that favored the needs of urban farmers over the proposed use of residential and commercial development models. Erik Bryld's article, "Potentials, Problems, and Policy Implications for UA in Developing Countries" (2008) helps to further support the amendment and reorganization of preexisting urban legislation for the sustained existence of UA. According to Bryld, if legislation were created that supported UA as a primary municipal system, it could potentially provide a "proactive solution to overcrowding" by helping to create "a sustainable urban infrastructure" (Bryld 2003 P. 81). By designating specific areas for farming, while simultaneously creating residential amenities, the continued migration of rural citizens into the city would negate the need for informal housing and limit the continued development of shantytowns.

Torres-Lima (2008) proposes that can be used to break through systemic barriers when used on a regional level. Using systems of UA on a provincial level would help to connect a variety of disinvested urban areas to a regionally based food network. According to Torres-Lima (2008) the creation of farming plots, immersed within a large interconnected system, not only helps to initiate the creation of new systems of UA but it also helps to conserves rural farming areas from being destroyed by processes of urbanization. Additionally, Torres-Lima attributes the use of regional UA as being able to create new systems of economics that are locally based and environmentally sound. The emergence of these systems would give newly emigrated rural populations, who already posses agrarian occupational skillsets, adequate employment opportunities.

Further Research: What's Next for UA?

In order for these solutions to remain viable, the root cause of the barriers that have continued to impede upon the existence of UA is of course the amount of money being used to

support its existence within legislative and development policy discourse. Therefore, we must transform the existence of systems of UA from subsystems of free market economics (FME) to community-based systems of agriculture. In order to complete this process, we must address the barriers created by systems of IA as externalities created and supported by FME. These externalities must be recognized, circumvented, rejected, and replaced within urban development discourse. If not the reciprocation of market trends might cause legislation change to allow new leniencies for IA to emerge. In order to complete this process, we must first recognize the extortive practices used by IA, as a subsystem of FME, followed by the physical realities of destitution that these systems are instrumental in creating. Once we have a visual representation of the terrible conditions that FME creates, we can then focus on the presumptions used to support these systems allowing us to “debunk” the validity of its use as a primary system of economics.

By focusing on the irrational elements that FME support as rational we can then focus on the societal disconnect that these presumptions have been instrumental in creating, namely the lack of access that homeless persons have to basic resources. This could be fixed through the use of UA. For the purposes of this paper I will be referring to basic resources as pertaining to food, shelter and housing. Contemporary systems of IA, as subsystems of urbanization, have routinely created environments devoid of employment opportunities while also being devoid of nutritional food sources. For those persons living on the edge of the socioeconomic periphery this lack of employment undoubtedly pushes these persons further into debt. Over time the lack of employment also can force persons to live in transitional housing, motels or single room occupancy hotels. Eventually some of these persons are forced to choose between food and shelter, routinely forcing said individuals to live on the streets.

Although this is not the only causality of homelessness I will be primarily focusing on it due to its connection with IA and how it can be potentially resolved through the use of UA. In order to support this process as being logical I will be providing an in depth theoretical model of UA being used within the Tacoma area. This model will support the use of UA as a community system, similar to systems of community supported agriculture (CSA's), that will provide homeless citizens with access to food, housing, vocational opportunities and social resources.

Research Methods

These areas will be assessed through the use of textual analysis on relevant discourse material required to conduct a systematic inquiry of the various barriers, both physical and written, that have denied the existence of UA as a primary food system. The specific type of discourse that I will be analyzing will include economic, political, sociological, urban studies and sustainable urban development discourse. Additionally, when assessing these discourses I will also apply UA as a solution to homelessness. I also illuminate the various gaps in systems of FME's, both theoretically and physically, associated to their use.

In order to show the strength of my model of UA in Tacoma, I also used research data that I obtained through my internship with the City of Tacoma's Homeless Services and the Tacoma Food Co-op. I provide the supplemental argument of using UA as a solution to homeless housing policies currently being used and supported by Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H).

Definitions of Terms

As there are numerous terms that are specific to urban discourse to be used within this paper, it is important to clarify the definition of each term that will be used. The term "basic resources" will be refers to Manfred Max Neef's definition, found within his book "*Human scale development: Conception, application and further reflections* (1991). Neef argues that in

order for persons to obtain the basic need of sustenance they must also have access to systems of protection. Additionally, Neef argues that in order for persons to access sustenance they must reside within an environment that is protected from violent elements by systems of protection. These protection systems safeguard the mental and physical health of humans while simultaneously providing an environment, devoid of violence, that allows the elements of food, shelter and employment to exist safely (1991 p. 32). Additionally “western development” will be used to describe development practices that are routinely found within the “Global North”. Furthermore the term “Global North” refers to regions that have contemporary infrastructure systems (Western Europe, North America) whereas the term “Global South” refers to undeveloped or underdeveloped nations and regions. (Africa, South America, South East Asia) “Sustainability” refers to processes that use renewable practices and or resources in comparison to practices that rely upon non-renewable sources or practices. “Green” or “greener” will be used to promote a specific element as being natural and connected to the earth. The term “fiscal land taxation” refers to the yearly property taxes that are used by a city for specific pieces of land. The term “urban periphery” refers to the physical and socioeconomic spaces located on the boundary of urban areas; furthermore these peripheries will also be categorized as “disinvested spaces”. The term “land tenure” refers to the mode by which land is held or owned, or the set of relationships among people concerning specific pieces of land or the produce it yields.

Chapter II: Economic Inequalities

The process of providing food to the global south (GS) has provided huge profits to the World Bank (WB) and its affiliated agribusinesses. Established in 1944, the WB was initially created as a “facilitator of post-war reconstruction and development” (World Bank-About us, 2012). Since this time goals of the WB have shifted to include “poverty reduction through an inclusive and sustainable processes of globalization”. Over the past 30 years the use of these “inclusive processes” have continually led to the emergence of exclusionary infrastructural development models that support the use of profit based systems of IA (Barret,2005; Broadway,2009; Davis,2006; Flisram,2009; Lawson,2007; Shiva, 2003). Since these programs are so destructive, I will be referring to their existence as “nondevelopment” programs. Victoria Lawson outlines the rudimentary objectives of agrarian nondevelopment programs within chapter four of her book *Making Development Geography* (2007).

According to Lawson the primary goal of agrarian nondevelopment programs (ANP's) is to transform the economies of developing nations into economies of the global market. In order to complete this process, ANP's provide developing nations with financial capital distributed through infrastructural loan development programs. These programs are centered on restructuring the majority of domestic farms within the agrarian economies of developing nations from producing food crops to commodity crops. Additionally each loan recipient is required to increase the amount of foreign products being shipped into their domestic marketplaces in order to establish processes of supply and demand (p. 68-79). These products are routinely cheaper in price compared to locally grown products allowing for a dependence to emerge upon their existence. As these foreign products continue to be shipped in, locally grown food sources that

are more expensive than international food sources lose their legitimacy as viable products within domestic marketplaces.

Once foreign grown products make up the majority of food sources being sold within domestic marketplaces, the economic viability associated to local farms ceases to exist causing them to close. But what happens when the price of international food sources eventually rise? Will the new commodity crops be able to provide enough profit for these newly dependent economic actors to survive? The answer is no. Even if commodity farmers are unable to buy international food sources, they are still required to follow the guidelines of their loans. The WB does not care about the “economic inefficiencies” (see Marshall, 1950) created through ANP’s.

Loan payments will still be required by each country, commodity crops will stay in place and international food sources will continue to be shipped into domestic markets regardless of the grief it may cause populations of the GS. The irrational logic of FME would argue that the closure of local farms by local farmers was an individual choice rather than an economic problem. But now that local food sources are unavailable, people have no other choice but to buy expensive international food choices in order to survive. So what happens when these persons are no longer able to buy food? The avaricious solution used by the WB is to provide inexpensive food aid to these countries distributed through programs financially and legislatively supported by the WB. This “iron triangle” (IT) of agribusinesses has also been highly influential within the creation of U.S food aid (Bezemer, 2008; Barret & Maxwell 2005; Davis, 2006; Lawson, 2007).

According to Barret & Maxwell the main objective of the IT, comprised of agriculture NGO’s, corporations and shipping companies, has been able to sustain the system of profit currently supporting our global system of IA (Broadway & Maxwell, 2006 p. 362). In order to

complete this process the IT has supported, created and used prejudicial development legislation that counteracts the inception and creation of reformatory U.S. food aid policies. Bezemer paper, “Agriculture, Development, and Urban Bias” (2008), argues that these institutions have allowed the WB affiliated NGO’s to not only sell U.S. food aid to the GS but to also use these profits to help finance the creation of future ANP’s, used by the WB, within the GS.

Therefore ANP’s have been able to create their own “triangle” of profit through the monopolization of the global food market, the inception of infrastructural loan development programs, and the distribution of food. But how can these processes continue to be supported as being efficient if the WB is really trying to “reduce” poverty? Instead of focusing on the mission statement of the WB, we must shift our focus to the primary guiding system of NP, FME’s. The critique of the value systems of FME will help us to understand what will need to be changed in order quell the sustained existence of extortive economic policies.

Debunking the rationality of Free Market Economics

In terms of its epistemological categorization economics examines the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. The chief model of economics used within our own nation is of course “free market economics” (FME). In basic terms FME refers to a market system that is completely devoid of regulative controls individual rights (Adams, 1977 [1776]; Scott, 2005; Viners,1927). Within this idealized system, buyers and sellers are not only allowed to conduct transactions freely, through mutually agreed upon prices, the profits obtained from these transactions are also free from government regulation. Therefore, the idealized existence of a free market economy is regulated by the “voluntary and free” transactions of individual economic actors.

Additionally, Smith associates the self-regulation of the free market as being maintained

by an “invisible hand” supported by processes of supply and demand (Smith 1977 [1776]). Furthermore, the actions required to maintain processes of supply and demand are supported as naturally occurring phenomena within FME discourse. This ideology was originally acknowledged by the academic designer of FME Adam Smith within his book *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1977 [1776]). Although Smith’s book was written during the initial years of the industrial revolution, it has been continually used out of its original context as a supporting theory the idealized freedom within contemporary society. This theory, used within its injurious way, helps to introduce the argument that the actions of free market actors are only adhering to their natural instincts.

John Stuart Mills compiled the first physiological assessment of a free market actor within his paper, “On the definition of Political Economy; and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It”. Mills initially refers to economic actors as “homo *economicus*” with the majority of the paper referring to economic actors as “economic man” (EM). In sociological terms, EM is “a being that desires wealth and is capable of judging the comparative efficacy of means for obtaining that end” (1836 p.321).

Mills categorized four distinct areas that EM “naturally” conducts specific actions to acquire including accumulation, leisure, luxury, and procreation. Of course, each of these distinct “attractions”, excluding procreation, are explicitly self-involved actions. The sociological effect of Mill’s categorization of these “attractions” as being “natural” allows for supporters of FME to further affirm its existence as a natural science. Therefore the events, actions, effects, and environments created by FME are “*naturally occurring*” in the physical sense. As a result of this categorization, FME has remained as a tangible institution of science and sociology rather than a subjective behavior model. Due to this support FME values have continued to be as guiding

principles within our nation's social, political and economic discourses. This process has ultimately created a preferred reality that continually reaffirms the use of egoistical capitalistic behaviors as normal. Even some of the political ideologies that supporters of FME embrace contradict the preferred reality continually affirm as natural by economic actors. Academic discourse that theoretically discusses these presumptions can be found within T.H Marshall's article *Citizenship and Social class* (1950).

Irrational logic

As a democratic nation our government contains a variety of political parties that uphold the existence of specific standards and principles within our countries sociopolitical discourse. The main political parties consist of the Republican, Democratic, Green and Libertarian parties. Although the majority of American voters affiliate themselves as a Republican or Democrat, a recent trend within American sociopolitical discourse has shown Republicans supporting Libertarian Party politics in defiance of fiscal and healthcare reform policies enacted by our current president Barack Obama. In basic terms, supporters of libertarian politics support the ethical view that citizens are also individuals who are given certain moral powers that allow them to acquire property rights with physical objects (Libertarian, 2010).

Furthermore, libertarians also support the belief that individuals, as single physical persons, have the right to be free from the interference and regulation imposed upon them by other individual persons. Clearly, the values supported by libertarians are parallel to FME's. But a distinct difference between libertarianism and FME is that libertarians define individual freedom as pertaining to the physical existence of individual persons (humans) while systems of FME define individual freedom as pertaining to economic actors (many humans).

Therefore the unilateral support of libertarian politics and FME by a single individual contradicts the definition of freedom being used within both systems. For the purposes of this paper, I will be referring to the obvious illogicality between the presumed realities being supported by FME and the actual physical realities they construct as “contradictive realities”. Further support for the existence of “contradictive realities” can be found within T.H Marshall’s essay “Citizenship and Social class” (1950). According to Marshall, the basic rights of a citizen residing within an industrialized (FME) society are only available to persons who have access to resources that uphold these rights such as employment, education and financial resources. Additionally, Marshall argues that industrialized democratic societies disregard the existence of this gap by categorizing all citizens within egalitarian societies as one single person by “preserving economic inequalities through the support of a presumed reality” (1950 p. 38). Marshall elaborates upon his argument by stating “our society is not aiming at creating absolute equality as there is a limit to removing economic inequalities that are not always regarded as legitimate” (p. 39).

Marshall’s introduction of legitimizing “economic inequalities” helps to promote the argument that increases in poverty and unemployment are only important if they affect the needs and priorities of the “legitimate citizen”. Therefore these problems will remain singular to the individual as long as the physical existence of absolute equality is not a legitimate problem. This use of standardized logic for assessing individual persons as one connected group has also been used to explain homelessness as a problem of choice rather than economic externalities.

According to Paul Davidson’s paper, “Only in America: Neither the Homeless nor the Yachtless Are Economic Problems” (1989), the existence of homeless persons are not an “economic “

problem at all but rather their physical existence within homelessness is created through “personal choice” (1989, p. 164).

Davidson supports his argument by stating, “the homeless are revealing, through their own actions, that they prefer to sleep in cartons or on street corners rather than having to work as hard as apartment dwellers and home owners who have bought their own shelter in the marketplace” (p 165). Davidson also argues that “the 25% percent of homeless persons who currently work full time but still live in old cars or abandoned buses prefer their current living work arrangement and hence there is no economic problem” associated to their continued existence (1989, p.166).

Furthermore Davidson categorizes “homeless persons who are only working 8 hours a day” as being lazy because if they “really wanted to purchase a home or rent an apartment they would work harder get a second or even third job until they were as productive as those with homes” (1989 p. 167). But where are the occupational options supported by Davidson’s argument? Ultimately the absence of labor resources has created a disconnect between the presumed reality of FME and the actual physical realities created through their use that will be categorized as a “labor disconnect” for the purposes of this paper. Both Marx (1848) and Foucault (1978) also theorize the existence of homelessness as resulting from a labor disconnect within our society.

Marx argues that the existence of homeless populations can be directly linked to their failure to act as participants within each society’s means of production (Burgoise, 2009 Pg. 17). Foucault’s theory of Biopower builds upon Marx’s theory by categorizing the labor disconnect felt by homeless persons as resulting from industrial powers being increased or decreased to specific populations (Bourgeois p 18). Therefore the “labor disconnection” experienced by homeless persons is an institutional process rather than a personal choice. This labor disconnect

does not just disallow these individuals from obtaining employment, it can also prevent these populations from accessing shelter and food. Obviously, the existence of this disconnect is not new as both Marx and Foucault theories are over fifty years old. So what are some of the solutions that have been used to connect homeless individuals with labor and other basic resources? The literature on homelessness shows that the solutions and efforts used within homeless eradication discourse have continually used an arbitrary definition of success. The “*efforts*” or “*accomplishments*” associated to homeless policies have only been able to provide temporary solutions. As the positive changes of each model dissipated into obscurity the existence and effectiveness of each model become disproportionate in relation to the revenue needed to support their existence. The impermanence of these policies can be intrinsically linked to the same fundamental reasons behind the creation of barriers to UA.

The bottom line is that even though homeless prevention and eradication programs may provide temporary services to homeless populations, there is no real fiscal accountability within this service community. Once these solutions are unsuccessful, they are either disregarded completely or changed to focus on other more fiscally sound objectives. One example of this can be found within the homeless rehousing policies used within the Pierce County Tacoma area during my time as an intern within the City of Tacoma’s homeless services department.

Chapter III Nonexistence to Existent is not Success

The clerical responsibilities I was in charge of completing within this internship included answering questions and directing clients to housing, food, health and occupational services through email, telephone and direct physical contact. Apart from these daily activities, I was also in charge of creating the agendas and notes for the Peirce County Tacoma Coalition to End Homelessness (PCTCEH) on a bi-weekly basis. During each of these meetings, I was exposed to the various difficulties and accomplishments associated to the support and use of homeless eradication policies and support systems within the Peirce County-Tacoma area.

In an effort to create a solution for persons unable to access housing, Pierce County representatives, in cooperation with the City of Tacoma, implemented a centralized intake and referral system for persons at risk of or experiencing homelessness on Jan 31, 2011. Referred to as Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H) AP4H's primary goal is to provide the Pierce County area with a single trusted access point where clients can be assessed, processed and matched with homeless prevention services (Associated Ministries, 2012). Throughout the first year of AP4H's operation a variety of complaints have been raised by community members in regards to the inefficiency of AP4H's intake and referral processes.

During November's PCTECH meeting Greg Claycamp, the Director of Housing & Shelter Services for AP4H, responded to these community members concerns (PCTCEH November, 2012). According to Claycamp the biggest "take away" from AP4H's first year was that the present level of service required by Pierce County's homeless citizens was much larger than the scale of service that AP4H was able to provide. Instead of addressing this coverage failure as an area requiring immediate improvement, Claycamp classified the simple act of addressing this failure and the sustained existence of AP4H' "central services" as two

“successes”. But wasn’t this the main reason why AP4H was created in the first place?

Reiterating the reasons why AP4H was created is not a sign of success, but rather a manipulative tool used by AP4H representatives to shift focus and responsibility away from their organizational inefficiencies.

When asked what the steps would be to create a solution to fix this decrease in housing services, Claycamp proposed the use of an organizational restructuring process within AP4H’s communicatory and service connections. Claycamp argues that this reorganization process would allow knowledge to be shared more proficiently when housing vacancies became available. But again wasn’t this the sole reason why AP4H was created in the first place? How is a multidimensional referral system supposed to work if basic knowledge is not shared within the professional channels of communication that it was influential in creating? Claycamp is categorizing the obvious inefficiencies of AP4H as a disconnected problem by manipulating the accountability of their existence within the process of providing housing services.

When questioned about the lack of persons being connected with housing resources Claycamp argued that a major reason for this gap has been linked to the diminishment in housing vacancies and an increase in clientele over the past year. Even though limited housing availability may be a supporting factor for AP4H’s failure to connect persons with housing, it is not the only causal factor. From my experience within my internship, I feel a major reason for the mismanagement of resources available to AP4H has been caused by inefficient communication, referral and assessment processes used by AP4H staff (PCTCEH March, 2012). The “discrepancies” associated with the referral process of AP4H, which were not acknowledged by Claycamp, have also included the misrepresentation of client needs, lack of response by AP4H personnel and loss of referrals by AP4H staff to local service providers. In response,

AP4H service providers blamed these inefficiencies as a result of software problems with a program called Dropbox. AP4H and PCTCEH members chose Dropbox because it allowed them to list their available housing resources online free of charge (PCTCEH March, 2012). During the first year of its use some questions were raised towards the efficiency of its use as primary communication and referral tool. These specific concerns pertained to whether or not people were using it properly and if vacancies were showing up due to software problems.

During March's PCTCEH meeting, an open discussion was directed at the lack of housing connections currently being made within Tacoma by AP4H. As the discussion continued, it was confirmed by local non-profit representatives that there were at least 18 open housing slots listed on Dropbox. When asked about these issues, AP4H associates denied having any part in the misallocation of these housing resources and instead referred back to the Dropbox program as being faulty. An investigation was made into these 18 openings by Troy Christensen, Pierce County's Homeless Programs Administrator, in response to an uproar of comments March's meeting. Troy found that some information was not available to the public. Some of the openings, were pending to be filled by clients or they were new to agencies. Troy also found that certain changes needed to be made to the Dropbox listings, such as listing the date the referral was made, as well as, the status of each client's application process. Troy was also informed by AP4H staff that the "centralized intake is a community wide program that requires a community effort and is not just associated ministries job." This blanket statement helps to frame the inefficiencies of AP4H as nothing more than a community problem. Instead of shifting the blame from one organization or group to the next, a concerted and uniformed effort must be made by AP4H representatives in order for adequate referral solutions to emerge.

The centralized housing referral process of AP4H is a great idea to help nonprofits pool

their resources. But it lacks the physical representation that allows its existence to promote a permanent effect within urban areas. Even if AP4H took responsibility for their inefficient communication processes and inability to properly connect persons with services the current amount of persons that require housing services has continued to grow over the course of my time within the city of Tacoma. One area of this process that I found inefficient was that the majority of housing services were located in a variety of physical locations. Additionally I found that some of the landlords in charge of these housing services, privately owned, were only trying to fill vacancies rather than help people. I felt that in order to circumvent the inefficiencies associated to housing services within Tacoma that a central physical space, instead of a referral process, would allow these persons to create their own communities ultimately creating the knowledge communication processes that are lacking within current models of Tacoma's nonprofit housing provision services.

Urban Agriculture: A Solution to Homelessness

Once I came to this conclusion I felt that the use of UA models centrally located around housing services would help to encourage urban development theorists to re-categorize homeless prevention policies as a primary, rather than secondary, element of urban development discourse. As my research continued I found that the use of UA in Tacoma, as a community based system, could provide a solution to resource gaps. According to Chamberlin (2009 P. 92 the emergence of new systems can be attributed to the interaction of newly incorporated elements with preexisting environments. "Chamber's argument, outlined within *Networks, Emergence, Iteration and Evolution*" (2009), supports the idea that the emergence, interaction, and sustained existence of new elements within pre-established environments help to form new complex systems. These new systems are fundamentally influential within the creation of new behavior

traits referred to by Chambers as “emergent phenomena”(2009 p. 92).

These emergent phenomena have also been referred to as catalysts, facilitators, or initiators. Beth Dempster’s paper, “A self-organizing systems perspective on planning for sustainability” (1998) helps to further support the existence of these “emergent phenomena’ by arguing that a systems internal relationship is critical in determining its emergence, behavior, and subsequent degree of complexity (1998 Sec 2.1). Therefore, the introduction of a single permanent element might be able to provide the necessary environment required for the emergence of a new system within a larger environment. The “emergent phenomena” required for the emergence of UA as a primary urban food system may be established by using it as a homeless eradication and prevention policy.

The physical existence of systems of UA will provide a physical solution to homelessness that will provide a watershed for communities to interact with on a daily basis. Instead of allowing the social stigmas associated to homelessness to hinder the support of solutions for their existence, systems of UA will alleviate this sociological boundary by including these persons as equal populations within contemporary urban environments. These systems will also help to create new socially based economies that represent the needs of local individuals rather than large scale corporations. This new economy would also help to alleviate the inequalities associated to FME. In order to support this argument I will be using a theoretical model of UA , located within the city of Tacoma, to show the various sustainable attributes associated to the wide scale inception of UA models as homeless prevention/eradication policies within the city of Tacoma. This evaluation will include the creation of new economic and social avenues of capital that will allow the exploit models of economic to be debunked.

Chapter IV: Urban Agriculture in Tacoma

According to a Pierce County Department of Health assessment conducted, one out of ten households experiences hunger associated to unavailable food resources on a daily basis (PCD, 2009) Further evidence that supports the need for new nutrition resources includes reports from the Pierce County Health Department indicating that obesity rates for adults more than doubled between 1970 and 1990 (Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, 2000). Additional information that supplements this growth in unhealthy trends includes the Washington State Department of Health finding that one in ten adults living within the Pierce County area currently have diabetes (Washington State Department of Health, 2010).

Therefore, the primary mission of the Tacoma Urban Food Shed will be to support and promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles for all of Tacoma residents through the use of Urban Agriculture. These models will transform vacant urban spaces within the Pierce County-Tacoma area, into community land areas that will be used to support networks of community and regional systems of UA. According to Wilson & Kelling "when property is abandoned, weeds grow up, window are smashed and families move out'" (1982 p. 3). Referred to as the 'Broken Windows theory" Wilson & Kelling promotes the argument that when "a window in a building is broken and left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken as well (1982 p. 3). Besides the visual "eye sores" that these areas are to local communities, they also largely remain unpatrolled by citizens and law enforcement officials alike, allowing for criminal activity to occur unperturbed (Kelly, 1982). The inception of systems of UA within these spaces would not only provide food sources for local community members, but it would also help to provide a new level of security through the physical presence of urban farmers. The constant existence of persons within these areas could help deter criminal activity from occurring if a strong enough

presence was sustained on a daily basis. The inception of systems of UA within these disinvested areas will also help to create new ventures of economic and housing resources, while simultaneously providing local communities with immobile capital investments and new community infrastructures.

Ultimately, the inception of systems UA is centered on providing disinvested communities with access to basic resources including healthy food sources, basic agrarian education classes and occupational support systems. Services specifically provided to residents will include, onsite housing and employment opportunities as TUFS staff members. The core goals of the TUFS program within the local community will be focused on eradicating negative nutrition trends within the Tacoma area by building healthy and sustainable lifestyles through the use of Urban Agriculture. The process of growing food for the community, within the community, not only helps to provide sustainable and healthier food sources, it also helps to increase communal relations within local communities.

In order to complete this mission efficiently, I decided to base TUFS organizational model on three major nationally recognized organizations including Seattle's P-Patch Project (SPPP) for organizational operations, the American Community Gardening Association for evaluative recommendations and the Housing First Program for housing operations. SPPP promotes the use and creation of community based systems of UA and other educational opportunities that support the culture and economies of local neighborhoods. Currently SPPP supports 75 "P-Patch" community gardens, 2,200 plots, and 4,400 gardeners within the greater Seattle area. (SPPP, December 2011).

Additionally, Seattle's P-Patch program also focuses on low-income areas with the goal of fostering sustainable community growth by providing these areas with access to healthy foods

sources through the use of UA. In order for TUFSS to accomplish this same task within Tacoma, we will be using an organizational model provided by the American Community Gardening Association (ACGA). ACGA's model focuses on four areas that are fundamentally important when creating sustainable networks of UA to include encouraging the formation and expansion of national and regional community gardening networks, developing resources that directly support community and sustainable development, supporting research that positively impacts environmental awareness and finally creating educational training programs to foster community support for the creation of gardening systems supported by UA (ACGA About, 2012).

Furthermore, the success associated the use of ACGA's model will be supplemented by the housing first program. Housing First categorizes the obtainment of stable housing as the first and highest priority for homeless persons to emerge out of homelessness (Padgett & Gulcur & Tsemberis, 2006).

Building on this research, the Housing First program provides homeless persons with housing regardless if they are currently afflicted by substance abuse problems or mental disorders. This process ultimately allows each client to obtain housing resources without having to enter substance abuse programs unless they want to (Padgett & Gulcur & Tsemberis, 2006 p.74). The successes of Housing First have included, initiating "residential stability" for persons who were considered "least capable of benefiting" from these services (Padgett & Gulcur & Tsemberis, 2006 p.82). Additionally, Padgete & Gulcr & Tsemberis support the continued use of homeless solutions that "favor choice over restrictions" as "not only effective but humane." The use of Housing First policies within TUFSS would help to embrace homeless persons as individuals, rather than customers or clients.

For those members of the community that have already shown interest in becoming

TUFS members, our resources will become a fundamental element of their lives that will safeguard the sustainability of UA and the health of local residents. With the work and collaboration of the community; Tacoma will build the progressive infrastructure that is needed to obtain healthy and sustainable lifestyle for the entire Puget Sound Region.

TUFS Goals and Programs

1) Basic Resources through Farming.

Within the first 3 months TUFS will provide basic nutrition and cooking workshops that demonstrate proper cooking methods for fresh produce. These workshops will help TUFS members have the ability to create healthy and cost effective meals with locally grown seasonal produce. Workshops will also be offered that will teach students proper gardening procedures including seed planting, transplant, and thinning plants for successful cultivation and food harvesting. The importance of organic agriculture, soil fertility, noxious weed management, pest control techniques, mulching and other pesticide-free growth method will also be addressed. Aside from occupational resources, educational classes will also be held twice a week, which will be focused in reading, writing and math comprehension. The ultimate goal of this program will be to help all TUFS residents and members obtain their G.E.D,

Workshops on building new personal systems of UA will also be held twice a month. Each class will have the capacity to hold fifty students per session. At the end of each month students within all classes will be tested on their knowledge retention. The result of each assessment will help to improve our centers goal of obtaining a 70 percent knowledge retention rate for each student, as well as, providing measurable outcomes for donors, granters and students.

Within the first month of the flagship garden's establishment, an institutional collaboration will also be made with the Tacoma School District. This collaboration will have the potential of establishing TUFS flagship garden as an agricultural learning center for local students. The garden will provide a viable destination for field trips and other education seminars focused on Urban Agriculture and farming in general. Eventually TUFS would like to become a regional destination for K-12 students as well as college students. The garden will be open Monday through Friday and will accept up to ninety students per day. The goal of the center is to receive a minimum of seventeen hundred students per year. Student interns from local colleges will be used to assist in the data collection and analyzing process. Intern requests will be made to the career development centers of local colleges on a quarterly basis. Students who have an academic interest in urban ecology, urban agriculture, urban studies and other agrarian and planning discourses will be valuable assets to our program. However, volunteerism is not only limited to students, but also open to all community members. The goal of the center is to receive a minimum of seventeen hundred students per year.

The initial steps required to complete this goal will include, creating a relationship with the Washington State office of public instruction, and representatives of the state's Education for Environment and Sustainability Program (EESP). The primary goal of EESP's is to develop a responsible citizenry that is capable of applying knowledge of ecological, economic, and socio-cultural systems to meet the current and future needs of our society (State of Washington, 2012). This model will be used as a best practices resource for TUFS community programs because of its success in supporting national advocacy through community gardening by: facilitating the formation and expansion of regionally based community gardening networks, through the use of ecofriendly education programs.

According to the ACGA, garden participants achieve qualitative and quantitative success through social interaction, beautifying neighborhoods, producing nutritious food, reducing family food budgets, conserving resources and creating opportunities for recreation, self-reliance, exercise, therapy, and education (ACGA About, 2012). Tacoma and other local school districts will be able to accomplish the goals, set out by EESP, by utilizing the amenities provided by TUFS. On a state level the curriculum provided by TUFS has the potential of becoming a fundamental element within the curriculum of Washington States future students. The second phase of this development process will be centered on creating new organizational relationships, by providing internship opportunities and education workshops for local non-profit organizations, universities, and conservation groups.

2) Educational Outreach through Community Development

These workshops will provide TUFS participants the opportunity to achieve qualitative and quantitative success through stimulating social interaction, encouragement of self-reliance, beautification of local neighborhoods, producing nutritious food, reducing family food budgets, conserving resources and creating opportunities for recreation, therapy and education. The level of success associated to these outcomes will be determined through the use of assessment models including: focus groups, in person interviews, and surveys issued to students and volunteers assisting within each workshop. Evaluations will be used to address the crucial adjustments needed to correct and refocus our workshops to ensure the continued success of our organizations primary mission. Additionally, TUFS members will actively seek the support and collaboration of other local non-profit organizations that share the vision and goal of increasing healthy and sustainable lifestyles in Tacoma. Within the first year of grant funding, we hope to establish working relationships with several organizations within Tacoma's local vicinity. One

organization that TUFS will partner with is Grow Local Tacoma, supported through Pierce County's department of recreation, which currently conducts hands-on gardening classes to almost fifty neighborhood gardens within the Tacoma area (Mcivor, 2012).

In order to create a broader communal presence, TUFS will also make efforts to establish a partnership with L'Arche Farm and Gardens (LFG), and Sustainable Communities All Over Puget Sound (SCAOPS). LFG is a Tacoma non-profit organization that helps persons with disabilities learn to garden (L'Arche Farm & Gardens, 2012). SCAOPS supports and helps local sustainability groups within the Puget Sound area through outreach, education and community-building programs (Tuttle, 2012). The establishment of these relationships will ultimately help TUFS to maintain and create an array of social networking relationships. TUFS also hopes to establish a partnership with the Community Harvest of Southwest Seattle (CHSS) to better serve and strengthen the entirety of the Puget Sound metropolitan food system. CHSS is an established non-profit organization that provides residents of Southwest Seattle access to affordable urban fruits and vegetables (Brothers, 2012). By collaborating with CHSS TUFS will be able to maintain communication with other non-profit organizations located in both King and Pierce County, which will help to create a broader net of local urban food security.

Lastly, TUFS will work with Pierce County and the Action Communities for Health, Innovation and Environmental Change (ACHIEVE). Initially funded by a cooperative grant from the Centers for Disease Control and the YMCA, ACHIEVE's primary goal is centered on providing a comprehensive one-stop source for persons seeking active living and healthy eating resources (ACHIEVE-About us, 2011). The Community Gardening Program was started by ACHIEVE in 2009 in an effort to increase the amount of community gardens within Tacoma and Pierce County. Since that time, considerable progress has been made in achieving their goal of

increasing garden space, staff, and volunteers. The Community Gardens Assessment Report found that certain gardens have struggled to retain minimal garden memberships while others have had to create waiting lists. To assist the Community Garden Program, TUFs will provide educational resources to communities with the lowest membership rates, while simultaneously, assisting within the development of future gardens as demand increases.

3) Create a Flagship TUFs Center.

A flagship garden center will be created within the first year of operation. The buildings of the center will provide up to thirty beds for persons currently immersed in homelessness. Maximum effort will be made to ensure that each center will use preexisting buildings before any new buildings are created in an effort to curb the growth of sprawl. If TUFs is unable to find vacant buildings, vacant lots will still be used for UA but the housing area's will be using military style tents, to provide squad bay style housing with cots lined up side by side for each person to sleep on.

Basically each center will contain a living space for residents complete with, hygienic amenities, eating areas and occupational agrarian resources. There will also be a classroom area for staff, residents and members to congregate within. These classrooms will provide TUFs member's educational and occupational workshops focused on UA and sustainability for TUFs residents and members. There will also be a shed full of the various tools required to sustain each garden. Each garden system will be positioned within the middle of each center allowing for persons to interact with its presence visually and physically within any position. As stated before we will be using the Housing First model to allow persons to live on the premises that have substance abuse problems. These persons will be incorporated as normal populations who have the right to live in comfort. Obviously there will be a code of conduct for all persons to follow

within each center, including persons being supported by the Housing First program values. This code of conduct will be regulated through specific rules of behavior supporting moral integrity by respecting every individual within the context of each center. The Flagship gardens presence will also help to create a sustained presence of UA for Tacoma residents to interact with. These workshops will provide TUFs participants the opportunity to achieve qualitative and quantitative success through stimulating social interaction, encouragement of self-reliance, beautification of local neighborhoods, producing nutritious food, reducing family food budgets, conserving resources and creating opportunities for recreation, therapy, employment and education.

The level of success associated to these outcomes will be determined through the use of assessment models including: focus groups, in person interviews, and surveys issued to students and volunteers assisting within each workshop. Evaluations will be used to address the crucial adjustments needed to correct and refocus our workshops to ensure the continued success of our organizations primary mission. TUFs members will actively seek the support and collaboration of other local non-profit organizations that share the vision and goal of increasing healthy and sustainable lifestyles in Tacoma.

Within the first year of grant funding, we will establish working relationships with several organizations within Tacoma's local vicinity. One organization that TUFs will partner with is Grow Local Tacoma supported through Pierce County's department of recreation that currently conducts hands-on gardening classes to almost fifty neighborhood gardens within the Tacoma area (Mcivior, 2012).

Within the first month of operation the TUFs center will begin to construct an online resource database that provides community members access to information on Urban Agriculture and local community gardens. The site will contain guides for healthy Urban Agricultural living,

nutritional health plans, lists of local Washington-based farms, and opportunities to support the creation of local gardens. Staff and interns will be in charge of updating the database on a quarterly basis. An on-site library will also be created that provides TUFS members access to a variety of academic discourse material, which includes healthy living, farming, cooking and nutritional health. Two donated, or purchased, computers will be available in the library for clients to access our online website. There will be a volunteer available in the library during our hours of operation to address any issues within our database. These resources will help enhance the learning experience of our curriculum.

4) Creating a network of UA gardens within vacant urban spaces.

Vacant urban spaces of Tacoma will be identified by TUFS as they become accessible for the use of UA. The transformation of unused urban space will also help to support the creation of pro urban agricultural land tenure policies, as well as, creating new fiscal land taxes. Quarterly goals for land obtainment include: surveying and making hard inquiries to owners of vacant land plots, making initial contact with community groups interested in community gardening, and creating advocacy groups to support the creation of permanent Urban Agriculture land tenure policies. Fiscal goals include, the acquirement of at least two land plots per year. Each garden will be organized, established and cultivated within the first three months of land attainment. Garden staff will then establish specific rules and policies for their plots. The procurement of volunteers and or members of each plot will be completed before the building of each plat has commenced. TUFS recognizes in order to manage its organizational efficiently, that it will need to obtain financial support from outside sources to provide the required supplemental income necessary for its existence. Some of the ways that TUFS will produce revenue will be, selling 50% of the food grown within each TUFS center, to Tacoma's farmers markets and local grocery

stores.

Each week two members of TUFFS and a volunteer or intern will travel to two farmers markets and sell produce grown at our garden. This process has the potential of contributing a minimum of \$200 a week to each TUFFS center. Estimated sales and in-kind gift donations, per market, per week, range at about \$300.00. Gross adjusted revenue for each center will range between \$10,000 and \$12,000 annually. Our fundraising committee, which will consist of two of our board members, will host two fundraising dinners, each taking approximately 6 months to develop. Our goal will be to raise \$20,000 from the each dinner event. Additionally, the dinner will increase our credibility and visibility in the community in which TUFFS serve. A third source of self-generated income will come from the students, living within the local community, who take TUFFS classes. There will be a recommended donation of \$25 per month, which TUFFS staff only expects that 25% will actually pay, generating a profit of \$450 a month and \$5,400 a year.

Outside sources of potential income will potentially include the obtainment of both private and government community development grants. Private granting institutions that will be looked at will include the Gates Foundation, United Way, Multicare Healthcare, YMCA, Cascade Land Conservancy and the Center for Disease Control. Government granters will include the USDA-Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Program, The Federal community development block grant, and The Tacoma Comprehensive Plan. As I researched potential donors I came to the realization that obtaining these resources is not guaranteed. The most valuable lesson that I learned from my internship at the city of Tacoma was that the money that supports grants are still created by FME and can be taken away indefinitely at any time without any sort of prior warning. In order to create more capital funding for TUFFS I felt that it was necessary to create a supplementary Food Co-op network within each

of TUFS community centers. The Co-op would act as single entity while being physically represented within each Co-op. This network would have the potential of providing more fiscally sound capital resources for TUFS while also increasing the loyalty of TUFS members due to their financial stake within each Food Co-op.

Chapter V: Creating a Network of 21st Century Capital

The initial question that I had when researching the organizational model of TUFS Co-op system pertained to what a Food Co-Op is actually defined as. Co-op's can be defined as worker or customer owned business that provides grocery items of the highest quality and best value to its members within a central location (Riemer, 2010) The two most prominent Food Co-op organizational models used within our own area are the NCGA, or National Cooperative Grocers Association (NCGA, 2012), and the Food Co-op Initiative program (FCIP)(2012). Each individual Co-op structures the NCGA around a corporate-style financial distribution system in which there are annual member dues as well as profit sharing to the NCGA. The main difference between the two organizational models is that the sharing of profits by individual Co-ops to a larger corporate as well as, the eradication of an annual membership fee is not present within the FCIP. Of course, the initial membership fee is still used within the FCIP, which is standard for many Co-op models.

The FCIP provides a variety of financial assets to Co-Op organizers within the beginning stages of implementation ranging from grants to loans. The FCIP consists of four organizational corner stones: vision, talent, capital, and organization. These are established through three development stages organization, feasibility and planning. Of course, in order for Co-ops to receive financial assistance from FCIP they must already have access to capital and pre determined amount of members before any investment will be considered. But how can this process remain efficient when systems of IA continue to use contemporary urban food systems as systems of profit? One way is to use equitable economic practices that “shift” away from traditional economic practices of coercion and control. Umar Haque's book, *New Capitalist Manifesto* (2011), provides an in-depth assessment of the effects of FME and its continued use

within our society. Haque refers to the continued use of FME as a “great imbalance” in terms of the continued use of historic consumption based models of economics referred to as “engines of prosperity” (2011, p. 6). Even though these historic processes may have been suitable during the initial expansion of the United States (i.e. within a big stable world) their current use (i.e. within a small, fragile and crowded world) no longer makes sense. Incidentally Haque categorizes the economic growth acquired from these historic practices within contemporary economic discourse as “dumb growth” (2011, p7.). In order for a new economic model to emerge, Haque calls for a “shift” of FME from industrial era capitalism to “20th century capitalism”.

Instead of extorting economic growth from communities, people, society and the natural world 20th century constructive capitalists will provide economic growth by creating meaningful payoffs in human terms, not just financial ones. This process will require that economists allocate resources democratically, instead of imperialistically, and respond ethically to “demand shocks” and or “market failures” instead of marginalizing these problems as person specific. This process will allow economic actors to become competitive over the long term (i.e. organically) instead of just blocking competition temporarily (i.e. artificially). Overall, Haque argues that this “shift” will foster the growth of new arenas of competition instead of exploiting existing ones (Haque, 2011 p. 29-30). The inception of Co-op models within each TUFSS center is a prime example of how 20th century capitalism can help to create new markets of competition organically.

Renewing Resources

The first step in trying to provide an organizational outline for the TUFSS Co-Op was to assess Tacoma’s local agrarian culture within Tacoma’s own Food Co-Op. The research I completed as an intern was supplemented by information I obtained from the Washington State

department of Agriculture. Currently, there are three major problems associated to sustaining fresh and local produce from local Tacoma Food Co-Ops. The first problem I found was within the marketing of local meat to Food Co-ops. Any livestock that is going to be publicly sold is required to be slaughtered and processed by a USDA certified slaughterhouse. To local community farmers, this process can require expensive transportation costs as well as commercial slaughterhouse fees. Obviously, the monopolization of urban food systems by the IT has allowed these processes to remain expensive for small family owned farms while giving large corporate farms the privilege of saturating the market with their own products. The second problem that I was presented with was how current distributional processes available to local farmers have become increasingly inadequate due to fuel costs and lack of cold storage spaces within local outdoor markets. Some farmers lost up to twenty-five percent of their products from the simple task of transporting them back and forth between home and market. The third problem that I was presented with was the lack of available marketing that local family owned farms were able to use compared to the millions of dollars that the IT uses to promote the use of their products on a daily basis.

These three problems have caused many farms to only be able to sell their products from roadside stands. In terms of advertisement, there are various government programs that can be used to provide adequate representation from the use of the “Farm to Cafeteria” (Sanger & Zenz, 2003) system which supports the selling of Washington grown produce by locally owned businesses and “From the heart of Washington” program (Washington State Legislator, 2004) which provides state wide representation of local farm produce within nationally owned grocery stores. Both of these programs provide various promotional materials for use within the stores as well as a large support network that can be utilized by small family owned farms.

As specified by Jeffrey R Erwin, owner and operator of Knee Deep Ranch in Tenino WA, the cost increase to produce “retail” meat is so significant that many small farms do not even try it (J. Erwin, personal communication, Feb 4, 2010). One solution provided by “Cheryl the pig lady” is to bring the slaughterhouse, to the farm through the use of mobile slaughterhouses (Reading, 2009). The mobile slaughterhouse that Cheryl has supported will provide a cheap and safe way for farmers to slaughter their meat, and it still falls within the legal specifications of the USDA. Currently, Cheryl runs a small farm that provides meat to local residents within a twenty-mile radius, but she still has to use USDA slaughterhouses located outside of the confines of her farm (Cheryl 1, 2011). The use of a mobile slaughterhouse would provide Cheryl and local farmers the opportunity to create local food sources without having to drive to slaughterhouses owned or influenced by the IT. The creation of mobile slaughterhouses would also help farmers such as Mr. Erwin expand their product distribution to encompass the selling of “retail” meat. By circumnavigating the use of large-scale slaughterhouses and by supporting an efficient use of transportation, the basis for a solution to the third problem of adequate transportation has now been set.

As stated previously the major problem associated with distributing local agriculture is not how to grow the produce but how it is brought to the market. The fact that many farmers have to rely upon open back trucks, increasing the loss of produce, is sometimes unavoidable. The use of closed trailers would be the most beneficial means of transportation for local farmers but the price of fuel is costly and one farm alone cannot always afford such a luxury. This is where the use of 20th century economics will come into play. Instead of shipping food sources to packing and processing plants, locally grown food sources could be shipped to a cold storage facility created within TUFs flagship center.

The creation of a cold storage area within TUFS flagship center would provide farmers with an efficient system for storing their food while also saving them time and money. Of course, each farm would become part of the Co-Op ultimately allowing for a whole new base of revenue to be established for our local economy. But how are these food sources going to arrive safely to TUFS flagship center? One method of transportation has been associated to the paper consumable industry. According to Gary Pederson the current inefficiencies associated to processes of distributing paper consumables can be used for the benefit of TUFS. Pederson has obtained this knowledge of the shipping industry through his employment twenty years of employment with Service Paper Company (SSP). SSP provides a variety of paper consumable products to its customers. SSP's main location is located in Renton, with additional locations in Portland and Spokane respectively. According to Pederson, current practices of distribution used by his company leave a majority of his trucks completely empty when they return to Renton.

Due to the nonexistence of cargo within these trucks, Pederson supports the idea of providing loading points for farmers at predetermined fueling points or rest areas. The key to this idea is that the stopping points do not cause the drivers to take extra time on their trips, as this would have the potential of making their routes late on the return trip. Of course, a logistical system would have to be in place to account for this interchange of product. When the trucks are full of produce they will then return to SSP's main location. From here, the TUFS would then have to provide transportation to bring the food back to their flagship center. The plan is to set up accounts with the farmers and either buy the product outright from the local farmers or set up a storage program for the farmers in case they would like to participate in the local farmers markets of Tacoma. Overall, the process of allowing TUFS to use PSS's trucks helps to

support the democratic allocation of transportation resources will help to further support Haque's theory of 20th century economics. Aside from the economic growth associated to this process, the city of Tacoma, and the entirety of the Puget Sound region would have access to new sources of fresh produce. Even if PSS representatives required small monetary fees for the use of their empty trucks, other trucking companies might be interested in this process, which would ultimately foster the growth of new arenas of competition instead of exploiting existing ones.

Imagine the potential for a system of UA that acted as a distribution center for a large percentage of farms not only within the local vicinity but on a statewide level as well. The sustainability aspect of this plan is huge. The support of local farms is not only an investment within locally grown healthy food, but it is also an investment within the future of our urban environments. Sustaining the validity of local farms will help to further debunk the validity of urbanization. Additionally the continued success of TUFs will also provide support for the shift from capitalistic economics into 21st economics.

There are many avenues of approach that can be used to support the future of TUFs. One approach is to utilize TUFs Co-op as a building block for local CSA's. The City of Tacoma's comprehensive plan has made of future CSA's within Tacoma's green space, as well as funds that have been appropriated to help establish a distribution system within the area. This is where Tacoma's Food Co-op comes into play (TFCO, 2012). Other future avenues of approach by the TUFs could be made in the direction of using Carbon Credits. These credits have been primarily used by large corporations for industrial pollution emissions, but President Obama has declared that the use of

these credits will be broadened to encompass more areas of the business world. This sociopolitical process will help promote a greener economic initiative, aligning with directly the goals of the Tacoma Food Co-op the benefits could range from tax incentives to grants. The use of UA within Tacoma on the level that I have just described is still theoretical.

But the sustained existence of homeless populations will continue to undermine the validity of our current sociopolitical systems supported by FME unless the creation of solutions to these “economic inefficiencies” is deemed priority. Replacing systems of IA will take time but it is not impossible. Over the course of writing this paper, I kept thinking back to the start of my own realization of what processes of urbanization actually were and how the experiences that I have endured have made me uphold environmental and urban sustainability as personal institutions rather than embracing them as contemporary trends of moral behavior.

Chapter VI: Coming Full Circle

When I first started graduate school I felt reluctant to research a thesis topic that had such a personal effect on me. The events surrounding my own academic journey within this discourse started when I was still in high school. As a junior, I decided my best option after graduation would be to pursue an illustrious career in music. Although my atrocious attendance and subpar grades might have been a deciding factor in my career, these were never an issue because I had “it all figured out” at this stage in my life. Of course my parent’s views on my career choice were much different than my own. On the last day of school before my last summer of high school started, my parents decided to have a sit down with me about the lucidity of my music career. I was instructed that music was great, but if I decided to continue my path of rock, I would either have to live on my own for the remainder of high school or put my rock plans on hiatus by attending college.

Of course this statement was met with defiance, causing me to search for a college that would help me continue to rock. The first and only school that I decided to look at was the Conservatory for Recording Arts & Sciences (CRAS) located in Tempe, AZ. The conservatory provides a ten-month program for students to learn how to record and process music. The tuition was expensive and the job obtainment rate after school was slim to none, but I felt my gift would nullify these externalities. Within a week after sending in my admissions packet to CRAS I was informed via email that I been accepted for fall enrollment the following year. Fueled by inspiration, I went to my parents to inform them that I had been accepted into college. After a short conversation on the differences between our own personal definitions of college my parent’s then had the compassion to inform me that they would not be helping me pay for school in any way.

Following this interaction I immediately started to research financial aid sources on the Internet. While trying to decipher the cryptic and enigmatic nature of federal aid, the phone rang with a stern voice asking for a Mr. “Ian Mearns”. Of course my initial reaction was that the caller was a military recruiter. My suspicions were confirmed when the caller introduced himself as SSgt Armin of the United States Marine Corps. Looking out the window, I calmly informed SSgt Armin “ I didn’t want to kill anyone” and “ I was already going to college after I graduated high school”. Assuring myself that this response would stop Armin’s verbal assault, I began to hang up when countered with “you know the Marine Corps can help you pay for college right?”

These words would act as a catalyst for the events that unfolded over the next five years of my life. After meeting with Armin and having my dad tell me it was a bad idea, I decided to join the Marines as a combat engineer on August 17, 2001. As I signed my enlistment paper I can distinctly remember telling myself “How hard could it really be?” The idea of going to war never seemed to be a viable threat within this historical timeframe; instead “free” college tuition reimbursement was the only object supporting my decision. Instead of worrying about war or foreign countries, my mental image of the Marine Corps consisted of days filled with international travel followed by nights of merriment and adventure. But barely a month after signing my contract, the worst terrorist attacks to ever happen on American soil would occur on Sept 11, 2001.

The collapse of the Twin Towers initiated an immediate change within our nation’s sociopolitical discourse and physical reality of my own life. Fear crept into our government and media. This thief of reason fueled public support of immediate military retaliation against the “network of terror” our government held responsible for these attacks. Of course, the initial feelings I had as a potential participant of war were influenced by the ideal of preserving my

nation's freedom. As the date of my boot camp departure approached I began to question what I was really getting myself into. Nearly ten months of bombing had still not ousted Osama and murmurs of war with Iraq were continuing to gain momentum within our nation's media outlets. This murmur had increased into a national threat by the time I had left boot camp in November of 2002. Our nation's War on Terror allowed my fate to be sealed as a participant within an ambiguous war on terror in a nation already destroyed thirty years of repression. By January of 2003, American forces had begun to mobilize along the Iraq-Kuwait border. The Iraq war would start in March only lasting a few weeks until Baghdad had been liberated. I would not be deployed to Iraq until the winter of 2004. Even though the "war" had been over for almost a year, our presence was still needed within Iraq's Al Anbar province in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF).

The first interaction I had with Iraqi civilians during my first deployment was in a small rural settlement located in southern Iraq. Stepping down from my truck, I had my M-16 loaded in expectation of being attacked at any time. The only attack I encountered was on my own moral compass when I found that the "terrorists" I had been so afraid of were living in bullet-ridden semi-trailers and mud huts, relying on puddle water as their only water resource. I remember feeling like a storm trooper from George Lucas's Star Wars films as I paraded around as an "ambassador of democracy" with thousands of dollars of technology strapped to my back while these people were barely surviving.

At one point in history, southern Iraq had been a territory of Kuwait, making its importance within Iraq's sociopolitical culture a secondary concern within infrastructural development programs. The infrastructural disconnection that southern Iraqis had from basic amenities had been made even worse shortly following the end of the Gulf War. According to

my interpreter, a majority of southern Iraq's marsh Arabs had backed the efforts of coalition forces shortly following Iraq's defeat during the Gulf War. These persons had been influenced by propaganda pamphlets urging them to take action against Saddam under the false pretense that coalition forces would support their efforts. Of course, coalition troops never entered Iraq making the efforts of these small bands of persons unsuccessful. In order to punish those responsible for the uprising, Saddam had ordered his engineers to drain the wetlands of southern Iraq by building a system of dams that completely destroyed an entire culture.

The fear of being mortally wounded was temporarily forgotten as I looked at this small community completely destroyed by war and economic disinvestment. If our mission was to actually support the freedom of Iraq, then why weren't we destroying dams and building people new homes? Eventually I would enter Iraq's larger cities and realize the majority of fighting my platoon encountered was located in the richest parts of Iraq. My initial reaction upon destroying these pockets of resistance was that we were eradicating the visages of Saddam's power. However my own viewpoints of this process would soon change once I realized the financial interest of our nations economy had become a guiding force within our "war against terror".

The amount of money coalition forces spent to control these areas was also supplemented by a variety of corporations including Backwater Security, Kellogg Brown and Root (KBR) and Halliburton Oil Services. While interacting with affiliates from these groups, I soon realized how much control they had over operational decisions central to the creation of infrastructural development programs. Once I realized the level of influence that these corporations had in Iraq, I came to the understanding that the main goal of eradicating the insurgency was to obtain maximum profit through the use of NP's once the insurgency had been suppressed

Once I came to this conclusion, I realized our nations presence was only reaffirming the

existence of Iraq's squalor rather than denouncing it. Even when efforts were made by my platoon to help the Iraqi people, including the construction of new schools and the restoration of roads, American media correspondents would never cover these stories. Instead, reporters would travel to units that were constantly under attack by suicide bombs or improvised explosive devices (IED's). Over the duration of my two deployments, I would witness Iraq's poor suffer from cholera, tuberculosis, unemployment, homelessness and unintended murder of coalition and insurgent forces alike. As my enlistment came to end I felt as if the only difference I had been able to accomplish within Iraq was safeguarding my own safety. I felt my only option upon leaving the Marines would be to completely disconnect myself from the institutions I held liable for creating the war in the first place. I knew this process would require me to distance myself from my own role as a Marine, patriot and combat veteran. I felt like this was the only action I could take in order for my family and friends to equate my existence as something more than a perpetrator of war and violence.

The first few months of reentering civilian society proved to be even more mentally straining than the time I had spent in Iraq. Whenever the war was brought up in conversation people would openly refer to recently returned veterans as "state paid mercenaries" who had sacrificed their own "blood for oil". Upon hearing these opinions, I decided that disconnecting myself from my own role in the war was not enough. The only choice I felt that would make a sustained difference to the sociopolitical responsible for the Iraq war was to pursue a degree in post-secondary education. My initial experiences within higher learning were difficult. The categorization of Iraq as a war of profit increased dramatically within my lectures as a freshman at Seattle Central Community College (SCCC). I felt like the majority of my professors were misguided about the war due to their unfamiliarity with the physical realities of Iraq.

Additionally, the constant condemnation of our nation's presence within Iraq only helped to reaffirm the worries I had before entering school, rather than resolve them. As my first year came to an end, I felt as if processes of academic learning were only being used to tirelessly produce the same arguments. If this were true, I knew I would never be able to make a difference within our society's institutions. Eventually, I decided to focus on obtaining a teacher's degree in order to make some sort of positive impact on someone's life.

Once community college was over I decided to transfer to the University of Washington Tacoma (UWT) campus as a junior in the hopes of finding an academic discourse that supported my goals of obtaining a teaching certificate. Once I entered UWT I came to the realization that the Urban Studies program focused on supporting the growth of sustainable urban ecologies through the creation of environmentally friendly systems of infrastructure. I decided to major in Urban Studies on the presumption that I would still be able to teach at local schools in an "urban setting".

During one of the core classes of this program, "World Cities," I was instructed to read Mike Davis's book *Planet of Slums* (2006). Davis's book provided me with my first educational interaction within an academic discourse community that researched urban environments similar to those I had observed in Iraq. The main objective of Davis's book is to inform the reader of how processes of urbanization have led to the continued growth and sustained existence of urban slums. The most influential chapter on my own academic career can be found within the sixth chapter of Davis's book "Slum Ecology". Within this chapter Davis examines the physical, social and ecological realities that are presently found within the interiors of urban slums in the global south (2006, p.102-125). Davis categorizes the geographical definition of where typical squatters settlements are located as being routinely built "over

former lakes, toxic dumps, and cemetery's”(p.102). A common element of these slums includes open pools of water that are used for consumption and bodily functions simultaneously. Davis categorizes these areas as perfect incubator environments for water borne illnesses including typhoid and cholera. Additionally Davis argues that the origins of these urban problems are rooted within the extortive practices used by colonial powers within each developing country. European empires that had control over the majority of the global south during one time or another generally refused to incept modern infrastructure systems within native neighborhoods.

Instead, racial zoning and sanitation cordons were used to segregate white populations from disease epidemics and the filth of uncontrolled human waste (Davis, 2006 p. 112). Davis argues that the “intimacy” that these populations had, and still have, with each other’s waste has created a physical barrier that continues to divide the social classes of urban environments within the GS.

As I read this chapter I could not help but think of my own experience within Iraq. I always thought that the starvation, disease and destruction I had witnessed in Iraq were only present because of the negative effects of war. However, once I discovered the existence of urban environments that often were far worse than those in Iraq I had located my academic calling. I felt, and still feel, privileged to dedicate my academic career towards the ending of global poverty. But even my journey through academia has not been without its own economic hurdles.

Conclusion: Privatizing Academia

As the “economic inefficiencies” of our global recession have continued to worsen, almost every institution within our nation has had to restructure its budget to remain successful. Over the past two years UWT has had to scrape together a budget with an increasing amount of funds being obtained from private corporations. On a student level, State funding has now been almost entirely replaced by private loans. The long-term effects of this aid restructuring process were brought up discussion with Professor Michael Forman during his class “Evidence and Action”. Forman argued that private funding would eventually lead to the complete privatization of our nations higher academic institutions. Additionally, Forman argued that the pursuit of academia after a Masters Degree is futile due to the “commoditization of academia” because of the draconian policies the only courses being taught will be in support of FME’s. Even though Forman’s argument may be slightly dramatic his argument is not without merit. A recent surge of unemployed PhD recipient’s is a key indicator of the validity of Forman’s argument.

According to Bonnie tenure track teaching positions for college professors are disappearing while adjunct faculty positions are becoming the standard (Kavoussi, 2012). With over 5,000 PhD holders currently working as janitors there is obviously a disconnect between the prestige of obtaining a PhD and the physical reality of having to find a job and pay back student loans (Kavoussi, 2012). Again Marshall’s critique of presumed social equality may be the downfall of our nation if it is used to surreptitiously support the existence of FME’s. If Forman’s ominous prophecy of privatization becomes a reality, the poverty that I have outlined within this paper may become a primary existence for the majority of persons within our society. No longer will there be courses, lectures and programs that rhetorically analyze our society’s institutions, instead the only rhetorical analysis that would be taking place is what is the best way to

maximize profit.

Therefore, it is imperative for our academic institutions to take a stand against corporate culture and embrace their communities rather than a preferred reality of affluence. If efforts are not made to create solutions to the sustained existence of homelessness, unemployment, food deserts and war, the existence of homeless populations and squalor may become an unfortunate reality for our entire global community as a whole.

At the beginning of this paper, I wrote about my own upbringing within a town that was transforming from a small town into a sprawling suburban mass. My childhood neighborhood is now unrecognizable. Even some of the major arterial roads have been changed such that trees along their edges were destroyed in order to accommodate increases in auto traffic. Trends of unemployment and private funding within our nation's university's can be equated to the initial destruction of an old farm within my neighborhood. Once these trends are left alone they will continue to grow until the end result is a school without organic styles of learning. The teachers are the trees and the curriculum is the farms and natural land areas. The only option we have as citizens, scholars, and environmental advocates is to sustain the validity of physical equality rather than a theoretical ideal. Overall, I hope that this paper adds too contemporary sustainability discourse in a positive manner. I hope that my research topic will continue to be added upon long after I have graduated, eventually making this research topic a historic problem rather than a contemporary one.

Bibliography

About ACGA. (2012). The Mission of the American Community Gardening Association. Retrieved from <http://www.communitygarden.org/about-acga/>

ACHIEVE-1. (2011). ACHIEVE-About us. Retrieved from <http://www.achievecommunities.org/about/index.cfm>

Adhikari, B., & South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics. (2003). *Property rights and natural resources: Socio-economic heterogeneity and distributional implications of common property resource management*. Kathmandu: South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics.

Alaimo, K., & Reischl, T. M. (May 01, 2010). Community gardening, neighborhood meetings, and social capital. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 4, 497.

Armar-Klemesu, Margaret. (2000). Urban Agriculture and Food Security, Nutrition and Health. *Growing cities, growing food: urban agriculture on the policy agenda. Feldafing (Germany)*. 99-117.

Associated Ministries. (2012). Access Point 4 Housing: Intake for Shelter and Housing in Pierce County. Retrieved from <http://associatedministries.org/pages/access4housing.htm>

Augsburg, T. (2006). *Becoming interdisciplinary: An introduction to interdisciplinary studies*.

Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub.

Bakker N., M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel Koschella, H. de Zeeuw (eds.) (2000)

Growing. Cities, Growing Food, Urban Agriculture on the Policy Agenda, pp. 99-117, DSE, Feldafing.

Barrett, C. B., & Maxwell, D. G. (October 27, 2005). They profit while the hungry die; U.S.

agribusinesses and shippers reap a windfall from America's emergency food-aid policy. And Congress won't stop it. *Los Angeles Times*.

Barret, C. & Maxwell. (2005) *Food Aid After Fifty Years: Recasting its Role*. New York: Routledge.

Bezemer, D., & Headey, D. (August 01, 2008). Agriculture, Development, and Urban Bias. *World Development*, 1342-64.

Binford, L. R. (1968). Post-Pleistocene Adaptation. In S. R. Binford and L. R. Binford (eds), *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 313-341.

Bourgois, P. I., & Schonberg, J. (2009). *Righteous dopefiend*. Berkeley: University of California.

- Burchell, R. W., & Urban Land Institute. (1994). *Development impact assessment handbook*. Washington, D.C: Urban Land Institute.
- Christensen, Karen, and David Levinson. 2003. Encyclopedia of community from the village to the virtual world. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications. <http://www.credoreference.com/book/sagecommun>. Press.
- Broadway, M. (December 01, 2009). Growing Urban Agriculture in North American Cities: The example of Milwaukee. *Focus on Geography*, 52, 23-30.
- Brothers, M (2012). Community Harvest of Southwest Seattle-Volunteer Match. Retrieved From <http://www.volunteermatch.org/search/org87411.jsp>
- Browning, G. K., Halcli, A., & Webster, F. (2000). *Understanding contemporary society: Theories of the present*. London: SAGE.
- Bryld, E. (June 06, 2003) Potentials, Problems, and Policy Implications for Urban Agriculture in Developing Countries. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 79-86.
- Census 2010 (March 26, 2012) 2010 Census Urban Area Facts, *U.S. Census Bureau, Geography Division*, Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/ua/uafacts.html>
- Chamberlin, W. (January 01, 2009). Networks, Emergence, Iteration and Evolution. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, 11, 4, 91-98.

Davis, M. (2005). *Planet of slums*. London [u.a.: Verso.

Davidson, P. (October 01, 1989). Only in America: Neither the Homeless nor the Yachtless Are Economic Problems. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 12, 1, 164-166.

Dempster, M. B. L., & University of Waterloo. (1998). *A self-organizing systems perspective on planning for sustainability*. Waterloo, Ont: University of Waterloo.

Diven, P. O. L. L. Y. (October 01, 2006). A Coincidence of Interests: The Hyperpluralism of U.S. Food Aid Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2, 4, 361-384.

Downs, A. (April 01, 2001). What does "smart growth" really mean?. *Planning*, 67, 4, 20-25.

Flisram, G. (August 01, 2009). A Serious Flirt with Dirt. *Planning*, 75, 8, 14-19.

Food Co-op Initiative. (2010). Cultivating Healthy Communities-Development Flowchart. Retrieved from <http://www.foodcoopinitiative.coop/resources/flowchart>

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.

GARST, RACHEL, AND TOM BARRY. (1990) Feeding the Crisis: U.S. Food Aid and Farm Policy In Central America. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Gould, K. A., Pellow, D. N., & Schnaiberg, A. (September 01, 2004). Interrogating the Treadmill of Production: Everything You Wanted to Know about the Treadmill but Were Afraid to Ask. *Organization & Environment*, 17, 3, 296-316.

House, W. J., Ikiara, G. K., & McCormick, D. (July 01, 1993). Urban self-employment in Kenya: Panacea or viable strategy?. *World Development*, 21, 7, 1205-1223.

Kauko, Tom. 2003. "Planning processes, development potential and House & Ikiara & McCKormick, prices: contesting positive and normative argumentation". *Housing, Theory and Society*. 20 (3): 113-126.

Kavoussi, Bonnie (May 07 2012), "Number Of PhD Recipients Using Food Stamps Surged During Recession: Report". Huffington Post: Business. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/07/food-stamps-phd-recipients-20072010_n_1495353.html#s609260&title=10_South_Carolina

Kelling, G. L., & Coles, C. M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*. New York: Martin Kessler Books.

L'Arche Farm & Gardens. (2012). Farms & Gardens-About. Retrieved from <http://www.larchethc.org/C-FarmGardens/C-index.html>

Lawson, V. A. (2007). *Making development geography*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Libertarian. (2010). Definition of Libertarianism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/>

Lupala, A. (2003). "The conflict between attempts to green arid cities and urban livelihoods The case of Dodoma, Tanzania". *Journal of political ecology* (1073-0451), 10.

Mannion, A. (July 01, 2009). Green acres in the big city: Increase in urban agriculture leads to new ordinances. *American City & County*, 124, 7, 16.

Marlowe, F. W. (January 01, 2005). Hunter-Gatherers and Human Evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 14, 2, 54-67. ress.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). "Citizenship and Social Class" in *Citizenship Debates: A Reader* ed. by Gershon Shafir, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *The Communist Manifesto*. Claremont: Joshua James Press.

Max-Neef, M. A., Elizalde, A., & Hopenhayn, M. (1991). *Human scale development: Conception, application and further reflections*. New York: The Apex Press.

Mcivor, K. (2012). About Grow Local Tacoma - Pierce County: The Community Garden Project.

Retrieved from <http://www.growlocaltacoma.com/about/>

Mendes, W., & Balmer, K. (December 07, 2008). Using Land Inventories to Plan for Urban Agriculture. *American Planning Association. Journal of the American Planning Association*, 74, 4, 435-449.

Milburn, L.-A. S., & Vail, B. A. (January 01, 2010). Sowing the Seeds of Success: Cultivating a Future for Community Gardens. *Landscape Journal*, 29, 1, 71-89.

Millstone, Erik, and Tim Lang. (2008). *The atlas of food: who eats what, where, and why*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mougeot, L. J. A., & International Development Research Centre (Canada). (2006). *Growing better cities: Urban agriculture for sustainable development*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

NCGA. (2012). National Cooperative Grocer Association-About. Retrieved from <http://209-240-78-12.static.iphouse.net/about>

Norgaard, R. B. (January 01, 1981). Sociosystem and ecosystem coevolution in the Amazon. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 8, 238-254

PCTCEH Home. (2010). The Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness Homepage. Retrieved from <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/Page.aspx?nid=384>

PCTCEH January. (January 12, 2011). Pierce County-Tacoma Coalition to End Homeless January Minutes. Retrieved from <http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/hrhs/HomelessCoalition/MINUTES&AGENDAS/2012/januaryminutes.PDF>

PCTCEH November. (Nov 10, 2011). Pierce County-Tacoma Coalition to End Homelessness November Minutes. Retrieved from <http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/hrhs/HomelessCoalition/MINUTES&AGENDAS/2011/novemberminutes.PDF>

Padgett, D., Gulcur, L., & Tsemberis, S. (January 01, 2006). Housing First Services for People Who Are Homeless With Co-Occurring Serious Mental Illness and Substance Abuse. *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*, 1, 74-83.

Persky, J. (March 01, 1995). The Ethology of Homo Economicus. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 9*, 2.)

Plous, S. (1993). *The psychology of judgment and decision making*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (January 01, 1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*, 1, 65-78.

- Reading, N. (2009). Cheryl the pig lady is here: Mobile Slaughter may be on the way. *The Capitol Record*. Retrieved from <http://capitolrecord.tvw.org/2009/01/cheryl-the-pig-lady-is-here-mobile-slaughter-might-be-on-the-way/>
- Reynolds, J. (April 01, 2005). ARE YOU LIVING IN A FOOD DESERT?. *Ecologist*, 35, 3.)
- Riemer, Alison. (April, 2010). Co-op Grocery Stores and the Triple Bottom Line: For the Workers, For the Community, For the Environment. Occidental College.
- Rindos, D. (1984). *The Origins of Agriculture: An Evolutionary Perspective*. London: Academic Press.
- Ropers, R. H. (1988). *The invisible homeless: A new urban ecology*. New York, N.Y: Human Sciences Press.
- Sanger, K., & Zenz, L. (2003). *Farm-to-cafeteria connections: Marketing opportunities for small farms in Washington State*. Olympia, Wash.: Washington State Dept. of Agriculture, Small Farm and Direct Marketing Program.

Schumpeter, Joseph, 1908. "[Methodological Individualism](http://mises.org/books/schumpeter_individualism.pdf)" *The Nature and Essence of Theoretical Economics*). http://mises.org/books/schumpeter_individualism.pdf. Retrieved 2010-07-02.

Seattle P-Patch Program. (2011). P-Patch community gardens-*Growing Communities*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/ppatch/>

Smith, Adam (1977) [1776]. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. University Of Chicago Press.

Soule, David C. (2006). *Urban sprawl: a comprehensive reference guide*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

State of Washington. (2012). Education for Environment and Sustainability program. Office of Superintendent of Instruction. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/EnvironmentSustainability/default.aspx>

Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department. (2000). Physical Activity and Nutrition. Retrieved from <http://www.tpchd.org/health-wellness-1/physical-activity-nutrition/>

TFCO. (2012). Tacoma Food Co-op: About Us. Retrieved from <http://tacomafoodcoop.com/about-us>

Torres-Lima, P., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, L. (April 01, 2008). Farming dynamics and social capital: A case study in the urban fringe of Mexico City. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*,

10, 2.) Treasury (Feb 18, 2009) Homeowner Affordability and Stability Plan, *US Department of Treasury* . Retrieved from <http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/tg33.htm>

Tuttle, Cathy (2012) Sustainable Communities All Over Puget Sound: SCALLOPS Network.

Retrieved from <http://goscallops.org/about/>

United Nations. (2005). *Population challenges and development goals*. New York: Geneva. Land-use controls in the United States. By John Delafons. Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962. 156 pp. (Apply Harvard University Press, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38). (November 01, 1962). *National Civic Review*, 51, 10, 586-587.

United States. (2011). *Food desert locator*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

US Aid. (November 18, 2011). About us. Retrieved from http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/

Walker, R., Fryer, C., Butler, J., Keane, C., Kriska, A., & Burke, J. (January 01, 2011). Factors Influencing Food Buying Practices in Residents of a Low-Income Food Desert and a Low-Income Food Oasis. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 5, 3, 247-267.

Washington State Department of Health. (2010). Pierce County Chronic Disease Profile. Retrieved from <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/diabetes/publications/2011-profiles/Pierce-2011.pdf>

Washington State Legislator. (2004). From the heart of Washington-Chapter 15.105 RCW.

Retrieved from <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=15.105&full=true>

Whitford, D. (2010). CAN FARMING SAVE DETROIT?. *Fortune*, 161(1), 78-84. Retrieved from

Academic Search Complete database. an idea to place a large-scale agricultural business within the city limits of Detroit, Michigan.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (March 01, 1982). BROKEN WINDOWS. *Atlantic* (02769077), 249, 3.)

World Bank-About Us. (January 31, 2012). World Bank- About Us- History. Retrieved from

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/0,,contentMDK:20653660~menuPK:72312~pagePK:51123644~piPK:329829~theSitePK:29708,00.html>

