Can Food Justice be Raceless?: Reflections on the GROW Campaign's Incorporation of Food Justice into their Praxis

Kidan Araya

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2015

Committee:

Lucy Jarosz

Sarah Elwood

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Geography

©Copyright 2015

Kidan Araya

University of Washington

Abstract

Can Food Justice be Raceless?: Reflections on the GROW Campaign's Incorporation of Food Justice into their Praxis

Kidan Araya

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Dr. Lucy Jarosz
Geography

Previous research around food justice primarily examined grassroots community efforts in the United States to address issues of inequitable food access and hunger through challenging institutional racism in local food systems (Agyeman and Alkon, 2012). Using a case study of GROW, a food justice campaign from development organization Oxfam International, this research discusses the ways that international development organizations adopt food justice principles into anti-hunger activities. I apply frameworks of food justice, critical race theory, intersectionality theory, critical geographic development studies, and neoliberalism philosophy to support my findings. I argue that race is absent in Oxfam's application and conceptualization of food justice, and this absence undermines their work in producing solutions to the structural problems of hunger. My findings conclude that this campaign lacks a challenge to capitalistic solutions and focus on people-driven change. This research provides insight to strengthen NGO strategies and programs to better respond global food injustice.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction....1
1.1 The Problem of Hunger....1
1.2 Purpose of Paper and Expected Contributions....6
1.3 Case Study: Oxfam International's GROW campaign....9

Chapter 2. Literature Review....11
2.1 The Pressing Problem of World Hunger and the Major Responses to it....11
2.2 Food Justice and Food Sovereignty Movements' Responses....16
2.3 Race and Food Justice....19
2.4 How NGOs Respond both to Hunger Theoretically and in their Programs and Practices....25

Chapter 3. Methods and Case Study....35
3.1 Overview of Methods....35
3.2 Case Study of Oxfam International and the GROW Campaign....39
3.3 How Oxfam addresses structural causes of hunger....40
3.4 Oxfam before Oxfam International....41
3.5 Creation of Oxfam in the 1960s....42
3.6 Oxfam in the Global Sphere....44

Chapter 4. The GROW Campaign....49-57

Chapter 5. GROW Campaign and Food Justice....58-71

Chapter 6. Race, Food Justice, and the GROW Campaign....72
6.1 Race in GROW's Food Justice....72
6.2 The Grow Campaign lacks an intersectionality analysis....74
6.3 Race and marginalization....75
6.4 Race and marginalized identities....82
6.5 GROW in South Africa and its absence of a racial analysis....89
6.6 Absence of analyzing apartheid in the food system in South Africa....90
6.7 Absence of race or intersectionality analysis in examining hunger....96
6.8 GROW Food Justice in Guatemala....101
6.9 Addressing the Structural Issues through policy in Guatemala....105
6.10 GROW in the United States....108
6.11 "You can't just leave those who created the problem in charge of the solution." -Tyree Scott Neoliberal Tendencies of the GROW campaign....112
6.12 Neoliberal Constraints of the GROW Campaign....114

Chapter 7. Conclusion....116
7.1 Implications for strengthening the GROW Campaign....120

Chapter 8. Considerations and Limitations....123
Bibliography....124
Appendix

Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PROBLEM OF HUNGER

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization, 805 million people in the world lack enough food to eat (FAO, 2014). This number reflects the amount of people in the world who are chronically undernourished (FAO, 2014), meaning that their hunger is not acute, triggered from a sudden event such as famine, but that these people are in a constant state of lacking the food and/or nutrients they need to be healthy (Young, 1997). The world's hungriest people are mostly found in countries of the Global South where Asia has the greatest number of hungry people, and sub-Saharan Africa has the highest percentage of hungry people out of all the continents (FAO, 2014). Despite the billions of dollars spent over the past few decades funding anti-hunger programs around the world, and although hunger has fallen in general, it has increased in certain places and still hundreds of millions of people go hungry. Even for wealthy Global North countries such as the United States, hunger dramatically increased in 2008 (USDA, 2015).

Hunger remains a top priority in the agendas of international development organizations due to its influence on virtually all aspects of social, economic, and political life. In particular, reducing hunger has oftentimes been coupled with primarily the agenda of poverty reduction; this is evident through the UN's Millennium Development Goal number one of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 (UN, 2014), and the FAO deems hunger as "the most extreme form of poverty(FAO, 2014)." Considering that 805 million people in the world are considered to be hungry and food insecure (WFP, 2013) and the majority of the poor are hungry, the connection between poverty and hunger remain justified. Additionally, hunger reduction has also been tied to health promotion, as

chronic malnutrition, undernourishment, and stunting remain hot topics for international development agenda on global health. If billions of dollars have been spent, thousands of awareness campaigns launched, and programs implemented to reduce global hunger, why is hunger still so prevalent? The juxtaposition of global effort to reduce hunger and the millions of people all over the world who are hungry demonstrates that the effectiveness of anti-hunger programs must be called into question. Specifically, the actions, campaigns, awareness, and overall strategies that anti-hunger organizations are employing have not been able to solve the hunger crisis. Ultimately, this thesis will explore the incorporation of the food justice framework into an international development anti-hunger campaign, the GROW campaign by Oxfam International, and if this campaign effectively addresses the main structural causes of hunger within a food justice framework. It is important to examine the food justice strategies of international development organizations claiming to incorporate food justice in their programs in order to understand the potential positive contributions of food justice in the anti-hunger development agenda. Because there are various organizations trying to combat hunger, these organizations conceptualize hunger in various ways and use multiple approaches to reducing hunger.

Organizations' responses to hunger are often shaped by their belief of how hunger is produced and what they consider to be the structural causes of hunger. For example, an anti-hunger organization can choose to focus on acute hunger or chronic hunger which stems on their belief of whether hunger is caused by immediate and/or natural causes, such as natural disasters and wars, or systemic issues such as ongoing poverty, inequality, and disenfranchisement. For example, when mainstream western media reported about the famine in Ethiopia in 1970's, they overlooked the fact that Ethiopia's agricultural

production was producing surplus and that certain groups who were in power had access to food while poor, marginalized groups were the ones starving and in famine (Shields, 1991). Powerful political groups can use food as a weapon of war and conflict, where the most powerful will deliberately alter and cut off the food supply of groups who are not in alignment with them; this is currently happening in Syria where the Assad regime is "starving communities out" who resist the regime as a weapon of war (60 Minutes, 2014). Even though international agencies give development funds to the Global South to help with their agricultural systems, some argue that their policies do not consider the needs of small scale producers or rural peoples (Lappe, 1992). Some of the key systemic and structural causes of hunger are colonialism, neoliberalism, and unequal distribution of power and resources across all scales (Shields, 1991). These structural causes contributed and/or contribute to producing material causes of hunger such as poverty and unequal access to resources (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). The beliefs of organizations and movements about the causes of hunger influence the focuses of their programs, agendas, and what theories of change they work off of to achieve their hunger reduction goals. The food justice and food sovereignty movements advocate for structural changes in the food system, and that programs must confront and work through structural problems to achieve positive outcomes in material problems of hunger. In contrast, organizations that work within an emergency food relief and/or food security discourse tend to offer solutions that mainly deal with the material problems of hunger. Their solutions are based in a neoliberal viewpoint of the world; David Harvey defines neoliberalism as the "theory of political economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized

by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2007)." For example, organizations that operate under a neoliberal approach to hunger could provide technical agricultural assistance in the form of seeds or other new technologies and fund large-scale agricultural projects in attempts to feed more people (Holt-Gimenez, 2010). Neoliberal solutions set to enhance the current food system to reduce hunger, while organizations that operate within a food justice approach to hunger acknowledge that something in the food system is wrong and structural issues in the system must be addressed to reduce hunger. Food justice organizations could advocate for policy changes in land and food initiatives and invest in programs that prioritize local communities' decision-making power and right to locally and sustainably sourced foods over large-scale corporations' benefits (Holt-Gimenez, 2010).

Frustrated by the seemingly ineffective responses to global hunger and food insecurity by the state and non-governmental organizations, several food social movements have arisen to address hunger (Holt-Gimenez and Patel, 2009). Social movements such as the food justice, food sovereignty, and community food security movements have developed principles and frameworks that describe their vision of what elements need to be present in a food system to eliminate hunger. Historically, NGOs have been criticized for their failure to address hunger and for their inability to affect the lives of the most hungry and impoverished. Some international development organizations have begun to acknowledge the flaw in their approaches and even incorporate aspects of these food movements into their agendas. For example, the FAO now acknowledges the importance of food sovereignty principles in indigenous communities, and Heifer International added a member on their Board of Directors with extensive experience in

food justice efforts in the U.S. in order to bring the food justice perspective into their work (Heifer, 2014).

Furthermore, minimal research has been conducted on how principles of food movements are being utilized by international development NGOs. Food movements have been highly critical of pro-market solutions to hunger (Patel, 2009). They criticize non-governmental organizations of sole focus on material problems of hunger instead of structural problems because material solutions do not address systemic failures that have produced and continuously produce hunger (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). For example, food justice advocates are critical of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for promoting the idea of food deserts and that a solution to hunger and obesity in low-income communities would be to increase private food retail operations in these neighborhoods (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). Advocates argue that the USDA's market based solutions to food issues in low-income communities shifts the conversation away from the structural causes of lack of food access, such as unfulfilled state responsibility to ensure people have the right to healthy, affordable food (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). It also avoids structural issues related to hunger such as disinvestment of communities of color and institutionalized poverty that also prevents poor people from buying healthy food.

Some international development NGOs such as Oxfam International are trying to address structural problems with the food system that produce hunger, but there is limited research that examines if those organizations are effectively applying these social movement principles to address structural problems and if food justice, a grassroots social movement, can meaningfully translate and contribute to solving hunger and food injustice

on a global scale This thesis will examine how the principles of food justice are incorporated in a food justice campaign operated by Oxfam International. NGOs such as Oxfam have the capacity to influence social change on a transnational scale and throughout various political spaces (Bebbington et al., 2008). These organizations also have the ability to be sites of social justice, but may be constrained by neoliberal institutional demands such as organizational cost-effectiveness and efficiency (Rubenstein, 2008). For example, NGOs have been recognized as promoting alternative interventions within a neoliberal framework rather than promoting structural changes (Bebbington et al., 2008). Alternative interventions within a neoliberal framework are solutions that do not disrupt the innate processes and structures in place that continuously produce a problem, but seek to maintain them. Some research has even argued that non-governmental organizations should only be considered autonomous members of civil society if they engage in addressing structural causes of poverty and actively challenge neoliberal agendas (Bebbington et al., 2008). Furthermore, this thesis will explore how adopting food justice into international development's historically pro-market anti-hunger initiatives challenges those neoliberal tendencies.

1.2 PURPOSE OF PAPER AND EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

This research is concerned with the following questions: 1) how do NGOs reinforce or challenge dominant thinking on pro-market solutions to hunger in international development 2) in what ways do international development organizations adopt food justice principles into their food security and anti-hunger activities? 3) what are the challenges, constraints, and enablers for international NGOs to incorporate food justice? 4) how does international NGOs alignment with the agendas of social movements foster or

inhibit meaningful cross-actor alliances for anti-hunger projects? This research analyzes the discourse of international development organizations in choosing to adopt food justice into their anti-hunger and food security campaigns. This thesis also explores if food justice allows for non-governmental organizations to advocate for alternative solutions beyond pro-market solutions and if they can foster meaningful engagement with social movements. David Harvey argues that despite neoliberal pressures, social change can start anywhere (Harvey, 2007) which makes it critical to examine the characteristics of social change that international NGOs adopt while claiming to work towards food justice within an environment of neoliberal constraints. For this thesis, the characteristics of social change will be derived from the literature on how the food justice movement conceptualizes and practices social change. Ultimately, it is important to examine the processes of NGOs to confirm if their activities are aligned with the principles of food justice as they claim and if their activities are truly oriented towards eliminating and dismantling structures of poverty, inequality, and hunger. Considering the food justice framework possesses origins in grassroots racial justice based social movements (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011), this research will also examine the ability of meaningful cross-actor alliances between international NGOs and the grassroots movements in reducing hunger and poverty within a racial justice perspective.

If international development organizations adopt or use the names of frameworks of social movements, this also means that international development NGOs need to adopt basic assumptions about structural causes of hunger from these social movements. For example, food justice calls attention to the structural causes of inequality in the global food system and how race and class shape those inequalities (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014).

Relatedly, food justice adopts a relational approach to explaining global inequality which emphasizes the role of structural processes such as economic growth and development in the making of poverty (Hickey, 2009). This is in deep contrast to a residual approach which emphasizes the idea that poverty is income-centered and to be solved on an individual level (Hickey, 2009). The residual approach reflects many international development organizations pro-market food security solutions to hunger and poverty where hunger is solved through giving an individual money or increasing their income to buy food (Holt-Gimenez, 2011). Consequently, it is important to note if international development organizations are adopting a residual or relational approach to addressing poverty in their partnerships with social movements to promote food justice.

Lastly, this research will provide insight on how food justice activism can operate on scales beyond the local scale as international development organizations have the power to deeply engage in local, national, and global scales simultaneously for their projects. It is important to have social change projects operate across various scales because scales are interconnected, and changes in each scale depend on what sorts of processes and changes are going on in the other scales (Sheppard, 2014). Therefore, it is important to examine the potential roles and contributions by international development organizations who possess a unique positionality to operate on multiple scales. Analyzing hunger within the context of all scales is important because it helps situates problems such as hunger and poverty within its broader economic, social, and environmental contexts (Mayer, 1996). Considering global processes shape national and local scales through setting policies and triggering phenomena, it is important to understand the global structures and processes that influence hunger and poverty. Specifically, this research will examine how

operationalizing food justice on multiple scales may benefit or disadvantage food justice strategies. Furthermore, food justice problematize the roles of neoliberalism and institutional racism in creating an unjust food system where poor, mostly people of color go hungry and calls for structural and systemic changes as being the solutions to world hunger (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). NGOs who consider themselves to be in alignment with food justice must also acknowledge that being engaged in social change is to move beyond neoliberal responses to hunger.

1.3 CASE STUDY: OXFAM INTERNATIONAL'S GROW CAMPAIGN

I will explore my research questions through an analysis of the GROW campaign, a food justice campaign launched by Oxfam International in 2011. Oxfam International is a large international development organization with the overall purpose of "help[ing] create lasting solutions to the injustice of poverty (Oxfam International, 2015)."Oxfam's GROW campaign's mission is defined as "working together and creating solutions" by "transforming our broken food system so that it works for everyone" using the keywords 'food', 'justice', and 'planet' to inform their program components (Oxfam, 2012). Furthermore, the GROW campaign operates under the assertion that "the global food system is broken" due to its structural inequality and unsustainability. Specifically, the GROW campaign argues that powerful actors such as governments, corporations, and elites control the food system and contribute to producing inequality (Bailey, 2011). This inequality disproportionately affects marginalized groups such as women, small-scale farmers, and the world's poorest people undergo the most harmful effects and insecurity within the current global food system (Bailey, 2011). Additionally, the GROW campaign argues that resources such as water and land are becoming more scarce due to

unsustainable usage which further threatens our global food supply, particularly for the most vulnerable populations, and contributes to the brokenness of the current food system (Bailey, 2011).

Seemingly, the GROW campaign differs from more traditional neoliberal discourse on hunger. First, GROW acknowledges that the food system is broken (Bailey, 2011), which infers that the solutions that they will suggest will challenge the structures that make a broken food system and not follow into neoliberal ideology of enhancing or fixing the current system while maintaining its structure (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). Secondly, GROW's response differs because it prioritizes the food and livelihood needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized populations. Thirdly, GROW places an importance on sustainable solutions to growing food that could curb hunger (Bailey, 2011), which differs from the neoliberal approach of growing and giving food regardless of how it is produced (Holt-Gimenez, 2011). Fourthly, it prioritizes small-scale farmers as the producers that need to be empowered to grow food which differs from the neoliberal approach of supporting large-scale agricultural production.

Chapter 2. LITERATURE REVIEW: EXPLORING THE STRUCTURAL CAUSES OF HUNGER

This review of the literature will briefly summarize important components of the food justice and food sovereignty frameworks, critical race theory, characteristics in non-governmental organizations in international development, and neoliberalism most relevant to the research questions. Furthermore, it will show how previous research conducted on international development organizations' involvement with hunger have not examined the current implementation of food justice in NGOs agendas and if current programs work outside of offering pro-market solutions to hunger to engage in structural change. Ultimately, this literature review will highlight important historical components contributing to hunger and food injustice, the traditional and alternative solutions proposed to resolve hunger, and the challenges of non-governmental organizations to effectively respond to injustice.

2.1 THE PRESSING PROBLEM OF WORLD HUNGER AND THE MAJOR RESPONSES TO IT

This section will discuss the various structural causes of hunger and viewpoints regarding the origins of hunger. Traditionally, conceptualizations of hunger focused upon natural disasters such as floods and changing weather patterns that produce droughts that disrupt agriculture (Young, 1997) and lead to starvation and malnourishment. However, food movements such as the food justice movement focus on structural causes of hunger occurring at the global level that are rarely included in the mainstream analysis of hunger which focused on environmental causes of hunger(Young, 1997). The structural causes of

hunger consist of economic, social, political, racial, and environmental processes such as colonialism, neoliberalism implemented in structural adjustment policies, and trade liberalization. Structural historical processes of racism and capitalism have heavily influenced the current state of the food system. For example, colonialism as a global process distributed political power to European countries which enabled them to control the production and consumption of the global food supply (Young, 1997). Additionally, this power gave the colonizing countries the ability to transform local food systems to serve colonial forms of capital accumulation. More recently, the neoliberal economic processes of structural adjustment and trade liberalization weaken domestic food production (Bailey, 2011). Structural adjustment policies pushed by the more powerful countries onto Global South countries forced them to open their markets and adopt trade liberalization to freely allow goods such as food from Global North countries to flood their markets. For example, the United States possesses an industrial food system that subsidizes corn. This highly subsidized crop is cheaper than locally grown corn in the Global South, causing the collapse of the local corn economy in developing countries (ActionAid, 2012). Ultimately, many small scale farmers and rural communities slip into hunger and poverty due to unequal trading practices. A key example of this is the Green Revolution which funded technology in agriculture in Global South countries, but the benefits went to farmers exporting crops and not small scale producers feeding communities. The Green Revolution is a prominent example of a neoliberal solution to solving hunger; as it emphasizes overproduction of food in order to increase outputs of food to give to people instead of addressing unequal distribution of food and why those hungry do not have access to the current supply of food (Lappe, 1992). In supporting mass production of food, it funds large-scale agribusiness

companies to grow the food for the world (Lappe, 1992). However, it does not consider how agribusiness disenfranchises small-scale farmers through eliminating them from the market and oftentimes participating in land grabbing, or the fact that small-scale farmers are a big part of the world's hungry so when they are out of a job, they become hungry (Lappe, 1992). These are only a few points to illustrate that the Green Revolution does not address structural causes of hunger and participates in the productions and maintenance of inequality. For example, the Green Revolution's biggest target crop was wheat, which is not considered a staple in most countries in the Global South and is mostly being used to feed livestock for export instead of hungry people (Lappe, 1992). Additionally, neoliberal food projects' negative effects on the lives of poor people and small-scale farmers is apparent in neoliberal agriculture trade policies. For example, the effects of neoliberal food policy in Mexico that contributed to Mexican farmers not being able to economically support their families with small-scale farming is argued to have contributed to the mass migration of Mexican agricultural labor in the U.S. working under low wages that does not enable them to afford purchasing adequate food (Brown and Getz, 2012). Overall, these issues represent some of the main reasons why some food movements such as food justice argue that relying on a globalized capitalistic food system to feed everyone adequately fails because the market mostly benefits the people and countries who have the most power and resources and its fluctuations leave the poorest with vulnerability (Lappe, 1992).

A second dominant response to world hunger is the neoliberal viewpoint of solving hunger that argues that hunger can be solved with economic incentives and reform. A close examination of the philosophy of neoliberalism is important to understanding the way in which neoliberalism manifests itself within international development organizations.

Neoliberal thought is pervasive as almost all states operate within some neoliberal tendencies as neoliberalism posits the state to ensure the protection and regulation of markets and capital (Harvey, 2007). There are several facets of neoliberalism that affect governments and non-governmental organizations such as international development organizations alike; these facets include but are not limited to trade liberalization, non-intervention of states, personal responsibility discourse, and structural adjustment policies (Gregory et al., 2005). The neoliberal view of hunger suggests that economic development and market based interventions are the solutions to hunger, arguing that hunger happens because there is not enough food in the world (Holt-Gimenez, 2011). This framework also emphasizes personal responsibility and that individuals need to ensure their own access to food. Market based solutions to solving hunger include funding agriculture systems in developing countries, subsidizing crops for cheaper trade prices, and providing food assistance. In general, the neoliberal point of view does not consider local, ecologically sound, or culturally appropriate food systems and food sources (Holt-Gimenez, 2010). In contrast, the food justice movement's proposed solutions to the hunger crisis are human rights-based, consider sustainability and locality in production, distribution, and consumption of food, and emphasizes the demands of people and not profit (Holt-Gimenez, 2010). Food justice challenges essential structures of neoliberalism and focuses on the needs of people in the food system by advocating for just access to food, food as a right, investing in disenfranchised communities, and creating fair living wages for all people, often poor, who work within the food system (Holt-Gimenez, 2010; Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). The food sovereignty perspective of the hunger crisis is connected to the food justice viewpoint, but it stresses that in order to fix the hunger crisis, the current economic

food regime must be dismantled because corporate interests have destroyed the livelihoods of marginalized peoples (Holt-Gimenez, 2010; La Via Campesina, 2015). It emphasizes that food systems should be regionally and democratically controlled, land and wealth distribution, the right to ownership of resources such as water that are crucial for food sovereignty, and sustainability and agroecology are essential for the food system (Holt-Gimenez, 2010). Each of these food movements offer different perspectives from the neoliberal and environmentally determined perspectives.

Shaped by structural processes of inequality and discrimination, there are several identity attributes that increase the likeliness of someone being hungry. An individual is more likely to be or experience hunger and poverty in their life if the individual lives in the Global South, is someone of color, is a woman or child, and does not own land (Shields, 1991; FAO, 2014; Oxfam, 2012). Currently, land grabbing by large multinational corporations in sub-Saharan Africa are forcing local communities off of their land and leaving them without subsistence or income-generating agricultural opportunities (Oxfam, 2013). Overall, the distribution of hunger in the world is important to look at because it reflects the global economic, power, gender, and racial inequalities that occur to shape these inequalities (Lappe, 2012). It also demonstrates the need to for international development organizations working on anti-hunger issues to acknowledge and address these inequalities and to address the specific causes of hunger for the most marginalized people.

2.2 FOOD JUSTICE AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY MOVEMENTS' RESPONSES

The food justice movement argues that "race and class are central to organizing of production, distribution, and consumption of food (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011, p. 9)" and

that the food system is a product of racialized formation and hierarchies. The food justice movement can be considered to have grown from the environmental justice movement which argues for the "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies (EPA, 2013)." Similar to food justice, the environmental justice movement was a response to criticism that the mainstream environmental movement failed to recognize and address the racial inequalities of environmental quality and how communities of color and impoverished communities were disproportionally affected by toxic environmental conditions caused by industrialization and capitalism (Bryant, 1995). Other common characteristics of the environmental justice and food justice movement are increased community participation in policy making and planning decision, respecting civil rights, empowerment, greater social equity (Gottlieb and Fisher, 1996), and a commitment to racial justice (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011) (Ramirez, 2015).

The food justice framework also came out of the critique that the mainstream food movement ignores the influence of positionality, "…the understanding that our lived experiences, particularly those of race, class, and gender, shape our worldviews," (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011) on an individuals' ability to participate in the activities the movement has made central to participation in it such as buying organic and local products. The alternative food movement that offers alternative food practices such as Slow Food movement and buy local and/or fair trade campaigns is accused of oversimplifying the problems of the current food system by only problematizing the industrial agricultural complex and not the socioeconomic, racial, and class-based

influences on creating the current problematic food system (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). Core examples of the food systems' origins in racial formations and hierarchies can be found in the groups of people who have grown food in the U.S. since the country's inception. Africans, kidnapped from Africa to serve as slaves across the Americas and Europe, were almost entirely responsible for growing food for the white colonizers, while being forced to work for zero wages and treated violently and inhumanely (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2010). Furthermore, positionality affects the food movement because a movement needs to be inclusive of all people's needs; the alternative food movements' proposal of neoliberal solutions to hunger hinges on the idea that many of the people who are involved with the movement have the financial means to afford food, whereas millions of people around the world encompass a positionality where their communities and countries have been disenfranchised for decades in the current food system and are therefore exposed to hunger. Their problems are beyond market-based problems such as not being able to buy affordable, organic local products; their problems stem from the injustice of structural racial, social, and gender inequalities that are produced and reinforced by the current food system. Additionally, an individual's likeliness of experiencing hunger is significantly determined by what positionality one holds in a post-colonial food system where food is controlled and produced for the colonizing countries and its citizens who are privileged in race, class, and gender to fulfill their food needs. The food justice framework argues that food injustice is formed by state-sponsored activities that have created an unequal food system where the needs of disenfranchised groups are not being met (Norgaard, Reed, and Van Horn, 2012). State-sponsored activities such as the genocide and land-grabbing of Native Americans, the discriminatory farming policies against African-American farmers

that stem from slavery and sharecropping, and the racialized discrimination of Asian and Latino farmers have contributed to current inequities in the food systems in minority groups (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011).

Secondly, the food justice movement argues that ongoing processes such as urban development, segregation, capitalist, and global processes have created unequal production, distribution, and production of food (McClintock, 2012). Ultimately, food justice activism consists of populations marginalized by a racialized food system organizing to take control of their food system to create a system that meets their food, livelihood, and cultural needs. The racialization of the food system goes beyond land access and affects all aspects of the food system including production, processing, distribution, and consumption (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2010). Research shows that food corporations sell salty and sugary foods detrimental to health specifically target youth and minority audiences. For example, the top commercial advertisers on television for African-American audiences were McDonalds and KFC, soda was the number one advertisement to Latino and African American audiences-two groups with some of the highest obesity rates in the U.S. (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2011). Even some of the biggest corporate fundraisers for low-income high schools come from fast food corporations, forging a bond between low-income youth of color and fast food companies beginning early in life (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2011). Overall, racialized consumption of food due to food injustice is important because it links to inequitable health outcomes and disparities for minorities. Ruthie Gilmore argues that early death is an indicator for institutional racism, so when minority populations exist in a food system that is designed against their best health needs within a greater racist society where inequitable economic opportunity and health care preside, they have increased

likeliness of dying early from lifestyle, chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease due to racism (Guthman, 2011; CDC, 2014). Ultimately, food justice's critique of racial inequities within neoliberal processes is important to consider in examining if international development NGOs are practicing food justice by challenging neoliberal processes and racial inequality.

2.3 RACE IN FOOD JUSTICE

This section of the chapter will give an overview of the role of race in the food justice movement and will argue that race is central to the claims and activism of the food justice movement. The food justice movement identifies itself as a social movement historically rooted in civil rights struggles against racial inequities and fighting discrimination in urban environments in the U.S (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). It believes that everyone deserves the right to access food. Food justice is rooted in racial analysis as Rasheed Hislop, a food justice researcher and environmental justice practitioner defines food justice as "the struggle against racism, exploitation, and oppression taking place within the food system that addresses inequality's root causes both within and beyond the food chain (Alkon, 2014).'' For example, the connection between food justice and racial justice can be explicitly understood through the case study of the Black Panther Party and how they considered the high rates of hungry black children in the inner city as a key example of the racial injustice brought upon the black community by the state (Heynan, 2009). Consequently, providing a source of food for the children through their breakfast program (i.e. food justice) was an act of racial justice and was met with resistance and contestation from the state because of their perception of their actions as radical racial activism (Heynan, 2009). Furthermore, food justice argues that race and class shape the

production, distribution, and organization of the current food system (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). Slocum further asserts that the understanding and analysis of racial theories, identities, formations, and experiences are essential in studying food, the role of racism in the food system, and how our understandings of race and food are fluid and interconnected (Slocum, 2006). She also adds that the oppressive food histories of minorities are ignored, and as previously mentioned in this paper, the food justice movement arose from the lack of analysis of positionality, that "…the understanding that our lived experiences, particularly those of race, class, and gender, shape our worldviews (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011, 19)" in the mainstream alternative food movement. Food justice perspectives argues that the alternative food movement through promoting "solutions" such as buying local and attending farmer's markets, creates a space where whiteness is allowed and where white privilege is reinforced and reproduced in the food movement (Alkon and McCullen, 2010). For example, Alkon and McCullen's case study of the farmer's market in Davis, California stated that the farmer's market became a public space of privileging whiteness without considering the role of intersectionality in the production and consumption of food. Specifically, they argue that intersectionality in the sense of not considering how race and class were linked within people's privilege at the farmer's market and their ability to have their presence and participation welcomed (Alkon and McCullen, 2010). Consequently, the farmer's market reproduced structural inequalities of the food system that were disproportionately problematic to low-income and minority consumers (Alkon and McCullen, 2010). Guthman argues that the alternative food movement's rise to popularity and mainstream attention is due to its lack of incorporating or discussing social justice issues (Guthman, 2008). The food justice movement argues that the industrial food system

was influenced by, shaped and reproduced racism, racial formations, and racial hierarchies present in the world order (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). Food justice claims that institutional racism through institutional policies by governments and economic entities about food, land, good and services, and rights serve to exclude and negatively target communities of color (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). This illustrates the claim that people of color, impoverished people, and women are disproportionately affected by the injustices in the current food system, as even government entities such as the United States Department of Agriculture provide research supporting the fact that racial minorities, women, and poor people are the most likely to experience hunger and food insecurity (USDA, 2012). In connecting the intersectionality of identities and their impact on poverty and hunger, black women in the U.S. and globally experience the highest percentages of hunger and poverty (Bread for the World, 2012; FAO, 2014). Food justice is concerned with all structural inequalities and engaging in critique of social structures such as neoliberalism which produces and reproduces institutional racism and poverty (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). This shows that the food justice movement engages in activism and challenges all structural and institutional processes which disproportionately affect minorities and disadvantage them to experience food insecurity, hunger, and poverty. Hence, the food justice movement is focused on fixing and solving the negative material outcomes of food injustice such as unequal access of healthy, affordable food while also attempting to dismantle the systemic processes and structures where food justice is produced (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). Additionally, the food justice movement argues that it is problematic and limiting to analyze processes and structures without analyzing race because those structures and processes are “created, controlled, and maintained” by racial projects and/or racism

(Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). It also warns that many alternative food projects such as urban agriculture initiatives are at risk of reproducing racial disparities, racism, and white privilege because they do not have a specifically anti-racist social justice frame while operating within a system that is known to produce these inequalities (Reynolds, 2015). Therefore, food justice emphasizes incorporating frameworks of social justice, critical race theory, anti-racism, and intersectionality into its projects and activism (Guthman, 2008; Reynolds, 2015).

In the face of food injustice, community-based and grassroots organizations have spurred about to address food injustice on the local and national levels in the U.S. Community activism and policy pressure on decision-makers to make school meals healthier and to pass anti-hunger based initiatives such as increasing funds for programs that provide food assistance. They have also organized themselves to grow their own fruits and vegetables, learn about cultural roots around eating healthy, and empowering community members to support community-based agriculture, food stores, and cooperatives (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). Overall, the existing food justice literature primarily focuses on the creation of food injustice and how grassroots organizations, primarily in the urban U.S., are creating spaces of food justice, but it fails to focus on how international development NGOs could also potentially reflect and encourage food justice.

Other food movements connected to food and environmental justice are the community food security and food sovereignty movements. Community food security organizations strive for better food environments and community participation in building up more accessible and sustainable food environments. They also critique the alternative food movement (as the environmental justice movement critiques the mainstream

environmental movement), for not paying attention to how the unsustainable and industrialized food systems disproportionately affects communities by producing negative access and health outcomes (Guthman, 2006).

Food sovereignty also influences global food activism (Fairbairn, 2012). It is considered to be the international community's parallel movement to food justice in the United States. The food sovereignty movement is said to have begun in the early 1990's in retaliation to failed discourses of food security by the World Bank and Food and Agriculture Organization that were supposed to ensure that everyone had food (McMichael, 1996). Specifically, the food sovereignty movement positions itself against globalized and industrial food system that supported trade liberalization and structural adjustment agricultural policies, and instead promoted domestic decision-making and control in food systems (McMichael, 1996). In the food sovereignty movement, the frameworks of rural livelihoods and climate change are central to their arguments. For example, rural livelihoods, which refers to the ways in which rural families economically support themselves, is central to food sovereignty because the movement protest neoliberal policies that have lowered the value of agriculture in developing countries. Climate change and climate justice have become central components for food sovereignty because of their attention to the disproportionate vulnerability of poor populations in climate change and the threatening of production of food in the Global South and the need to mitigate climate change through farming in a sustainable and ecologically sound manner (Tokar, 2011). Additionally, food sovereignty has been significantly tied to indigenous rights as indigenous groups around the world are connecting their struggle to obtain land autonomy with their right to control their natural resources, including the production and consumption of food.

This highlights the importance of a rights-based approach in food sovereignty and food justice-that people ultimately have the right to eat healthy, affordable, culturally appropriate foods (Viertal, 2011).

La Via Campesina defines food sovereignty "the right of each nation to maintain and develop its own capacity to produce its basic foods respecting cultural and productive diversity (Patel, 2009). " Instead of a food system that prioritizes trade, capital, and profit, food sovereignty advocates for a food system that prioritizes the health, livelihoods, and environments of the poor (Patel, 2009, pg. 665). The food sovereignty movement challenges monoculture, neoliberal agricultural policy, genetically modified foods, unequal distribution of agricultural profits, and income inequality (Holt-Gimenez, 2011). Conversely, it advocates for not only participation from all races and classes in the food system, but also for youth and female participation and empowerment, non-capitalist solutions, ecologically sound and sustainable agriculture, biodiversity, populations' control over markets, fair wages, and collective participation in all aspects of the food system (Nicholson, 2011). It is highly critical of the neoliberal solutions to hunger in the form of international food security discourse that prioritizes populations having enough food and does not consider the culturally-specific ways of food cultivation, production, consumption, and extensive knowledge (Stedile and Carvalho, 2011). A key strength of the movement has been its ability to change and adopt to the concerns and needs about the food system in specific places, such as its origins in rural peasant communities and its extension to addressing the needs of communities in cities (McMichael, 2008).

Overall, the extensive literature on food justice identifies several actors as being instrumental in creating food injustice and engaging in food justice activism. For example,

the role and contributions of government in food justice and food sovereignty differs from the other actors in the sense that their role has been viewed as causing unequal food systems through unfair policies (McKeon, 2011). Specifically, scholars and activists alike have credited U.S. influence on international agricultural and food policy to the problems in the food system through the U.S.' neoliberal policies, the IMF and World Banks' structural adjustment programs in developing countries (McKeon, 2011). Furthermore, some argue that these policies disempower farmers by making it difficult for them to practice organic agriculture, use non-genetically modified foods, and operate independently (Edelman, 2014). Consequently, most literature recognizes that policy must change in order for global food justice and sovereignty to be possible. Policy advocacy acts as a pressure for governments and governmental organizations to implement policy, and can be considered one way that international development organizations engage with issues of hunger.

2.4 HOW NGOS RESPOND BOTH TO HUNGER THEORETICALLY AND IN THEIR PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES

NGOs possess a variety of responses to hunger that can address structural causes as well as maintain aspects of the conventional global food system and neoliberal responses. International NGOs due to their multiscalarity and political position have the ability to promote structural change in communities and governments, yet their social justice agendas can be limited by neoliberal constraints on funding. International development NGOs possess several characteristics that make them possible sites of social justice activism. First, NGOs' activities have the power to influence structural processes and policy making that can enable potentially social justice (Rubenstein, 2008). International development NGOs are gaining more political power in a variety of places including

corporate, governmental, and community places (Bryant, 2009). Their influence across a variety of actors further enables them to "transform global spaces of civil action (Bryant, 2009, pg. 1546)" and a key strength of their ability to engage in social justice action lies in the fact that international development organizations are inherently multiscalar (Bebbington and Hickey, 2008). Additionally, NGO related activities such as humanitarianism can oftentimes be perceived as nonthreatening compared to direct claims of engagement that challenge societal structures, and therefore may have more political power than states to engage in structural change (Rubenstein, 2008). Research around development has been concerned with how international NGOs engaged with development practice can be places of politics of possibility (Silvey and Rankin, 2008).

However, many international development NGOs with the possibility of engaging in social justice can be largely constrained by neoliberal institutional demands such as organizational cost-effectiveness and efficiency (Rubenstein, 2008). Furthermore, NGOs have been criticized for contributing more neoliberal alternatives to current problems than offering solutions that address systemic and structural changes (Bebbington and Hickey, 2008). Sometimes, the ability of development NGOS to engage with structural change and social justice remains unexamined because the work of civil society in the mainstream are usually perceived as good (Bebbington and Hickey, 2008). This positive perception prevents further analysis of how civil society such as international development organizations contribute to the problems of injustice and racism found in other structures such as government (Bebbington and Hickey, 2008). Furthermore, the multiscalar nature of NGOs are considered to be a disadvantage as well as an advantage to engaging in social justice, as their involvement with corporations and governments for funding purposes

makes NGOs vulnerable to their agendas being co-opted by their funding sources (Bryant, 2009). This co-optation tends to come in the form of NGOs having to transform their potentially justice oriented agendas into measurable outcomes in order to "prove" their "effectiveness" and to frame their agendas in alignment with the priorities of their neoliberal funders through the lenses of national security, economic growth, and trade (Silvey and Rankin, 2010). Some argue that much of the development that NGOs are involved with further contributes to capitalist, neoliberal outcomes such as monetary accumulation for the most powerful actors, uneven development, and exacerbation of structural inequalities (Silvey and Rankin, 2010). Considering neoliberal philosophy emphasizes the importance of individualized solutions, personal responsibility, and human agency in solving societal problems, it can be assumed that this philosophy works against social justice-oriented philosophy that advocate for systemic and structural change (Roberts and Mahtani, 2010).

NGOs have also been accused of being sites of white supremacy and racism. Some argue that international development is composed of racial ideologies about white supremacy in that non-white societies are less developed and need help in adopting economic, political, technological, and social policies in Europe and America (Shields, 1995). Kalpina Wilson (2012) argues that race is silenced in development. Race is important to consider in development because it shapes critical aspects of development such as bodies and structures of power and distribution of resources (Wilson, 2012). Furthermore, it is important to consider the role of race in the production and maintenance of material and social inequalities in the world. Race provides a key foundation for understanding the way in which the world functions and how privilege, power, and

inequality manifest themselves in development (Kothari, 2006). Additionally, NGOs have contributed to racist stereotypes of the Global South; for example, NGOs have benefited from the perpetuation of a racialized representations of Africa by stereotyping African leaders as lazy and greedy and African people as poor and helpless, needing the help of western NGOs as their savior (Wilson, 2012). Additionally, the racialization of othering of people in the Global South by NGOs often benefit their fundraising efforts and rationalization to intervene in these countries (Wilson, 2012). NGOs have also been accused of appropriating resistance in Global South countries by creating their own demands and solutions for pressing issues that affect marginalized peoples, without incorporating or representing the types of resistance that those marginalized people were wanting or working towards already (Wilson, 2012). Specifically, this appropriation of Global South resistance facilitates solutions "of handouts and charity, not one of liberation…against neocolonialism and neoliberalism" as defined by Global South people (Wilson, 2012, pg. 196). Despite this trend of silencing race in development, critical development theorists argue that adding race to development analysis can make more visible inequalities and inadequacies in development programs and policies (Kothari, 2006). Even the lens through which European or U.S. countries assess if developing countries are experiencing the right kind of development or following the obligations of their donors are framed in racist ideologies (Lawson, 2007). Race will be important to analyze in my case study of Oxfam's GROW campaign to see whether or not they acknowledge racial histories, processes, undertones, ideologies, and disparities in the hunger crisis. Race cannot be untied from food justice (Agyeman and Galt, 2014) so it will be important to consider race in order to see if Oxfam is practicing food justice.

International development NGOs have assumed various positions and responsibilities in their activities to address global hunger. NGOs are often the provisioners of food aid as states and private organizations from the Global North who fund food aid for impoverished Global South countries. They assume provisionary responsibilities because of perceptions that NGOs can more effectively and responsibility distribute food aid than Global South countries due to limited state capacity and corruption (Collier, 2005). This substitution of states by international NGOs is used to support the notion that international NGOs benefit from neoliberalism by taking advantage of the neoliberal state with reduced capacities and intervention capabilities (Pearce, 2005). Specifically, Pearce argues that NGOs have taken over the role of providing social services as neoliberal states are pressured to cut budgets by Global North funders and are unable to provide services (Pearce, 2005).

Historically, many international development NGOs involved with issues of hunger have worked with and adopted to intergovernmental organizations such as the World Bank's view for developing action in addressing hunger (Uvin, 1999). Many intergovernmental organizations have adopted the definition and lens of food security to define what it means to not have food and the causes of hunger. The implications of the food security model for solving world hunger are large for the approaches that international development organizations have used, as made evident through large scale anti-hunger development initiatives such as the Green Revolution. For example, the World Bank argues that "Food security is achieved only if all households have the ability to buy food" in which food insecurity is solved through individual's ability to purchase food, developing countries' incorporation into global food and agricultural markets

(Jarosz,2011). Hence, food security becomes another neoliberal solution to the social problem of hunger (Jarosz, 2011).

However, in recent years, some intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in the field of international development have turned away from neoliberal definitions of food security. Instead, they have chosen to adopt other frameworks for analyzing hunger, including food justice, food sovereignty, and a rights-based approach or to form their own definitions of food security that draw upon several interpretations and frameworks. Increasingly, international development NGOs are choosing to adopt the terms of food justice and food sovereignty, both terms heavily critical of the mainstream food security framework, to describe the approaches of their anti-hunger programs. It is important to examine if the GROW campaign adopts original frameworks for food justice or chooses to modify them for whatever reasons. Additionally, we must further understand how alternative concepts to the neoliberal food security models incorporate aspects of hunger largely ignored in the global international agenda such as race, neoliberalism, and inequality.

Food justice employs critical race theory, considers racial formation, and applies racial analysis in its explanation of the current food system. Critical race theory argues that that racism is pervasive and institutions are formed by, maintain, and reproduce racist strictures (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001). Racial formation thought argues that race is an identity formulated through multiple social, political, and environmental processes (Norgaard, 2012). Furthermore, racial analysis implies critically analyzing phenomena within a racial lens. Critical race theory also argues that institutions operate under racist ideologies and white racial hegemony, which is important to consider in food justice for a

variety of reasons (Brown, 2003). Critical race theory provides the tools necessary to analyze the ways Oxfam addresses race in their conceptualization of food injustice. Furthermore, this thesis using critical race theory and food justice frameworks argues that practicing food justice requires an understanding of historical processes of racism and capitalism are important in analyzing hunger because these are central to the formation of the current food system. For example, historical processes of capital accumulation and demarcation situated in racism shaped the current food desert in west Oakland. (McClintock, 2011). McClintock argues that urban planning discriminated against African Americans through segregated city development, racist mortgage prices, and discriminatory city and national policies such as subsidies and loans for housing (not offered to African Americans) and redlining which automatically devalued land populated by African Americans, contributed to a modern day food desert. As high loan and mortgage rates pervaded in Oakland, supermarkets could not get loans to open in the city and opened in white suburbia instead. By the time food retail loans were available, only liquor stores and fast food restaurants were willing to open in African-American communities which contributed to the food desert and 'junk food jungle (McClintock, 2012).' This is similar to how colonialism produced racial disparities in the global food system. Colonizers would dispossess local people of their traditional agricultural land in order to grow cash crops and force people to work on it as slave labor. This separated people from their traditional agricultural and food sources while making them too poor to purchase adequate food (Shields, 1995). One key way that racial disparities are produced in the food system is through the dispossession of land lived on by people of color by the white majority. For example, many Native Americans communities became food deserts through state-

sponsored dispossession of their land which alienated them from their traditional agricultural techniques and food sources (Norgaard, Reed, Van Horn, 2012).

Pushing for justice in the food system is central to the food justice movement (DuPuis, Harrison, and Goodman, 2011), and the food justice movement represents mostly productive justice claims in comparison to distributive justice. In general, justice is concerned with multiple needs such as justice through the form of equitable political representation and participation, equitable distribution, and recognition of justice and injustice (Fraser, 2007). Productive justice, along with distributive justice, pushes for the equitable distribution of resources and goods (Waterstone, 2009). However, distributive justice is more focused on equitable distribution of resources and not focused on equitable distribution of social goods and rights (Waterstone, 2009). Similar to the food justice movement, productive justice acknowledges that injustice produces current inequalities of distribution, that power in decision-making is inequitable, and that mechanisms of deciding distribution need to be fair (Waterstone, 2009). Food justice acknowledges the power inequalities in shaping the global food system, and that powerful, privileged actors that have the most-decision making power are responsible for producing and reinforcing injustice and hunger in the world. Additionally, the food justice movement is connected to productive justice in its emphasis on deep individual, community, and public participation and engagement with decision-making processes that strongly affect people's lives (Waterstone, 2009). The food justice movement centers the most vulnerable people in decision-making as they are the most affected by problems, it is only fair that they need to be the most involved with deciding solutions to problems. Ultimately, it will be important to apply understandings of multiple definitions and concepts of justice and what

constitutes injustice in order to fully understand the claims of justice present within the case study of the GROW campaign.

The critical development perspective incorporated into this paper will be drawn from the disciplines of Political Science and Geography. These development perspectives argue that development analysis does not consider the role of western countries in producing the problems that many developing countries face that are the alleged target of development (Lawson, 2012). Specifically, critical development claims that economic policies and agreements and political decisions from richer countries contribute to higher rates of poverty and inequality. It argues that development knowledge is created by multiple actors such as non-governmental organizations, governments, and social movements which shows they are important actors in implementing and challenging development (Lawson, 2012). Additionally, development is a historically grounded process and it must be approached within a historical context. Critical development within geography specifically highlights the role of space and place in development processes and aims to analyze ideas within a geographic context (Lawson, 2012).This means that it is important to analyze processes across multiple scales in order to examine "situated agents who shape development" and to examine place-specific political processes and how that shapes development on all scales (Lawson, 2012). Critical development geography critiques capitalism, and that "systems of race, gender, ethnicity, and nationality" influence the ways in which processes and people interact with each other. Ultimately, this perspective underlies food justice because of its emphasis upon analyzing historical and place-specific processes of race and class formation, the intersection of scales, and the roles of different actors in producing and challenging development.

Political ecology has been used in recent research as an important framework to analyze food issues. Food is a resource that is contingently tied to material realities yet is a resource under political control and access to food is shaped by inequalities (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). Additionally, political ecology examines cultural, environmental, and political factors through the examination of power among classes, races, and nations governs the ways in which food is distributed and how hunger is produced (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). Political ecology has the ability to focus on the material consequences of hunger such as starving children while also addressing the structural political, social, and cultural processes that continuously contribute to hunger.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND CASE STUDY

3.1 OVERVIEW OF METHODS

This research thesis is an inductive study as it uses the observations and findings from the data collection and analysis of bibliographic information, discourse analysis, and interviews to explore the research questions: 1) how do NGOs reinforce or challenge dominant thinking on pro-market solutions to hunger in international development 2) in what ways do international development organizations adopt food justice principles into their food security and anti-hunger activities? 3) what are the challenges, constraints, and enablers for international NGOs to incorporate food justice? 4) how do international NGOs align with the agendas of social movements foster or inhibit meaningful cross-actor alliances for anti-hunger projects? The bibliographic information helps answer these questions by providing background information on how Oxfam has historically addressed hunger, the literature review provides what theories are important and helpful in analyzing these research questions and offers insight on what other academics and organizations have written about food justice, race, development, and other themes discussed in this paper. Furthermore, the interview allows for information not immediately found in the texts using the previous methods about the case study to be used in this analysis and to clarify any preliminary findings.

An inductive approach to answering the research questions is the most-fitting because the thesis examines the activities of the organization so consequently, the data analyzing the organizations formulates theory. The various materials examined from the case study include reports, websites, and other tools of the GROW campaign to be examined. The case study is a singular, in-depth case study design; Dictionary of Human

Geography defines a case study examines "a complex set of processes in context" (Gregory et al., 2005)." Oxfam International's GROW campaign is the sole case study of the thesis research, and it was selected because they have created and publicized a global campaign around food justice named the GROW Campaign. Because Oxfam has publically expressed that their new campaign is about food justice, GROW provides a perfect backdrop to explore the research question of how international NGOs are adopting the term into their agendas.

The research design of this thesis is primarily a combination of qualitative research methods such as conducting background research, a singular qualitative, semi-structured, in-depth interview, and discourse analysis and policy analysis via policy content. It is important to note that policy analysis only occurs in examining textual content of specific policies and laws relevant in the case study; GROW oftentimes does not mention what specific policies they support, making it difficult to conduct all aspects of policy analysis. The primary method of analysis is discourse analysis of previous Oxfam reports, agendas, academic critique, and other documents such as press releases and websites that will serve as case studies. Hence this paper examines the discourse of Oxfam's GROW Campaign, with discourse being defined as "described and analyzed the ways in which meaning is constructed through and the structures of knowledge and power that construct and structure every day ideas, ideologies, narratives, texts, institutions, and practices (Lawson, 2006, pg. 31)." For example, this thesis uses a variety of academic and policy-oriented books and articles related to hunger, international development, international organizations, and food justice. This thesis also uses a variety of books about food justice, inequality, scale, and critical race theory to provide understandings of those concepts more

to be able to determine how those are being incorporated in Oxfam's GROW campaign. Additionally, I use academic literature that provides analysis and commentary on Oxfam's activities to gage how the current GROW campaign fits into Oxfam's greater mission and give me a historical context for understanding how the GROW campaign may add something different to Oxfam's vision than previous food campaigns. Lastly, I read specific literature published by Oxfam about their organization and about the GROW campaign for discourse analysis. I found these documents through the websites of Oxfam and scholarly databases.

The main sources that I analyzed for discourse analysis were Oxfam's GROW reports; these reports are publications written by Oxfam International and different Oxfam country offices about the state of food injustice and hunger in the world and/or particular countries, or within particular structures such as corporations or governments. These publications outline what factors GROW believes contribute to hunger, in what ways GROW problematizes hunger and food injustice, reasons for why hunger exists, the populations that are most affected by hunger and food injustice, any programs or work GROW or Oxfam countries have done, and GROW's recommendations and proposed solutions for hunger and food injustice to be reduced. Their recommendations and proposed solutions address corporations, governments, and general readers about the hunger and food injustice in these countries. For the two case studies featured within this thesis, I mainly rely on GROW reports for the subject of my analysis.

This discourse analysis also draws on the work of Michel-Rolph Trouillot who emphasizes the importance of silences in producing knowledge. Silences are important to note just as much as the things that are mentioned, as silences can provide insight on who

has the power to call attention to specific processes and that silences are reproduced in order to exclude certain aspects of historical memory (Trouillot, 1995). Trouillot asserts that not everything is remembered or recorded and that silences can be conscious or unconscious, made in narratives produced based off their audience. For the purpose of this thesis, I paid attention to what was mentioned and what was also silenced in GROW materials, so my methodology led me to make grounded conclusions, based off of existing theory mentioned in the literature review and case studies, as to why certain elements of food justice were silenced in GROW's conceptualization of food justice.

The secondary method of this research project is qualitative interviewing. I conducted an interview with a high ranking GROW staff member in the Global North responsible for project design, management, and implementation. This individual is a key player in the design and implementation of the campaign and able to provide context, origins, and plans for the GROW campaign to supplement my discourse analysis. This interview was conducted to supplement the preliminary findings of the discourse analysis and to clarify certain findings and ask questions not imminent in reports, websites, or other written documents about GROW and Oxfam. A semi-structured format was used for the interview which allowed me to have all of my important questions written within the interview guide to be answered, but also allow space for flexibility for the interviewee to comment on related issues that may further give me more insight into his or her points of views. There may be themes and concepts that I may not have identified prior to interviewing in which semi-structured interviewing could nurture their emergence from interviewees. Therefore, the semi-structured interview method allowed for emic codes to emerge from the participants' responses that may differ from the etic codes identified

through the prerequisite literature review for the study. The questions asked during the interview attempted to learn about the organization's theories of change (the strategies and processes in which NGOs write out to achieve their intended outcomes), engagement with food justice, the interviewees' opinions regarding their programs and its incorporation of food justice. The interview was recorded with a digital recorder in order for their responses to be accurately remembered and analyzed to the best ability. Verbal consent was received from the interviewee prior to the interview.

I intend for this research to contribute deeper understandings of the manifestations of food justice on a global scale and how international organizations are utilizing food justice principles. It is meant to examine food justice as a tool to enrich international development's perspectives and solutions to the hunger crisis. Therefore, these findings intend to include and offer practical recommendations and ideas for the organizations to use in their prospects to realize food justice and food sovereignty in their anti-hunger and food security activities. The literature review provided has already begun to answer the research questions, specifically the ones related to the practice of food justice, and the case study and following questions intends to shed further light on the exploration of the research questions.

3.2 CASE STUDY OF OXFAM INTERNATIONAL AND THE GROW CAMPAIGN

Oxfam, the organization that runs the GROW campaign, this thesis' case study, has been involved with world hunger issues since its inception in Great Britain in the 1950's and 1960's (Black, 1993). Although limited documentation is readily available about Oxfam's approach to hunger in its organization inception, there is some documentation that Oxfam was engaged in a variety of anti-hunger campaigns. For example, Oxfam

solicited donations for famine relief to help starving children and was involved with agricultural development projects that provided technical assistance to farmers (Oxfam, 1960). Oxfam also had a campaign called the Freedom from Hunger Campaign, that they described as "a movement to rid mankind of hunger (Gill, 1970)." It seems that this campaign worked in alignment with the FAO's Freedom from Hunger campaign at the time. On Oxfam Australia's website, it states that Oxfam in Australia grew out of the Freedom of Hunger movement that took place there (Oxfam Australia, 2014). Some of their advertisements mention that Oxfam not only relieves problems, but addresses the causes of hunger. It is also interesting to note that many of their advertisements soliciting donations in British newspapers contained pictures of starving children of color, and Oxfam is connected to the perpetuation of the starving children in Africa stereotype (Delahunty, 2009). This offers insight on racially (in)sensitive discourse that Oxfam has historically used to solicit donations and to set up a public image of the work they do and who is benefiting from that work. GROW's use of images of people of color will be discussed later in this paper.

3.3 HOW OXFAM ADDRESSES THE STRUCTURAL CAUSES OF HUNGER

This chapter will provide a summarized overview of the history of Oxfam as an organization. This information provides context on the origins of the organization, their programs and strategies, and offers clues into how and why the GROW campaign came about. Exploring the origins of the program also helps to understand how hunger, poverty, and food justice became agenda items for Oxfam and how they may have historically addressed those issues in their philosophy and programming.

3.4 OXFAM BEFORE OXFAM INTERNATIONAL

Oxfam's history can be traced back to 1942 to a small organization called the Oxford Committee of Famine Relief in Oxford, England (Black, 1993). During the midst of World War II, a group of mostly Quaker people formed the committee out of concern for the situation in Nazi-occupied countries in Europe, where there were stories of extreme hunger, malnutrition, and starvation. Many Nazi-occupied countries were experiencing starvation, hunger, and malnutrition because the Nazis would take complete control of national food and agricultural systems of countries, and would take livestock and food to feed the Nazi soldiers. For example, the Nazis confiscated the most food from Greece in order to feed its soldiers in North Africa. England was one of few unoccupied European countries, and England felt that a moral responsibility to care for the victims of war and poverty (Black, 1993). Hence, England started a National Famine Relief Committee to mobilize British people to help with donating food and other resources to European war victims. Therefore, Oxfam's origins were in disaster relief and responding to emergency situations. The committee was supported by political leaders such as Winston Churchill who openly discussed the role of Germany in producing hunger and starvation in their territories. Although there were famine committees all over England, the Oxford Committee on Famine Relief set themselves apart by being particularly active in fundraising, advertising, and working with other organizations. For example, the Oxford Committee would send letters to newspapers explaining the situation in Nazi-occupied Europe and how people were starving and needed Britons' help. This strategy of appealing to public emotions by presenting images of suffering and starvation would become an essential strategy for the committee's fundraising efforts. The committee claimed to use

this strategy because they were working against a public that was not fully aware of the suffering happening in other parts of Europe due to the Nazi cut-off of outside media.

From their earliest days, the committee targeted issues that they felt went under-addressed by other organizations and people. They made it a priority to help the world's "forgotten peoples" (Gill, 1970). Even though the British Red Cross and Save the Children were the top non-profit organizations, the committees were the key ones addressing hunger in Europe. Additionally, most likely influenced by the Quaker roots, the committee worked with other Christian religious organizations to raise awareness about hunger in Europe. The committee's first project funded through fundraising efforts was a project that funded a women and girls empowerment project in Greece, the country most affected by hunger and starvation. The organization worked for European victims of the Nazi occupation for years after the war ended, and also extended disaster relief to Korean and Algerian refugees of the war. The more they extended their reach, the more recognition they received, after the post-war relief efforts such as the Marshall Plan rebuilt much of Europe were largely over near the end of the 1950s, the Committee decided to expand the reach of their affairs.

3.5 THE CREATION OF OXFAM IN THE 1960s

Along with the rising interest and conversation in American and European political arenas about global poverty around the world in the 1960s, particularly in developing countries, the committee directed their attentions to hunger and poverty around the world (Gill, 1970; Black, 1993). It is important to note the various political incidents that occurred which contributed to interest and action on global hunger and poverty. First, the 1960's began with a wave of African countries declaring independence from their

European colonizers which brought more attention to the realities of life in these countries and interest in engaging in newly formed states that were once seen as colonies. The racial and cultural implications of having to collaborate with the majority of the world people of color brought in new ideas and curiosity. Additionally, the United Nations deemed the year of 1959 to 1960 as the year of the World Refugee which stirred global attention to the plight of the poor in developing countries, and 1960-1970 is considered by many to be "the development decade"(Gill, 1970). In particular, in 1960 the Food and Agriculture Organization launched the Freedom from Hunger Campaign, vowing that all nations should work together to eliminate hunger from the world (Black, 1993). Consequently, the Oxford Committee used the freedom from hunger as publicity to fundraise for their efforts and joined a national competition for non-profits to raise money for the global campaign. The committee amplified their key fundraising strategy of the past, and for their fundraising with the freedom from hunger campaign, they posted ads in newspapers filled with pictures of starving African children with captions of how much suffering, poverty, and hunger children were facing and how the readers' donations of money, food, and clothing would put a stop to the wrong (Black, 1993; SOFII.org, 2014). In fact, to this day Oxfam (through the early form of the committee) is credited with projecting the image of the African starving child on British public memory (Black, 1993). This strategy proved to be very successful and the committee brought in the most money out of all the organizations who participated in the national campaign and gained increased credibility and notoriety. With the rising publicity and extended reach of services, the committee decided to shorten their name and go by Oxfam in 1965. Oxfam defined their mission as "to relieve poverty,

distress, and suffering from any public calamity" and they began funding projects around the world.

3.6 OXFAM IN THE GLOBAL SPHERE

Oxfam continued to use their strategies of newspaper articles and ads, but also adopted more publicity stunts to raise awareness about hunger, poverty, and their own organization. For example, they would partner with owners of theaters, directors of plays and movies to incorporate Oxfam into their artistic work. Soon enough, celebrities such as the Queen of England, Jackie Kennedy Onassis were publicly declaring their support of Oxfam's work, which catapulted their success and fundraising to new heights. At the time, non-governmental organizations were credited with providing and setting the image standards of the "third world" and Oxfam used their newfound status to shape the image how they wanted to shape it. Oxfam also took advantage of the momentum building up in young people to respond to global injustice, and the organization began to establish Young Oxfam Groups at college campuses around the UK to help raise funds to respond to Oxfam's disaster projects. However, Oxfam's publicity did not come without criticism, and Oxfam found criticism with the Charity Commissioners, the umbrella organization of global charities, for spending money on public ads instead of just their projects. Oxfam supported emergency situations in Peru and Congo, and worked in India and Botswana during the early 1960s. They were involved in a variety of projects such as rebuilding areas, supporting local farmers, building agricultural irrigation systems, building hospitals, and passing out food and medicine (Gill, 1970). In terms of food, for example, Oxfam worked with the Ministry of Agriculture in Botswana to support a project that made small farmers' cattle heavier so they could sell it for a higher price, and help transport the cattle to local

markets. In many of their projects, Oxfam continued with their tradition of having female-centered projects, and in the places where they were working with males, they would always include a partner female-centered project. For example, in India when they worked with male farmers and created a rural training center for them, they also included classes for women on nutrition and gardening. At this time, Oxfam began to refine its approach to addressing poverty and hunger, and realized they needed to transition from a "natural and man-made" disaster and emergency response organization to an organization that also handled more chronic situations (Gill, 1970). It is important to note that Oxfam did acknowledge the role of politics in producing emergency situations in countries around the world, and did not always adopt the idea that famines and sufferings had "natural" i.e. environmental causes.

Oxfam also utilized social and political movements in overseas countries to promote and implement their programs. For example, Oxfam's first biggest overseas projects were in India implementing a variety of agricultural, microfinance, and women's empowerment projects during the time where Mahatma Gandhi's movement was gaining popularity (Black, 1993). Additionally, Oxfam decided to go into Tanzania when Julius Nyerere was president and announced his Ujamaa liberation movement that promoted social welfare policies for Tanzanians. Oxfam looked at working with existing political movements as a sign of solidarity of more developed countries working with the poor instead of simply helping the poor (Black, 1993). In 1975, Oxfam specifically declared a policy of solidarity with the poor and that they would work together with partner field sites. Furthermore, Oxfam developed a strategy they called bridge partnering, where they would work with existing organizations and structures in their field areas to implement programs, instead of

starting off projects on their own (Black, 1993). This was to make sure Oxfam was in solidarity and supporting communities instead of overriding local efforts to create positive change, and Oxfam funded projects of existing organizations instead of funding new projects that were specifically Oxfam operations. Local groups were often religious organizations, but Oxfam also worked with government ministries and the United Nations on their projects (Gill, 1970). This also attracted controversy and trouble from the charity commissioners, which argued that Oxfam was being untruthful in their advertising because it was not clear that money could be going to other organizations than Oxfam. Oxfam also struggled with balancing their new solidarity strategy of supporting indigenous groups for development and with engaging in "humanitarian space" with emergency and relief efforts (Black, 1993).

Oxfam claimed that they were interested in fostering sustainable development and responding to geopolitical issues, and in order to do that effectively, they would have to work with knowledgeable partners in their field sites. They still wanted to engage in emergency and relief efforts, but also wanted to expand their operations in a way which was not always apolitical but not compromising the political neutrality they vowed to as a charity organization. Specifically, the Charity Commissioners' encouragement of political neutrality proved very difficult for Oxfam at times, in particular in the early 1990's with apartheid South Africa. Along with demands of activist movements in divesting funds from companies which invested in apartheid South Africa, Oxfam decided that they would divest their funds in Barclay's Bank in a clear statement against apartheid (Black, 1993). Additionally, Oxfam's research and article publications, in particularly with food and hunger, were interpreted as being non-neutral. For example, in Oxfam publication "For

Richer and For Poor, and Western Connections with World Hunger", Oxfam researcher Jon Clark blamed Western nations' structural adjustment policies for the Global South's debt which prevented them from investing in national agricultural systems and contributed to mass starvation in the non-western world (Clark, 1986). Additionally, Oxfam supported the Against the Arms campaign which stated they would not work with countries which funded use of arms because they said money was being deferred from funds to feed populations to funds to project violence on to marginalized populations (Black, 1993). Oxfam additionally partnered with Palestinian organizations an spoke out against Israeli imposed closures of schools and land in Palestine, in which the organization receive major backlash from a variety of sources(Black, 1993). In 1991, Oxfam received a formal complaint from the Commissioners that they were being too political, but they continued with their ways. Lastly, another strategy that Oxfam identified as important to their organization was the strategy of scaling up. Scaling up strategy meant that Oxfam would transfer successful initiatives implemented in one place to another location and onto potentially higher levels of change. Oxfam also allowed their solidarity strategies to influence their fundraising strategies. When Oxfam started working with Indian women and wanted to support their microfinance, they allowed the women's products to be sold at Oxfam gift shops in England so they could ensure that women were participating in fair trade deals (Black, 1993). Ultimately, this history roots Oxfam International as a pioneer in international development which challenges structures and power more than other similar organizations on hunger and poverty. It also shows that Oxfam has a history of working with existing social movements throughout the world.

To make a note, in the history of Oxfam, any explicit connections to race is rare. There are very few mentions of race and racism through the secondary and first sources I read about the history of the organization. In recent years, Oxfam has supported the end of racism and racial discrimination for indigenous people in Peru (Oxfam, 2010), anti-racism campaigns, yet it appear as if race is not central to the organization's efforts or its agenda.

CHAPTER 4. OXFAM'S GROW CAMPAIGN

The GROW campaign is a recent campaign launched in 2011 by Oxfam International and all its country affiliate offices to advocate for justice in the global food system. Specifically, GROW targets the way in which the world grows food, the way the world distributes food, and who grows food and has control over the food system. The campaign relays its message and programs in a variety of ways such as publications, advertisements, campaigning, and advocacy tools such as petitions, and the campaign addresses a global audience. GROW claims that the global food system is broken and that all of us, governments, businesses, farmers, and citizens, must work together in creating and enforcing solutions to fix its brokenness (Oxfam, 2013). Oxfam believes that the food system is broken first and foremost because one in seven people in the world are hungry (Oxfam, 2013), and that such a high rate of hunger in a world which produces so much food is unacceptable. Relatedly, Oxfam emphasizes that the reason why people are hungry has little to do with the amount of food available, but is influenced largely by the fact that large corporations and governments control the food system and "decides who eats and who doesn't" (Oxfam, 2013). Furthermore, Oxfam contends that the inequality in power and money increases poor people's vulnerability to market and natural imbalances, such as food price shocks and increasing occurrences of natural disasters due to climate change. Due to the fact that poor countries and poor people are more vulnerable to the negative consequences of natural disasters, the GROW campaign calls for a food system that is based in ecologically sound practices as to not harm the environmental system. Consequently, the GROW campaign outlines key actions that need to happen to reduce hunger and "to grow food and justice without wrecking the planet" (Oxfam, 2013).

First, Oxfam proposes increasing the access that small-scale producers, and in particular female farmers have to selling their products in the market, increasing resilience of small-scale farmers, and boosting productivity of farmers. GROW emphasizes women farmers as a focus throughout their programs because women make up most of the world's food production sector, and are more adversely affected by lack of land and water access, and pregnant women's nutrition and health is intrinsically tied with infant and child nutrition and health. Oxfam also states that we need to increase land and water access for small-scale farmers who rely upon agriculture survival on that for their livelihoods and survival and to ensure that larger corporations are not taking advantage of them by taking over the farmers' land or water rights. GROW also calls for reform in food aid programs to make sure they are more timely and efficient and calls for monitoring and calling out of governments and businesses and how their practices, policies, and programs are negatively contributing to poor outcomes for hunger and poverty. With all of these pressing concerns, Oxfam calls citizens and consumers to engage in the problem of the food system by signing various petitions, advocating for anti-hunger and pro-poor policies in their communities, and considering how the food they eat affects the environment and the people who produced the food.

The GROW campaign is highly multi-faceted and includes several main components that target their various goals about fixing the food system through the collaboration of governments, businesses, and consumers. The GROW campaign consists of in-country programs that fight for food justice within the contexts of their environments, but is mostly policy advocacy and reviews of corporations and governments and their contributions to food injustice. The campaign also includes various awareness and advocacy campaigns

such as petitions to harbor support to pressure corporations and governments around food justice. Hence, the GROW campaign operates throughout the world across different mediums and scales: it happens online, in real life, in the field, the Global North and the Global South, and in boardrooms. GROW also publishes research and evaluation reports to inform people about the program. Additionally, the GROW campaign is very active on social media and has used social media to promote the campaign; the GROW campaign has also utilized Oxfam's celebrity connections by getting celebrities such as Coldplay to tweet out petitions and information about the program (Oxfam, 2013). This situates GROW in relation to other Oxfam campaigns where social media and celebrity are used to call attention the cause at hand. The Behind the Brands program targets large corporations, and the GROW method largely targets consumers. I will briefly discuss each of these components and how it contributes to the overarching goals of the GROW campaign.

Behind the Brands is part of the GROW campaign and calls out the top ten corporations in the global food industry to reform their practices and policies to fight hunger and climate change. The corporations selected are "Associated British Foods (ABF), Coca-Cola, Danone, General Mills, Kellogg, Mars, Mondelez International (previously Kraft Foods), Nestlé, PepsiCo and Unilever" (Oxfam, 2013). The campaign recognizes that certain corporations have expanded their activities to financing and creating programs that provide certain social services to the communities in which they operate in, such as a women's training program, but GROW campaign criticizes that those programs do little to address underlying reasons behind poverty and hunger in communities and corporations need to adopt structural policies in their supply chain management and operation that address roots of hunger. Oxfam acknowledge the extensive power and influence these ten

food and beverage companies, referred to as the 'Big 10' in the GROW campaign, have on the global food system and call for them to be inspirational and creative leaders in enforcing just and sustainable solutions (Oxfam, 2013). GROW problematizes several characteristics of the businesses that are contributing to the problem of a broken food system. First, none of the Big Ten companies enforce policies that ensure the protection of local communities' rights. Secondly, Behind the Brands brings attention to the lack of policies that make sure that the company gives farmers a fair price for the products, and there are no policies expressing zero tolerance in exploiting or marginalizing small farmers, women farmers, and other minority farmers. GROW also states that the lack of transparency in their activities makes it difficult to investigate whether or not corporations are engaging in social responsibility or sustainability (Oxfam, 2013). It calls attention to the consolidation of the food industry and how dozens of smaller companies that many consumers think are produced by small producers such as Stonyfield Farms or Odwalla, have been bought and are owned by one of the Big 10 corporations(Oxfam, 2013). Lastly, corporations are not using their power and resources to do enough about climate change mitigation or make their supply chain sustainable. GROW considers it unjust that these Big 10 corporations could be making so much profits derived from acquiring cheap resources and using unfriendly environmental technologies and producing many products of little nutritional value that do not help with nutrition security in developing countries(Oxfam, 2013) .

Hence, Behind the Brands tracks the progress of these companies in their environmental and social responsibility policies and achievements and intends to make known publically the progress of companies, whether good or bad, on areas that the

campaign identifies as being instrumental to good environmental and social responsibility. One of the main goals of Behind the Brands is to have consumers know where their food and beverage companies stand on policies that shape the global food system, and to make consumers knowledgeable enough to use their consumer power and demand that their companies change their policies in order to keep their business. Behind the Brands also makes the argument that social and environmental responsibility is good for business for their corporations. First, environmental sustainability ensures that the products they are harvesting are being sustainably extracted, leaving more products to be harvested in the future, and that current operations are not upset by environmental risk factors. Secondly, social responsibility is important because it ensures that farmers want to be farmers and that consumers will continue to buy products. The campaign cites the fact that Ghanaian cocoa farmers only make 80 cents a day, which provides little incentive for younger generation to stay in agriculture, which may lead to corporations having a labor shortage later. Hence, they should pay the farmers well to ensure the sustainability of their businesses and labor supply. Oxfam argues that the social and environmental responsibility need to be maintained in order for the Big 10 to maintain its customers and increasingly consumers want to buy products that are ethically and environmentally sound. Oxfam includes a study saying that 50 percent of consumers from emerging economies would pay more for products that give back to society, and that 90 percent of female consumers wanted to know how the products they buy are changing the world (Oxfam, 2013). They also point to the beyond average rapid growth of companies such as Equal Exchange, which grew more than 12 percent in 2012, and only sells fair trade products, as an example of the profitability grounded in responsible sourcing. Oxfam also claims that the seven areas they

for their measure of the progress are rooted in the similarity that all seven categories have been historically neglected by international corporations (Oxfam, 2013). The seven categories consist of: women, small-scale farmers, climate change, land, farmworkers, transparency, and water. Behind the Brands finds that most of the organizations score poorly on all seven categories.

The second major component of the GROW campaign is the GROW method which mainly attempts to engage consumers and citizens with helping to fix the broken food system through their own actions. The GROW method tries to engage with consumers to reflect on their food purchasing and dietary habits and consider how their decisions affect the global food system. The GROW method claims that "fighting hunger can start right at your kitchen table" and suggests for consumers to do that in several ways: saving food, eating seasonal foods, eating less meat, supporting small farmers, cooking more energy efficiently (Oxfam, 2014). The GROW method calls on consumers to reduce their food waste by limiting the amount of food they throw away and saving leftovers. This helps in conserving resources to make sure everyone around the world has enough to eat. Secondly, it suggests that consumers eat seasonally because it reduces greenhouse gas emissions that are emitted when energy goes into growing foods at different times of the year than they are grown. Thirdly, it advocates for consumers to eat at least one vegetarian meal a week and to eat less meat because it takes more land and water to grow animal products than to grow non-animal product and it emits more greenhouse gas emissions. Fourthly, it tells consumers to support small farmers by buying products and brands that are labeled as being from small farmers, because small farmers rarely get any profit from the work they do in producing food for large scale brands. Lastly, it tells consumers to "cook smart" and

to make changes to their cooking such as taking their kitchen appliances out when not in use in order to reduce energy and water so that can be saved for growing food for everyone. They refer to these steps as "five simple principles to feed the planet." It encourages people to share recipes with each other, teach each other about more sustainable ways of eating, and to talk about their meals on social media to raise greater awareness of the food. They encourage people to participate in GROW on social media through taking pictures of their sustainable meals and using the hashtag #GROW as the caption, the campaign has published a cookbook on Pinterest, and recipes on their website. It recognizes that many people find enjoyment in eating together and cooking together, and the campaign hopes to inspire people to reconnect to their food by reflecting on how their food is a product of the current food system, and how their eating choices can have positive influences on improving food justice.

The third component of the GROW campaign is the gathering of support to sign petitions to get action around localized problems of hunger. This coincides with one of the major goals of the campaign of building a public consensus and movement around food justice. The petitions called for the public's attention to put pressure on a variety of governments and corporations to act on various issues such as hunger crises, land grabs, and sustainable food policy. One of the biggest petitions was a petition calling for world governments to take stronger action on solving the hunger crisis in the Sahel region of sub-Saharan Africa in 2012(O'Neil, 2013). The Sahel region is made up of Chad, Cameroon, Niger, Mali, Nigeria, Uganda, and Central African Republic and a large portion of the land is arid, desert, and dry. The region had experienced an increase in droughts, floods when it does rain, and diseases that flourish in those environmental conditions. Combined with the

loss of livelihoods from the natural disasters and the vulnerability that these communities face by not having risk preparedness, food insecurity and malnutrition skyrocketed. The petition named "Stop the African Hunger Games" referencing the popular movie The Hunger Games, claimed that although 18 million people in the Sahel region were going hungry, the United Nations reported receiving 645,000 dollars or "only 43 percent of the 1.5 billion" necessary to provide immediate assistance to people (Oxfam, 2012). Furthermore, the petition asks for the public to demand that Global North countries such as the United States, France, Germany, and Japan, fund the remaining amount. It appeals to consumers to not just wait for media reports of starving children to appear on their television screens, but to act now by urging leaders of their world governments to prevent the crisis to being too out of control. This petition in particular was signed by 533,000 people, and helped the GROW campaign establish its goal of networking in collaboration with other non-governmental organizations to fight for food justice, as organizations such as CARE, Action Against Hunger joined the efforts to push governments to fund food security assistance in the Sahel (O'Neil, 2013). The petition ultimately led to a 41 million Euro increase in funding from European Union countries to efforts to address the Sahel food crisis (O'Neil, 2013).

The second major petition that the GROW campaign started was a petition to stop land grabs in the Polochic community in Guatemala. Oxfam states that 769 families in this community were forced to leave their property. Their farms, homes, and belongings were burned to the ground, and with three people dying, because the government forced them into eviction. The government signed a 26 million dollar deal with a sugar cane company to operate in the community in 2005 (O'Neil, 2013). This meant that hundreds of families

were displaced from their land throughout the years, and in 2012, the remaining 769 families were evicted (O'Neil, 2013). The petition gathered 100,000 signatures from over 55 countries to deliver to the government of Guatemala and demand that they assist the displaced families and help recover their land (O'Neil, 2013). The collaboration between Oxfam and grassroots organizations in Guatemala pressured the government to provide land for some of those families (Niezan, 2013). Oxfam also put pressure on the World Bank to stop financing businesses that engage in land grabs because the sugar cane company was financed through a loan partially funded by the World Bank. The petition resulted in the World Bank agreeing to review their policies in light of the United Nations land rights and the increased awareness partially contributed to land rights and land grabs being put on the agenda at the G8 summit in 2012. This increased attention on the connection between land access and food insecurity prompted the GROW campaign to launch the Land Freeze campaign targeted at the World Bank. The petition demanded that the World Bank stop authorizing land grabs for six months and conduct a review of their policies and their incorporation of land rights, land governance, and Free, Informed and Prior Consent of communities. Even though the World Bank denied the request to conduct a six month land freeze, Oxfam considers the campaign to have had a positive effect on the World Bank's policies as "…inclusion of land rights in the WB safeguards review; an International Financial Corporation (the WB's private sector arm) action plan on financial intermediaries; and a promised internal review on land rights issues by the WB evaluation group (O'Neil, 2013)." Ultimately, the World Bank changed its reviewing policy involving land claims to include an analysis of land rights.

CHAPTER 5 THE GROW CAMPAIGN AND FOOD JUSTICE

This chapter will give an overview on how the GROW campaign's claims to food justice compares to the definitions and components of food justice as outlined in the existing academic literature. I will argue that Oxfam is engaging in food justice in their work on emphasizing the role of women, land, history and the environment in shaping food justice, but lack an analysis of race in shaping the food system. Furthermore, they mainly focus on governments and corporation driven change as compared to people agency and social movements' driven change which is a tenant of food justice (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). (IATP, 2011). Furthermore, I will argue that their heavy concentration of facilitating the role of governments and corporations can be considered to be a reflection of the neoliberal constraints on the non-governmental organization that prohibits them from advocating for a more structural and long-term approach to change. Throughout the GROW campaign, governments and corporations are considered to be the ones that will enable food justice, as opposed to having a people-centered and agency focused approach to facilitating global food justice. It is important to note that the frameworks for food justice are drawn from a variety of academic sources, and I will use the model diagram outlined by Eric Holt-Jimenez, the director of the Institute of Food and Development Policy in his chapter for Cultivating Food Justice, and the various academic sources in the literature review section to guide my analysis in this section.

The GROW campaign coincides with food justice's model of advocating for "agroecologically produced local food" (Holt-Gimenez, 2012). The GROW campaign's emphasis on the environmental degradation occurring within this current broken global food system, supporting small-scale farmers who may not rely heavily on chemical

pesticides and fertilizers to grow their food, and emphasizing the negative impact of chemical fertilizers on the water and land of indigenous communities offer insight into why Oxfam is practicing a food justice that is agroecologically sound. Oxfam cites the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's report of claiming that 25 percent of greenhouse gas emissions are caused by agricultural industry, which solidifies the importance of the food industry to become environmentally sustainable (Bailey, 2011). For example, GROW claims that the current agricultural production, particularly in developing countries, is too resource-intensive to maintain sustainability (Bailey, 2011).

GROW's main goal is to develop collaboration to establish a food system that is socially and environmentally sound. It emphasizes the important of reducing fossil fuels loss, and highlighting the fact that some poor countries spend more than six times more on importing oil than on funding healthcare; this would be diminished by finding alternative economic opportunities that are not reliant on a heavy use of fossil fuels(Bailey, 2011). Additionally, international food and beverage corporations should be transparent about the environmental costs of their work on the communities and environments in which they operate. The GROW campaign also emphasizes the importance of respecting biodiversity in agricultural production and making sure businesses are not involved in environmental degradation such as cutting down large parts of the rainforest. Additionally, the GROW campaign argues that we must create a food system where agriculture is less input intensive, and that many lower intensive activities are environmentally sound(Bailey, 2011). Many of the nitrogen fertilizers that larger corporations use run off into the water sources of the community, making water sources polluted and useable (Oxfam International, 2012) and polluting the land around them. They also endanger aquatic food

sources for communities because nitrogen can fertilize algae and the algae will grow more and require oxygen for its survival, and therefore lead to reduced oxygen supply for fish and other sea animals which leads to death (Oxfam International, 2012). For example, they recommend a food system that supplies farmers with animal and green manures in order to replace chemical fertilizers, that employs principles of agroforestry by planting multiple types of vegetables help to maintain the nutrients in the soil. Additionally, sustainable water harvesting reduces reliance on irrigation systems or irregular rainfall. GROW also argues that environmentally sustainable can be more economically profitable in the future: GROW cites a study saying that 40 sustainable African farms had greater yields of about 40 percent after 3-7 years of using sustainable methods from chemical ones. A major sustainability tool that Oxfam promotes and implements across their programs is the System of Rice Intensification, "an agro-ecological methodology for increasing the productivity of irrigated rice by changing the management of plants, soil, water and nutrients (Cornell, 2013)" which boosts the productivity of small farmers and emits little greenhouse gasses. GROW has overseen the implementation of this technology in three countries, Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, and India. Overall, GROW continuously links environmental degradation to the loss of livelihoods of communities and states that bigger corporations engage in both activities and earn big profits to degrade the environments and livelihoods of communities in the Global South.

GROW considers the government's role in ensuring an environmental sustainable world and food system as major, and several GROW research publications such as "Governance for a Resilient Food System" (Evans, 2011) and "Averting Tomorrow's Global Food Crisis: The European Union's Role In Delivering Food Justice In A Resource-

Constrained World" (Oxfam, 2012) and have been written to explain how Oxfam perceives the government's role. In this argument, Oxfam's form of food justice coincides with existing definitions about resource distribution, as food justice advocates for equitably and fairly sharing the "benefits and risks of where, what, and how food is grown and produced, transported and distributed, and access and eaten…" (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2011). Food justice argues that powerful actors wrongfully use land, water, and air and demands that large corporations respect the environment of where they operate (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2011). Hence, Oxfam is concerned that corporations are profiting off of environmental degradation of Global South communities while not bearing the same consequences for their behavior. They believe that governments can make reforms in environmental corporate policy and in consumption of less meat for consumers.

Additionally, they also link environmental degradation with the cycle of poverty, as they claim that environmental risks puts already impoverished and vulnerable at risk of losing their livelihoods dependent on the weather and land, therefore driving that family into poverty (Evans, 2013). Families in poverty oftentimes cannot afford to send their children to school and so the child's ability to be successful is limited, hence there is an intergenerational effect of poverty linked to environmental degradation. Oxfam also suggests looking at the impact of richer countries environmental policies on hunger and the global food system. For example, Oxfam claims that the European Union's environmental policy of securing biofuels for at least 10 percent of fuel contributes to agricultural degradation in the countries where the biofuels are sourced, which contributes to land displacement and environmental degradation for Global South communities. Furthermore, Oxfam's framing of the environment fits into food justice framework as Oxfam considers

the environment of the poor as a site of injustice and that their environmental needs should be prioritized in order to ensure food justice. Specifically, environmental degradation disrupts poor communities' fulfillment of food justice because their land and water to farm becomes degraded, and it is one of the various ways in which more powerful, larger actors control the food system and commit injustice. They cite major political opportunities such as the G20 Summit, meetings around the Kyoto Protocol, as places where Global North governments can make commitments to reducing their environmental impact and setting standards for corporations (Bailey, 2011).

Oxfam's commitment to environmental justice concerns related to food justice is reflected in their field programs of Oxfam in the Global South. For example, Oxfam's food justice campaign in the Philippines directly roots the environmental degradation harmful for small-scale farmers to the larger multinational cooperation who operate in the Philippines. The report states that intensive agricultural practices have led to 66 percent of the total forest cover in the Philippines to be considered lost (Illo, 2013). These intensive agricultural practices such as logging and land clearing were predominantly practiced by international corporations operating in the Philippines (Illo, 2013). Oxfam Philippines also encourages the consumption and growth of brown rice for environmental reasons over white rice because brown rice processing requires less fossil fuels than white rice (Oxfam Philippines, 2013).

Oxfam practices food justice through advocating for land and food access for marginalized populations. Land and food access is an important consideration in food justice, as Holt-Gimenez considers them to be a key aspect of how food justice empowers people in the food system (Holt-Gimenez, 2010). As food justice is also concerned with

recognition that marginalized peoples' have had their rights to land and food violated (Agyeman and Galt, 2014), food justice asserts that marginalized people's rights to land and food need to be respected, recognized, and fulfilled. Food justice is driven by unequal access of food, and asserts that institutional racism, patriarchy, classism, sexism and priority of capital profit over people have contributed to inequitable food access. (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). Land access is intrinsically tied to food access for many of the world's people because land provides opportunity to grow one's own food with the physical space and resources required to grow food such as water (Bailey, 2012). Land also becomes important for cultural traditions and social cohesion as land allows for people to gather on the land where they feel a historical connection (Noorgard, Reed, and Van Horn, 2012). Furthermore, food justice asserts that land dispossession fits into a larger racialized environmental injustice history as oftentimes white and/or lighter skinned elites, more powerful actors dispossess marginalized communities of color via colonial and post-colonial processes (Noorgard, Reed, and Van Horn, 2012). Overall, unequal land and food access is a result of larger, structural issues in the global food system and the world.

The GROW campaign identifies land access as one of their key parts of their agenda that they wish to accomplish, stating that they would like to work towards stopping big investors from acquiring land from communities in the Global South and exploiting their resources and therefore undermining their experience (Bailey, 2012). They intend to achieve this agenda point by "naming and shaming" investors who are implicated in land grabs, supporting institutional enforcement of high business standards of organizations that oversee land investment and natural resources, making sure that agribusiness are developing and adhering to responsible land policies (Bailey, 2012). Additionally,

considering GROW identifies ensuring the rights of women and female small-scale producers as an instrumental part of the campaign, the campaign's agenda also includes encouraging countries to sign the voluntary guidelines of land and natural resource tenure that are administered Context of Food Security guidelines created by the Food and Agriculture Organization (Bailey, 2012). Specifically, GROW frames the problem with land back to land being controlled by powerful global actors such as corporations, and powerful elites in countries who have control over giving land and blocking land reform (Bailey, 2012). Furthermore, Oxfam asserts that large corporations are deliberately targeting Global South countries with poor governance in order to commit land grabs; GROW reports that more than 66 percent of countries that were sites of land grabs scored below average on good governance indexes (Oxfam, 2013). Poor governance allows corporations to often times skip certain steps required to control land such as conducting environmental assessments and obtaining consent from communities to operate on their land (Oxfam, 2013). Oxfam also considers land access to be an important point for small-scale producers in the Global South, as they point out that small-scale producers that feed over two billion people are currently doing this without access to land, financial support, technology, infrastructure and that we need to fix this "gaping inequity" (Bailey, 2012, 56). GROW also identifies land reform to be a successful tool in achieving food security for countries; many GROW reports identify Vietnam as a real life case study of the influence of land reform on eliminating high levels of food insecurity. Oxfam reports that Vietnam in 1993 developed a national Hunger Eradication and Poverty Reduction Programme and a key part of the program was accomplishing economic growth that was inclusive and dependent on land reform. Land reform distributed land back to the impoverished and small-scale producers

which enabled them to gain access to technology, land, water, and markets to sell and grow their rice. As a result, Vietnam now supplies rice to feed their population and reduced poverty rates significantly, falling to 18 percent from 58 percent poverty rate in 1993 (Bailey, 2012). Furthermore, Oxfam's commitment to land was made evident in their Land Freeze campaign described in previous sections that urged the World Bank to stop giving out loans on investments which initiate land grabs.

GROW's conceptualization of the food crisis fits into the food justice model as Oxfam calls for prioritizing the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people by demanding for better safety nets to protect against food insecurity and providing locally produced emergency food aid in order to support small-scale farmers in those areas. Oxfam ultimately contends that there is enough food grown to feed the planet and that hunger persists because the poorest GROW's advocacy work around the Sahel Food Crisis points to one of Oxfam's conceptualization on food security. Despite material threats to growing food such as climate change, desertification, and lack of water, Oxfam does not consider these environmental causes to be the end-all, and encourages government collaboration in reducing the impact of threats by prioritizing food security. For example, Oxfam encourages Global North and South governments to build resilience against food crisis through devoting 10 percent of their agricultural budgets to emergency food reserves and by prioritizing equity within sourcing options to support small-scale and female producers (Oxfam, 2013), while reminding them they are still responsible in ensuring food access, despite being in times of food crisis (Oxfam, 2013). Oxfam encourages funding and implementation of global, national, and local food reserves to ensure that small-scale producers can sell their food during crisis and people have access to food during crisis as

well (Oxfam, 2013). Additionally, they stress the importance of increasing access to undernutrition prevention programs so everyone in need know where they can access food. Oxfam also emphasizes the importance of type of access to food; in GROW's work on South Africa, they conclude that poor people have sufficient and affordable access to less nutritious food or food high in starch and carbohydrates, but lack of access to affordable and nutritious food (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014). They also conclude that rising electricity costs are forcing people to not buy foods that require cooking, and are ultimately leading them to buy processed and previously packaged food (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014).

Furthermore, Oxfam fulfills food justice principles by putting an emphasis on the needs of marginalized populations within the broken global food system. The food justice movements is all about marginalized people, and it sprang from the negative effects on marginalized people of color in the United States (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011). For example, Oxfam contends that issues with land disproportionately affected marginalized populations such as women, pastoralists, and indigenous people (Bailey, 2011). Oxfam's main framing of marginalization is that marginalized people are the ones who are denied the most of their human rights and access to basic goods such as the right to food, land, water, and autonomy, hence making them the poorest and the ones who are disproportionately hungry. They claim that marginalized peoples are the ones who are most taken advantage of and affected by powerful actors' decisions that affect the food system (Bailey, 2012). For most of the GROW rhetoric and publications, marginalized people's identities stay the same (women, small scale producers, indigenous people), but are sometimes identified differently within different country contexts. For example, in South Africa, Oxfam identifies

urban dwellers without land living in informal settlements, who are children or female headed households, and are unemployed as marginalized peoples in the population (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014). They claim that these are the people who experience the most hunger and also the most obesity from overconsumption of affordable, low nutritious foods.

In Guatemala, Oxfam perceives the marginalized people to be the ones who are left out and not considered in plans and policies which provide benefit to other parts of the population (Oxfam, 2011). For example, they say that the rural growth model, dependent on the land resources to achieve economic growth, is highly beneficial to certain government entities and corporations, but completely exclude consideration and needs of the marginalized (Oxfam, 2011). In Brazil, indigenous people remain marginalized in their benefits from public policies, as Oxfam shows that they have a 44 percent prevalence rate of stunting among children despite Brazil's overall deep reduction of hunger in the general population (Leao and Maluf, 2013). GROW staff in Brazil also points out that the black population, which suffers from a 48 percent poverty rate, continues to be marginalized due to the lasting impacts of slavery and discrimination (the only mention of race found in GROW literature) (Leao and Maluf, 2013). Lastly, in GROW's "Standing on the Sidelines" report Oxfam considers poor countries to be marginalized in international climate change talks because climate change presents a more immediate negative effect for poor, tropical countries are not considered in the formulation of climate change policies by richer, global north countries (Oxfam, 2013).

Oxfam's GROW campaign also practices food justice through advocating for better business models that benefit the community as made clear in their Behind the Brands

campaign. GROW proposes a business model that first and foremost considers the needs and respects the rights of the marginalized people over the current model which they said prioritizes the most profit from the least capital input into communities. Therefore, this is a clear point where GROW would not be considered to be a food sovereignty project as food sovereignty calls for dismantling of agribusiness corporations (Holt-Gimenez, 2011). GROW positions itself as wanting to improve the way that business is done through encouraging policies and projects that respect the needs and rights of marginalized people. In GROW's agenda, it prioritizes creating a business model not dependent on land grabs and exploitative use of people's natural resources. Specifically, GROW advocates for strengthening of regulatory organizations that monitor corporations, and helping corporations implement and follow through on policies that promote sustainable and fair use of resources and land (Bailey, 2012). This includes committing to policies that reduce the environmental and social impact of their operations through committing to zero deforestation and signing specific mandates such as Corporate Leaders Group (CLG) Trillion Tonne Communiqué that respects carbon budget (Oxfam, 2013). It also asks for reforming the way that the agribusiness sector does business by investing in small-scale farmers and "sustainable and resilient" projects and contributing to Zero Hunger goals (Bailey, 2012). Additionally, Oxfam's food justice model for business includes companies committing to "a time-bound plan" that demonstrates transparency by reporting out every aspect of their supply chain which includes information about their suppliers, how much greenhouse emissions they are letting out, the environmental risk and greenhouse emission estimate assessment for every project it is involved with and cite country of origin (Oxfam, 2013) This new business model also excludes extra environmentally vulnerable

places from being the site of capital accumulation if the site with High Conservation Value (Oxfam, 2013).

Overall, Oxfam's GROW campaign solidly fits into a general model of food justice, but it also fits into certain aspects of food sovereignty and food security. It fits into food security by advocating for pro-market solutions for changes in the food system. For example, GROW's publications target Global North consumers to take action to reform the global food system contain much encouragement to purchase fair trade products-an extension of neoliberal logic of using purchasing power to change the system. For example, one GROW publication states that consumers can do their role in supporting small-scale producers by buying fair trade products such as chocolate (Oxfam, 2012). They state that if every person living in the urban areas of Brazil, UK, the U.S., and Spain bought fair trade chocolate as all of the 12.5 billion chocolate bars consumer in those areas in 2010, then that would fund the livelihoods of over 90,000 small-scale producers (Oxfam, 2012). This coincides with the logic of food security that further development needs to be done with markets in which then they become capable to solve problems with the global food system (Holt-Gimenez, 2012). Furthermore, it acts upon a neoliberal logic that ethical consumerism without changing any structural aspects of how capitalism and corporations work will make significant changes such as making sure small-scale producers have livelihoods, and that market solutions can solve market problems (Roy, 2012).

This theme is found throughout some of the GROW publications where there appears to be a strong connection between increased food and livelihoods and market mechanisms such as introducing new technologies. For example, in GROW's evaluation of Haiti, Oxfam supported continuous technology funding of USAID's Feed the Future, the U.S.

government's global food security development project, for providing improved varieties of corn, banana, and rice for farmers. GROW stated that a threat to the success would be the sustainability of funding for these technological advancements, and pushed for more funding (Fuller-Wimbush, 2014). They encourage Feed the Future to strengthen the success of their projects by increasing the adoption rate of these technologies for farmers so farmers can grow more yields, sell more crops, and make more money for their livelihoods (Fuller-Wimbush, 2014). This reasoning can be considered to operate under the logic that the technologies will improve yields, hence farmers will have more to sell in the market and be able to support themselves. However, this contradicts the idea that hunger is man-made and that the reason why small-scale producers are not getting paid enough is because corporations and governments marginalize them for reasons discussed by GROW (Bailey, 2012). It is also important to note that this same evaluation stated that some farmers did not like the hybrid corn seeds because they thought were too expensive, would lose desirable traits, and would make them too dependent on them (Fuller-Wimbush, 2014). Encouraging Feed the Future to continue to fund those seeds despite certain farmers' setbacks seems set against some of the key tenants of the food sovereignty approach, which advocates for culturally appropriate foods and relies on peasant agricultural knowledge to grow enough food for communities and not technological inputs (Holt-Gimenez, 2011).

Despite this contradiction in this example of GROW's discourse and the food sovereignty approach, GROW aligns with some of the food sovereignty's approach to the food system. For example, both the GROW campaign and food sovereignty acknowledge the rights of communities to lands and resources. This is important to note because

acknowledging the right is more powerful and community-based than just promoting equal access; access implies that as long as someone can use it, then all is good, but rights assume that people have a claim to resources that cannot be taken away, that is respected, and need to be fulfilled. Additionally, the GROW campaign claims to work with several social movements around the world to achieve the objectives of food justice, which aligns with food sovereignty considering the approach is community based and believes that communities mobilized into movements will be the ones to change and sustain the food system. For example, GROW claims to work very closely with social movements in Guatemala. GROW and La Via Campesina, the major peasant driven food sovereignty movement, both problematize corporations as facilitating food injustice. GROW chooses to focus on corporations because "the private sector sets the rules of the global food system – often at the expense of poor producers" (Oxfam Website, 2014). La Via Campesina advocates for the halting of destructive neoliberal processes that destroy the resources of the poor (La Via Campesina, 2015). La Via Campesina also advocates that poor people should have access to water, land, and other resources, but they are more committed to fighting for the right for the poor to manage water, land, and other resources than just have access to these resources (La Via Campesina, 2015).

CHAPTER 6. RACE, FOOD JUSTICE, AND THE GROW CAMPAIGN

This chapter will discuss the ways in which Oxfam's GROW campaign does not addresses race in their food justice activism. I will use two case studies from Oxfam's GROW campaign countries and use critical discourse analysis to examine the ways in which race is conceptualized and/or not conceptualized in GROW reports. I will argue that GROW does not address the role of race in the broken global food system. In ignoring race, the GROW campaign lacks a critical perspective mandatory in practicing food justice, analyzing the problems of the global food system, proposing structural based solutions to fix the food system, and further enforces the idea that race is absent in international development. Furthermore, the lack of racial analysis prevents deeper and more meaningful alliances with social movements in the Global South and engagement by Global North consumers into the GROW's campaign's food justice activism.

6.1 RACE IN GROW'S FOOD JUSTICE

This section will discuss the ways in which the GROW campaign does not include race, and will argue that the GROW campaign ignores race, which is detrimental to its analysis and activism around food justice issues around the world. After reading the key GROW campaign's literature report "Growing a Better Future" several times and not thinking I saw any reference to race or racism, I decided to search the key word "race" and "racism" to be reinforced that there were zero locations where those two words were mentioned throughout the report on global food justice. Even looking through various GROW campaign websites, advocacy tools, and reports, race was barely mentioned. This surprised me considering how the food justice literature emphasize how race is central to the claims of the food justice movement and race cannot be taken out of the practice of food

justice (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014; IATP, 2011, Reynolds, 2015). When I asked about the absence of race in the GROW campaign in my interview with the GROW staff member, they stated "some cases [of food injustice] are about racial or ethnic minorities in some countries, but it varies from country to country so it's hard to talk about racial [issues]when its globally...it's hard to agree for countries to include race [in the campaign] because it's not always a basis of inequality… so it's about getting language that works globally (Personal Communication, 2015)." Although race may not be a main basis for inequality within a particular country, or different country offices may not think that race is important for food injustice in their country, it is a fact that race and racism have shaped the distribution, consumption, and organization of the current global food system (Agyeman and Alkon, 2012; Shields, 1995). As racism, racist thinking, racist normalization, and racial privilege have become so normalized that it can be rendered invisible and deemed non-existent by individuals or groups, this act of communicating racelessness within discourse does not make race any less important in examining how race and racism influence processes (Moreno and Figueroa, 2010). I will use the food justice framework described in my literature review to frame my analysis and argument that a discussion and incorporation of race and racism is mandatory in effectively addressing food justice, and that the lack of a discussion of race and racism is a serious weakness and impediment of the GROW campaign. I will specifically demonstrate that through conducting a critical discourse analysis of two different GROW operating country reports, South Africa and Guatemala and show how the lack of a discussion of race weakens the campaign's ability of accomplishing its ultimate goals and understanding food injustice and marginalization that people face in those countries. I will illustrate using intersectionality analysis and outside

academic, governmental, and policy literature on these two case studies' to showcase how an analysis and acknowledgement of race can enrich and strengthen GROW's contributions to fighting food injustice. Lastly, I will begin to theorize potential reasons for why race is absent in the GROW food justice campaign near the end of this section.

6.2 THE GROW CAMPAIGN LACKS AN INTERSECTIONALITY ANALYSIS

This section will argue that the GROW campaign, by largely ignoring the role of race in the broken food system, lacks an intersectionality analysis which is critical in examining hunger, food insecurity, and food (Guthman, 2006). Intersectionality analysis refers to the ways in which systems such as race, class, gender, and nationality mutually construct and effect one another (Collins, 1991). Intersectionality theory argues that the multiple identities, social locations, and power structures intersect to influence the experiences of people (Hankivisky et al., 2014). Additionally, intersectionality analysis provides further examination on how power structures and powerful actors operate and are organized (Collins, 1991) and how different oppressions intersect and change over time (Collins, 1991). Furthermore, intersectionality theory claims that one type of oppression cannot be analyzed within itself or reduced to "one fundamental type" (Collins, 1991, p. 18) as we need to understand how intersecting oppressions work together to produce injustice. As mentioned, food justice is concerned with unequal food access, power relations, and the disproportionate burden of the negative impacts of the unjust food system on poor people, women, and people of color (Agyeman and Galt, 2014). In similarity with the food justice movement, the GROW campaign recognizes that there are groups that remain marginalized in the global food system, but in contrast with the food justice movement, GROW narrowly identifies examples of marginalized people as "pastoralists, indigenous peoples, and

women" (Bailey, 2012, p. 17,). The GROW campaign is very concerned with the effects of the broken food system on women and poor people around the world. The goal of the campaign is to work towards ending extreme poverty and "redistributing consumption to the poorest (Bailey, p13, 2012)" and achieving gender equity as they identify women as a marginalized group in the food system (Bailey, 2012). Oxfam asserts that women are hungrier than men in the world and that they are more vulnerable to food shocks and food scarcity (Bailey, 2012). Furthermore, GROW asserts that poor women have limited access to food, markets, land, and resources to grow or purchase their own food and call for governments and businesses to promote and ensure the rights of women to whatever they need to eat and live well (Bailey, 2012). However, despite GROW being identified as the ideal platform to promote awareness of gender inequality, external evaluators critiqued Oxfam because gender was not promoted consistently campaign-wide and that Oxfam should hire gender specialist to help with gender integration in the campaign (O'Neil, 2013). Additionally, the external evaluators noted that Oxfam "did not aim nor claim to be influencing the societal factors that support discrimination against women that exists in many countries (O'Neil, 2013)." In the next section, I argue that applying an intersectionality analysis will strengthen and enrich GROW's analysis on gender inequality in the food system because the structures that facilitate discrimination against women also facilitate racial discrimination. Women's experiences with food injustice are intersectional and must be approached as that in policy recommendations.

6.3 RACE AND MARGINALIZATION

The GROW campaign's conceptualization of marginalization must include race because race is foundational to marginalization in the food system (Agyeman and McEntee,

2014) and the foundation for inequalities and power (Kothari, 2008). Furthermore, the addition of race into GROW's conceptualization of marginalization expands GROW's understanding of power imbalances and inequalities which is one of the main goals of the campaigns. GROW quotes in their central GROW report, "Growing a Better Future" that quotes Oliver De Schutter "We need to address the question of global hunger not as one of production only, but also as one of marginalization, deepening inequalities, and social injustice" (Bailey, 2012, pg. 8). As the food justice movement's claims to social justice largely stem from racial justice (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014) and race is central to the organization of the current food system where marginalization, inequalities, and injustice are present (Shields, 1995), GROW must include race as another factor that marginalizes people in the broken global food system. Considering race is foundational to the problems that GROW aims to examine, race intersects itself with other forms of marginalization identified in the GROW campaign, and can help GROW better expand their understandings of the experience of those persons (Collins, 1991). Furthermore, race enriches the structures that GROW aims to examine within the food system and how those structures contribute to marginalization. GROW quickly mentions apartheid and colonialism in some of their reports as a factor in shaping the food systems of countries, but offer no connection or description that these structures are past and/or ongoing racial projects. The issues that GROW is confronting in the GROW campaign such as access to land, water, food and the marginalized experiences of small-scale farmers and women are legacies of the colonial agricultural system (Whitehead and Tsikata, 2003; Shields, 1995), and considering colonialism is a racial project (Omi and Winant, 1994), these issues are racialized and require an analysis of race to fully confront these issues. If GROW is concerned with

“finding structural solutions to hunger and poverty” (Oxfam, 2015), they must address structural problems contributing to hunger and poverty such as race. As race is at the center of these structures influencing the food system and play a key role in shaping hunger and poverty (Bread for the World, 2012;Shields, 1995), GROW must incorporate racial marginalization in their programs in order to make sure they are capturing people’s marginalization in the food system. Additionally, GROW states that “we must empower women and men living in poverty to grow or to buy enough food to eat” (Bailey, 2013) so when race is a factor in why these women and men are living in poverty and do not have enough to eat, it must be included as a way of disempowerment in Oxfam’s food justice discourse. Thirdly, Oxfam states that “people living in poverty are all too often exploited or marginalized by the huge power imbalances in the food system” (Bailey, 2012, p. 35). GROW is concerned with talking about power imbalances in the food system, and race is an important contributor to that imbalance in power (Shields, 1995), (Wilson, 2008); hence, GROW must discuss how race shifts the power in determining who benefits, who has control, and who remains marginalized in the global food system.

For example, GROW’s analysis of power inequalities in connection to wealth and class inequalities and critique of current development policies such as structural adjustment policies are incomplete without a racial analysis. Considering these policies have historical roots in racial projects, it is important to understand how these policies maintain racial inequalities. Although GROW inconsistently states what specific policies are problematic, they state that current development policies are not working for the poor and that “more-of-the-same development obsesses about a narrow notion of economic activity, ignoring the stock of human, social and natural assets (Bailey, 2012, pg. 46)” and “current

development models take a laissez-faire approach to markets, expecting them to deliver social progress in a way they never can without big shifts in public incentives, regulation and investment (p. 46).” Furthermore, they call for Global North countries to stop agricultural subsidies and agricultural liberalization “where these measures distort trade – by restricting market access or by incentivizing over-production and dumping– they directly undermine the development of resilient agricultural sectors in poor countries (Bailey, 2012, pg. 49).” Ultimately, GROW problematizes agricultural trade liberalization policies such as structural adjustment because they produce food and class inequalities around the globe. However, these forms of trade liberalization also reproduce racialized inequalities in the food system by maintaining the colonial food system where food resources were being transported from the Global South to the Global North, leaving Global South, predominantly people of color hungry (Shields, 1995). Neoliberal trade policies allowed for predominantly white-owned, Global North farmers to make a profit off of pushing their excess product on Global South countries, while destroying the profits of people of color, small-scale producers in the Global South which deepened their hunger and poverty (Young, 1997; Edelman, 2014). Overall, these neoliberal trade policies that GROW problematizes also produces and maintains racial inequalities, and GROW’s recommendations to addressing the inequalities in the food system must acknowledge these racial inequalities.

Neoliberal activities enforce racism and racial inequalities by producing racial subjects (Roberts and Mahtani, 2011). As evidenced through structural adjustment policies and in the food systems of the two country case studies in this thesis, neoliberal activity operates upon shifting risks to people of color. Neoliberal thought uses capitalism to hide

race or racial inequalities (Roberts and Mahtani, 2011, pg. 252) and silences the ways in which racial injustice and racism is imbedded in neoliberalism. I argue that by ignoring race, GROW conceptualizes inequality in the food system as just being one of just class, power, and gender inequalities, and that more capital investment, (more investment in small-scale farmers, less-investment in land grabs deals) can fix the inequalities in the global food system. Furthermore, ignoring race, a foundational aspect of neoliberal practice, prevents an analysis of what processes, discourses, and social actions (Roberts and Mahtani, 2011) that perpetuate problematic neoliberal policies that produce hunger. It ignores the racial inequalities inextricably linked to the class and other power inequalities of the food system, and that racism further facilitates the production of inequality in the food system.

Although the influence of race and racism on inequality in the broken food system is silenced in GROW discourse, it is important to note that the reports that contain pictures of people are almost all images of people of color. For example, the 26 images in the central Growing a Better Future report consisted of all people of color and/or black and brown hands (Bailey, 2012). Considering Oxfam's past use of people of color, particularly starving black children, has been critiqued as trademarking the stereotypical starving, suffering child in Africa that white Global North citizens must help (Delahunty, 2009), it is important to understand the images of the GROW campaign as images have been a critical part of fundraising for Oxfam in the past. Kalpina Wilson reminds that charity organizations in the beginning of the development age relied on racialized images of others to raise capital for their organizations and that racialization of people in the Global South help NGOS justify their interventions and funding (Wilson, 2011). Furthermore, positive images of Global

South citizens practicing agency and looking happy in engaging in small-scale farming or other activities generates more funding as Global North citizens feel like they are investing in these people's happiness and well-being by donating to the organization (Wilson, 2011; Crisp, 2015). Also, many of the captions for the pictures in the main report discuss that the person is participating and/or benefiting from an Oxfam related project (Bailey, 2011). GROW through its images showing only people of color and no white people in their pictures, tells a silent story that people of color are the only ones hungry, yet race is silenced in their campaign. Although GROW is not a fundraising campaign in its essence (Personal Communication, 2015) and more about building capacity of a food justice movement, GROW is benefiting through gaining support of Global North citizens to participate in GROW by featuring these images and portraying that their work is helping these people of color, without mentioning the specific ways in which these people are racially marginalized by inequalities and are marginalized in a food system that prioritizes the lives and profits of white, Global North people. If GROW verbalized the fact that the people of color in their images are disproportionately marginalized in the broken food system, these images could facilitate the global narrative that all of these people in the world, with different circumstances and stories, are all disenfranchised in the global broken food system. A common story of racial marginalization among different groups would surely contribute to GROW's goal of building a global food justice movement. Ignoring the racialized implications of the broken food system while using pictures of people of color face makes GROW seem as if they are directly addressing the problems that people of color without analyzing or offering recommendations to remedy racial inequalities can be considered a form of appropriation where policies can be made to seem

as they are directly helping, but not advocating for all of their best interests (Heilig, Brown, and Brown, 2012). Overall, GROW offers a food justice discourse that is colorblind and deems race invisible and as an insignificant factor in the global food system.

Although Oxfam is correct in identifying deep gender inequality in the food system, it is incomplete to identify a gender problem without identifying a race problem. For example, Oxfam constantly brings up how women, mostly poor, make up the majority of the hungry, yet when female hunger is examined in relation to race, there are deep inequalities between different racial groups of women. Geographically speaking, Asia possesses the largest amount of hungry people at 526 million and sub-Saharan Africa contains the highest percentage of hungry people with 227 million, which makes clear that the majority of hungry people in the world are people of color (World Food Programme, 2014). As women make up 60 percent of the world's hungry (The Hunger Project, 2014) (UN, 2013), it is safe to say that women of color in developing countries make up the majority of the world's poor. Developed nations have about 11 million hungry people within their populations (World Hunger, 2015), and further statistics support the claim that there is a deep racial disparity in hunger. For example, in the United States, Black and Hispanic households make up more than half, 53 percent, of the food insecure households in the country despite only being 30 percent of the population (USDA, 2013) (Census Bureau, 2015). Specifically, there are 10 percent more Black households that experience food insecurity than all households (Bread for the World, 2013). Much of these disparities are influenced by the racial disparity of poverty in the United States; even though women in general are more likely to be poor than men, there are 29.1 percent impoverished black women compared to 16.2 percent of all women(Bread for the World, 2013), and to white

women at 11.6 percent (Center for American Progress, 2008). Ultimately, these statistics support Oxfam's claim that poor women are most likely to be hungry, but brings to the light the fact that poor women of color experience the most hunger around the world. It is interesting to note that the discourse of Oxfam GROW reports contain many images of small-scale farmers and children around the world, and all of them are pictures of black and brown individuals, mostly women. Their pictures serve as a visual vehicle to demonstrate that hunger and food injustice disproportionately affects people of color, yet this discourse remains silenced in their literature. If Oxfam intends to bring visible the high hunger status of women around the world and to ensure policies and rights for them, they need to highlight and address all factors that influence women's experiences with hunger such as race. As Oxfam identifies women as small scale producers, farmers, poor, and marginalized along with other groups such as indigenous people, it is important to understand the racial components and histories behind the reasons why women of color are mostly poor, small-scale producers, and marginalized. Overall, GROW is missing a complete analysis of the ways in which food injustice affects women and therefore lacks the knowledge to push for policy that addresses the intersectional ways in which women experience hunger and food injustice and are marginalized in the broken food system.

6.4 RACE AND MARGINALIZED IDENTITIES OF WOMEN

This section will argue that the marginalization of women in the food system identified in the GROW have racial implications and that their racialization contributes to their marginalization. Specifically, GROW's identification of women as being marginalized because they are poor, small-scale producers, and potentially indigenous must include a recognition that those markers are racialized identities. I argue that the incorporating

analysis and recognition of this will strengthen GROW's campaign of advocating for the rights of women by acknowledging their racialized identities. First, throughout GROW materials, women are referred to as the majority of the world's small-scale producers and a key marginalized group in the broken global food system (Bailey, 2013). This aligns with the majority of research by leading hunger and poverty organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization which reports that 43 percent of all agricultural workers are women, and that 60-80 percent of the world's small scale producers or "peasant farmers" are women, and women make up 90 percent of the small-scale producers in Africa (FAO, 2013). GROW and other organizations such as the FAO state that small-scale producers are a marginal group in the food system because they have limited access to agricultural technologies such as seeds and fertilizers, to natural resources such as land and water, and agricultural markets to sell their food because the food system is set up to advantage more powerful, large-scale industrial producers (Bailey, 2011) (Oxfam Australia, 2014). Oxfam also argues that the world must focus on investing in small-scale producers in order to help fix the broken food system as small-scale producers are more likely to farm with environmental sustainability and usually farm for profit and for subsistence, so when they do not have the resources to grow food, their poverty and hunger increase significantly (GROW Australia, 2014). Small-scale producers are usually rural or peasant growers, and 80 percent of the world's hungry live in rural areas (GROW Australia, 2014). Ultimately, the GROW campaign asserts that they will work towards enforcing and strengthening national agriculture and corporate policies that support the livelihoods and productivity of small scale producers such as forcing national food reserves to source from small-scale producers and laws that ensure the natural resources of the producers as well as policies

promote the participation of female small-scale producers in agricultural decision-making (Bailey, 2011).

Oxfam repeatedly in the key GROW report stress how unjust circumstances for women stemming from “historical and cultural traditions” (Bailey, 2011, p. 33) leading to the conclusion that “overcoming systemic and corrosive discrimination...is the real task for governments, companies, and societies.” However, the GROW campaign fails to examine in-depth exactly what historical and cultural traditions that disadvantage women shaped their plight as marginalized members of society and marginalized small-scale producers. This is in alignment with GROW’s statement of how the global food system is increasingly unequal, socially unjust, and more marginalized (Bailey, 2011) which calls into question of how and why the global food system became what it is now. Although in some country reports of GROW such as Vietnam and Guatemala where there are brief mentions of colonialism and its effects of this on present-day agriculture, GROW reports lack a deep analysis of historical injustices that occurred in the food system, meaning it lacks a key element of what the food justice movement acknowledges as critical in understanding why the global food system is broken, and critical in solving the broken food system (Slocum, 2014).

At an international conference in Minnesota in 2012 organized by Institute of Agriculture Trade and Policy, they identified their first theme of food justice as recognizing historical trauma (IATP, 2012). They assert that a foundational base of food justice is to “acknowledge as fundamental in our consideration of food justice that we cannot deliver food justice without addressing historical trauma and the way it requires an intersectional analysis of our relationship with the land, with each other, with the economy, across

cultures, and with our food and other consumption choices (IATP, 2012)." They connect the colonial past to the present as they state that "to divide and to conquer" was an important aspect of the historical trauma of food injustice and that food injustice reproduces and reinforces historical trauma of racism, sexism, land dispossession, genocide, health disparities (IATP, 2012). Furthermore, Professor Robert Sandler in the book Food Ethics asserts that food injustice is interconnected with historical injustices and that food injustice in developing countries is connected to continued historical legacies of injustice created by colonialism (Sandler, 2014). It is important to recognize that the global food and agriculture system consists of historical injustices that contribute to the historical trauma of food injustice that these previous scholars and organizations refer to in their food justice work. Colonialism is an important consideration to examine within food justice, especially when looking at food justice in developing countries as is the main focus of the GROW campaign. Key historical traumas that continue as legacies in developing countries are the loss of land and food of indigenous populations as a result of economic and military exploitation and colonialism (Slocum, 2014). She cites the importance of recognizing and understanding historical traumas and moving forward with solutions and applying it to food justice activism as a productive and mandatory exercise for the movement (Slocum, 2014).

Ultimately, the emphasis on recognizing the role that historical trauma has on food injustice in the world is an essential point missing in the GROW campaign's report as they only briefly mention colonialism, without mentioning the racial trauma that accompanied the colonial process. The next two sections will demonstrate how discussions of colonialism in food justice projects needs to be rooted in a racial analysis in order to fully

show and use the historical legacy of colonialism on the food system to transform and fix the food system into something that works for everyone, as the GROW campaign wants. I will explain through a miniature case study of two of GROW's strategic countries, South Africa and Guatemala, to show how the legacies of colonialism and neoliberalism that create and reinforce food injustice are deeply racialized issues imbedded in racial projects. GROW acknowledges gender and class inequalities in the food system (Bailey, 2012; Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014) but does not consider racial inequalities or how some gender and class inequalities were/are produced by racial projects imbedded in colonialism, apartheid, and neocolonialism and how that contributes to the broken food system. Hence, GROW risks reinforcing and/or maintaining status quo policies that maintain racial inequalities in the food system. Furthermore, analyzing those countries' food injustice must apply a food justice analysis based in historical trauma, critical race theory, and intersectionality theory to fully understand food injustice and to accomplish GROW's goals of working towards structural solutions (Oxfam, 2014).

Colonialism and its legacy remains a very important consideration in global food justice because of its contribution in creating the conditions for food injustice to thrive. First, we must acknowledge that the driving economic factor of colonialism in most countries was exploitation of natural resources, including agricultural resources, for the profit of western Europeans. The connection between hunger, malnutrition and colonialism was publicly made evident in 1974 by the United Nations in their World Food Conference which claimed that people were affected by hunger and malnutrition "from their historical circumstances-including in many cases alien and colonial domination (Shields, 1995, p 9)." Shields asserts that the reason why people of color around the world are the most hungry

is because the historical legacy of colonialism as Europeans stole and exploited the natural resources of people of color around the world, which of course limited the natural resources that people of color could use to feed themselves (Shields, 1995). In order for European countries to become a global leader in military and economic expansion, they needed to accumulate valuable natural resources such as natural minerals and food products such as spices, tobacco, and cotton that due to the natural environment of Europe, were not naturally grown in the continent (Shields, 1995). Furthermore, colonialism was fueled by an ideology of white superiority (Shields, 1995). The food system in most developing countries before colonialism were self-sufficient, and widespread hunger such as famines were episodic and stemmed from natural causes; this differs from the systemic, chronic hunger that makes up the majority of hunger cases in today's world (Shields, 1995). Pre-colonial food systems were environmentally sustainable and were created to work the land for multiple generations and to not use more resources and land than what was needed. As colonialism introduced country borders, pre-colonial food systems for the most part were locally operated and communities worked together to feed each other. Yet when the European colonizers occupied the developing world, they forced the people of color into enslavement and exploitative work conditions to cultivate the land using European agricultural techniques. Furthermore, they disrupted the traditional farming and animal herding techniques and natural cycles to enforce European agricultural practices (Shields, 1995). Additionally, European colonizers needed the most arable, fertile land to grow colonial cash crops such as coffee, tobacco, tea, coffee, rubber, peanuts, and sugar cane and dispossessed local populations of their farming land (Shields, 1995). This began the dispossession of land and lack of land rights that we see among small-scale producers

today and the unsustainable practices of large-scale agriculture in these areas as the European agriculture techniques depleted the soil of many of its nutrients, as well as destroyed many green areas from deforestation and overgrazing because they used unsustainable and nonorganic farming practices (Shields, 1995). Naturally, the dispossession of land and violation of land rights of local populations contributed to high poverty and hunger rates as traditional farmers did not have the arable land to conduct subsistence farming or sell crops for profit (Shields, 1995). Considering the cash crops were meant for export to the western world, the majority of the food produced in the developing countries were for feeding the local populations and food became for the profit and consumption of Europeans. Clearly, the colonial agricultural system set up the current global food system where the majority of food in developing countries are created for export and consumption of white, Global North consumers, and/or majority not for the local populations in a system that disenfranchises people of color in these countries of their land, natural resources, and food, which drives them into deep hunger and poverty. Another important historical trauma in the colonial food system was the forced labor and enslavement of people of color in the Americas and the Atlantic slave trade and forced labor of sub-Saharan Africa (Slocum, 2014). This forced enslavement to conduct agricultural work furthermore shifted the global food system to the interests of the white population at the expense of the murder, exploitation and enslavement of the people of color; this continues to be the legacy of the global food system. We can see this legacy today through a variety of factors. First, countries that experience some of the most hunger in the world experience chronic and systemic hunger as Oxfam points out, meaning that hunger differs from the pre-colonial world in that hunger in developing countries are not the cause

of natural causes. Secondly, former colonies still send many of their food products to the western world, as many colonial food products such as peanuts, coffee, cocoa, sugar cane, and spices are higher than demand than ever. Thirdly, land grabs, as the GROW campaign points out in their Behind the Brands program, happens most in developing countries, and it is important to note that land is being used primarily for agricultural development for profit of richer countries and corporations(Oxfam, 2013) and land grabs are rooted in the racialized process of colonialism.

Ultimately, this section aims to connect today's global food system with its historical origins and historical trauma of when the current global food system was first created, through the racialized and capitalist institution and process of colonialism. By the GROW campaign neglecting to make connections between the past and current injustice of the food system, they ignore a critical portion of food justice activism in moving forward with solutions by ignoring the historical racialized trauma of the global food system. Understanding the components of the post-colonial global food system is critical in examining what aspects that food justice activism can focus their attention on to dismantle the problem of food injustice and transform the system in order to improve food security.

6.5 GROW IN SOUTH AFRICA AND ITS ABSENCE OF A RACIAL ANALYSIS

This section will examine the discourse used by the GROW campaign to describe hunger and food injustice in South Africa, and will show the lack of an analysis about colonialism or racism and its effects on food injustice and hunger in South Africa. Consequently, I will argue that the lack of analysis contributes to the GROW campaign ignoring race in their food justice efforts and underestimates the role of race and colonialism in shaping hunger and policy priorities in South Africa. In 2014, Oxfam

produced a report named "Hidden Hunger in South Africa: The Faces of Hunger and Malnutrition in a Food-Secure Nation." The report called attention to the fact that South Africa is considered an economically and socially developed country with the ability to provide food security for its citizens yet 13 million people go hungry in the country (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014). Furthermore, the report discusses the disparity between having enough food in a country while people are still going hungry, and report that poor populations and women are most likely to experience hunger. The report also analyzes hunger within a geographic lens by highlighting the most hungry provinces, Limpopo, Western Cape, and Eastern Cape, and highlighting that both urban and rural populations are experiencing high hunger rates as the urban hunger rate is 32.4 percent and the rural hunger rate is 37 percent (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014). Similar to the general GROW campaign, the report continues to highlight how disenfranchised populations such as small-scale producers, women, and landless peoples experience hunger and food insecurity at a higher rate than the population.

6.6 ABSENCE OF ANALYZING APARTHEID IN THE FOOD SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA

It is interesting to note that Oxfam calls for looking at larger socio-economic structures in examining hunger, but the paper fails to discuss arguably the most important societal structures of the South Africa-colonial rule and apartheid regime from 1652-1991. Although it briefly mentions apartheid and the fact that South Africa achieved democracy only in 1994 and the need to invest in farmers whose agricultural skills were lost in apartheid, there is a lack of analysis of how the racial project of apartheid shaped the current food injustice and hunger. In the Hidden Hunger report, GROW states hunger

perpetuates social inequality (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014, pg. 4), but fails to examine how racial inequality has been a driving force in creating and perpetuating those social inequalities such as poverty and hunger. Race is also silent in the Hidden Hunger's examination of the connections between land loss and hunger and their marginalized people's case study of fisherfolk in South Africa. The only mention of apartheid affecting the food system in South Africa is that "the government should expedite ownership and access to land for the most marginal and vulnerable groups, alongside post-settlement support: water, equipment, access to credit, marketing and training for new farmers coming out of a post-apartheid era where agricultural skills were lost" (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014, pg. 21) and that most subsistence farmers live in Bantustan settlements "which were created for black farmers during apartheid (pg. 21)." As land is a central theme of the GROW campaign, and is central to the Hidden Hunger report, it is important to examine the structural problems contributing to the problem of land ownership in South Africa for farmers in order to recommend grounded policy change. Ultimately, changes in land policy and the redistribution of land from black South Africans to whites is a legacy of colonialism (Atahuene, 2011), black farmers do not have access to land and other resources such as water because of the legacies of this racial project, and racial justice for blacks is the central theme for current social movements and policy discussions about land in South Africa (South Africa Department of Agriculture, 2001; Land Access Movement of South Africa, 2008). Hence, a discussion of race would strengthen GROW's goals of "contributing to current social movements and growing current movements of food justice (Bailey, 2012) (Personal Communication, 2015)" considering race is central to the movements in South Africa and clarify and strengthen their policy recommendations as

race is central to policy advocacy in South Africa (SANDA, 2001).

This paragraph will discuss the ways in which the South Africa GROW report discusses issues of land, hunger, and race. First, the report states that subsistence farming of food is important for food insecurity of South Africans, but that most subsistence farmers live on former Bantustan settlements created for the black population during apartheid, which makes up only 13 percent of the available land in South Africa (Oxfam, 2014). For example, they say that the people traced their poverty and hunger to land dispossession caused by "historical dispossession and forced removal" without examining how apartheid and race influenced land organization. It is clear that when South Africa became colonized, the indigenous black population were stripped of land rights and land was distributed to white colonial populations; when apartheid ended in 1994, it was estimated that whites owned over 87 percent of the land despite composing only 10 percent of the population (Atuahene and Brophy, 2015). In regards to Bantustans, the apartheid regime deliberately moved black South Africans from areas inhabited by whites, as the government "from 4.2 million in 1960 (39 percent of all Africans) to over 11 million in 1980 (52.7 percent)" (Hart, 2008, 68). In terms of overall land distribution, only 8 percent of the land stolen from apartheid has been redistributed (Atuahene, 2011). Additionally, South Africa pays white farmers high amounts of money to purchase their land (that was taken from blacks at the start of apartheid) to purchase in order to put blacks into homes and must volunteer to participate in the land redistribution program.

This sort of racialized injustice in land distribution is instrumental to the current structure and organization of land access and rights in South Africa. Considering the report argues that access to land is instrumental for food security and that black farmers only

have access to 13 percent of their land, this provides a racial historical hint of understanding why blacks experience the most hunger and whites experience the least. This supports that the racialized legacy of apartheid's distribution of resources based upon race shows that land redistribution has not been accomplished, and any organization supporting land rights for the most marginalized needs to support decolonialized land redistribution of the land from whites to blacks. It would be advocating for social equity policies that acknowledge the role of institutional racism that was produced by apartheid policies of land distribution and attempt to undo those inequalities beyond advocating in a general manner for lands access and land rights.

Ultimately, the policies around land in South Africa are around land reform, not just land access as GROW states; land reform acknowledges the need of changing the current organization of land ownership, whereas land access hints that increases in availability of land need to be made, nevertheless the current system. It is not that land is vacant and the only problem is that small farmers are waiting for their applications to get approved; it is that the land is inequitably distributed by race in the aftermath of legacy of the racial project of apartheid (SANDA, 2001) and a reform of the past system of apartheid era land needs to occur in order for small-scale farmers to own land. Expediting ownership and access to land requires advocating for land reform on the basis of racial discrimination and racial justice from apartheid; advocating for access to land without claims to racial injustice produces a limited response.

Relatedly, there are specific policies and programs in South Africa dealing with land reform, and it would clarify and strengthen GROW's stance on land if they identified a particular policy, or particular content of policies in South Africa that they wish for the

government to support in defense of small farmers. For example, the key policy in South Africa for land is Section 25 of the 1994 post-apartheid which argues that the government "must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis "(South African Human Rights Commission, 2002, pg. 13). Furthermore, the land reform program that currently operates states that the goal of that policy is that South Africa's land policy and land reform program is land redistribution (to enable equitable access to land), land tenure reform (to eliminate tenure insecurity) and land restitution(to compensate for land dispossession)" (SAHRC, 2002, pg. 14). Furthermore, the South African government states that the role of this policy is to, "…to provide grants to black South African citizens to access land specifically for agricultural purposes, increase access to agricultural land by black people (Africans, Coloureds, and Indians) and to contribute to the redistribution of approxi-mately 30 % of the country's commercial agricultural land (i.e. formerly 'white commercial farmland') over the duration of the programme," (South Africa National Development Agency, 2003). Clearly, this policy is meant to address land reform and land redistribution, not just land access, and defined to address the land loss claims of black people. Within food justice, access can occur without necessarily changing the system, whereas reform requires a restructuring of the current system (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). The only vulnerable groups Oxfam mentions is women and poor people, without acknowledging that the entire policy of land in South Africa is based upon racial discrimination and trauma claims of black people, with a mention to prioritizing women and poor folks within the black population. (SANDA, 2003). The silencing of race for a policy built upon undoing institutional racism is a barrier for in the GROW campaign's

contribution to mobilizing the food justice movement and policy to promote land rights in South Africa.

By not mentioning the key population that land rights are meant to address and not saying specifically what policies GROW supports, GROW is taking apolitical and colorblind stance. As this is a highly politicized and racialized issue, it does not help the cause to support land access to vulnerable populations without making mention to the politics and race factors that influence the formation and hindrances of the policy (England, 2013). A vast majority of the contemporary conversations around land policy in South Africa cites the South African government's slowness and ineffectiveness in implementing land reform and underfunding of black farmers who do acquire land through land redistribution (England, 2013) (Iob, 2012) (E.C.S., 2012). Without mentioning race, GROW makes race seem invisible, when it is the most significant factor in this policy, and when the fight for food injustice cannot be separated from the fight for racial justice (Guthman, 2008), a colorblind and apolitical stance does little. Land reform is one issue tied into the fight for racial justice in post-apartheid South Africa, as evidenced through the social movements involved with pressuring the government demanding for land reform such as the African National Congress Youth League (Bauer, 2012) and Land Access Movement of South Africa, who frame land reform in a historical and racial context. Social movements in South Africa consider the land movement as "The struggle over 'land' is a potent symbol of oppression experienced by disenfranchised black communities in SA (LAMOSA, 2014)." Ultimately, by supporting or naming a specific policy, this would strengthen GROW's legitimacy and impact in policy-making around food justice in South Africa, clarify exactly what policies or claims they believe would facilitate food justice, and enrich their goal of helping existing

social movements as many of them have already aligned themselves or not with specific policies. From academics, to social movements, to independent media, key policy points and/or recommendations are to strengthen Section 25 of the constitution are to financially support black farmers when they acquire redistributed land, make the government commit to achieving its goal of distributing a certain percentage of land thereby reinforcing the policy, and remedy and address historical injustices and inequalities to the black population through land reform(Atahuene, 2011; LAMSA, 2011; Lahiff, 2010; England, 2015). Race in this context is clearly a foundation for understanding the power and inequalities in the food system and land distribution (Kothari, 2006), racialization forms land access (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2011) and land distribution is imbedded in a racialized history and present (Noorgard, Reed, and Van Horn, 2012). Furthermore, GROW cannot deliver food justice policy recommendations without analyzing the intersection of race and historical trauma in shaping the food system (IATP, 2012). GROW should offer specific policy commentary on these existing policy conversations in order to meaningfully contribute to the land rights policy in South Africa.

6.7 ABSENCE OF RACE OR INTERSECTIONALITY ANALYSIS IN EXAMINING HUNGER

The report states that hunger is mostly geographically located in four provinces. Considering geography stresses the importance of place, it is important to examine specific characteristics about these places that may contribute to the food injustice and hunger. In looking at the demographics of the hungriest provinces, it is important to note that these provinces are overwhelming majority black South Africans. For example, according to the South African census in 2011, Limpopo is 96 percent black, Eastern Cape is 86 percent

black, Gauteng is 77 percent black, while the province with the least food insecure households, Western Cape, has only a 32 percent black population (Lehohla, 2014). Hence, the areas the highest black population simultaneously experience the highest hunger rates; this shows that hunger is a racially concentrated in the country within black communities. If hunger is concentrated within the black South African population, this calls into question why this demographic significant to identifying hungry people in South Africa was not mentioned in the report. Additionally, the report states that women are hungrier than men, and statistics support that most likely the majority of women hungry are not white women, but in fact black women or other disenfranchised people of color such as colored people.

Considering that the report also talks about poor people being the most hungry and are most negatively impacted by high priced and low quality food, it is significant that it does not make mention to the fact that 94.2 percent of country's poorest population is black South African (Lehohla, 2014). Considering whites only make up .7 percent of the poor and Asians 4 percent in the country, there is a definite racial disparity in the South Africans who are poor and hungry. Additionally, the province of Limpopo and Eastern Cape have an 80 and 60 percent rural population respectively (LAMOSA, 2011). Race serves as a key uniting factor of why poverty is concentrated in specific areas, and why poverty among the black population and the female population is very high. Race adds to the conversation on class inequalities because it explains why poverty is so concentrated in the rural areas is due to the racial project of apartheid where rural land was given to whites for economic productivity, and blacks were forced to work for white-owned farms or mines with no or little pay (LAMOSA, 2011). Considering black men were called to work in the mines, black South African women were left in the rural areas responsible for agricultural production

(LAMOSA, 2011). This shows that the poverty of black South Africans, black South African women, and black farmers were strongly shaped by apartheid and the failure of post-apartheid policies. Today, many blacks still are without land, poor, and work for white-owned farms and mines (LAMOSA, 2011). Oxfam states that they support "decent employment and income generation for people facing hunger with targeted government work schemes that provide reliable income as well as training, alongside reviewing living wages and social grant (Tsegay, Mistry, 2014, pg. 35)" but considering the ways in which black and economic activities in South Africa are connected, any policy recommendation by GROW must speak about historically produced and currently maintained racial inequities if they are to address the structural causes of poverty and hunger.

Additionally, the report discusses the marginalization and hunger of fisherfolk citing the lack of fair fishing policies, the difficulty in gaining permits, and bias toward commercial fishers in securing employment (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014, p 23). GROW argues that those barriers contribute to the high unemployment, poverty, and food insecurity of fisherman and they advocate for policies that give fisherman more ownership rights, livelihood alternatives, and promote the resilience to climate change and natural fish stocks. In examining GROW's discussion of the challenges that face fisherman, it appears to be rooted in food justice as the fishermen are made vulnerable by the disenfranchisement of small-scale producers to the benefit of the most powerful, large-scale producers within the industrialized food system. However, it is important to examine this narrative that is apparent in the global GROW campaign within the context of South Africa and its food system produced and influenced by the apartheid regime and its institutionalized racism. First, it is important to note who makes up the fisherman who are

being marginalized and who and what represents commercial, industrial fisherman and companies. Black and Coloured South Africans make up the majority of fisherman while fishing rights and fishing companies are primarily owned by white South Africans or white foreigners (Martin and Nielson, 1996). Similar to land resources, the apartheid regime redistributed water resources from the black South Africans to the whites and black South Africans only held .75 percent of total fish catch (Martin and Nielson, 1996) and only 6 percent of fishing licenses were granted to blacks. Considering one of the main facets of the apartheid regime was to put the control of resources in the hands of large-white monopolies, small scale producers, mainly black, had little chance to compete in the market; hence large-scale industrial corporations and farmers must give up privileges and rights historically acquired within the racist regime in order for small-scale producers to thrive in the market. Nielson and Martin argue that redistribution of water and fishing resources must occur within the industrial corporations because of its historical roots to apartheid which calls into question if Oxfam's language of increasing rights and access will be sufficient within a food system where small-scale producers own so little of the resources already (1996). To advocate for fisherfolk in South Africa would mean to advocate for the undoing and dismantling of the institutionalized racism of the apartheid regime by redistributing water resources back to the fisherfolk who are black and coloured. It would mean to advocate for racial justice and equity and to acknowledge the historical racialized traumas of apartheid where black farmers were stripped of their rights and ownership to land; it is in this fact that simply asking for more rights and access for fisherman is insufficient to address the structural roots of the issue at hand.

Ultimately, this is another example of how GROW's solutions to food injustice in

South Africa must be strengthened because they do not meaningfully consider, acknowledge, or incorporate in their analysis the historical, racialized effects of apartheid on the current inequalities in the food system. Ultimately, this section shows how the GROW campaign fails to acknowledge the role of racial projects and race in determining who is hungry in South Africa. GROW would benefit from incorporating a full intersectional analysis into the populations who are hungry in South Africa. They cite the gender and class of the hungriest populations, but fail to incorporate race, which the statistics provided by the South African government clearly demonstrate race playing a major role in who is poor and hungry which is the population that the GROW campaign wants to help with its policy advocacy and programming (Tsegay, Rusare, and Mistry, 2014). Additionally, they fail to include the role of racial projects in creating the structural problems of land loss, poverty, and female and small-farmer disempowerment even though racial claims and racial justice shape South African discussion around policy-making of those issues. If the issues of hunger and food insecurity and how it affects the people are not being fully understood or analyzed in the report, or connected to racialized realities of hunger and that racialized historical traumas produced by the racialized colonial regime of apartheid and its impacts on the current society and food system, it becomes more vague and difficult for the GROW campaign in South Africa to fulfill food justice principles and to make policy recommendations for food justice. Ultimately, racial justice is a building block of food justice (IATP, 2012) (Agyeman and Galt, 2014) (Guthman, 2014), and if the GROW campaign cannot consider how race and racism impacts hunger, it is unclear as to how the campaign will effectively formulate and push for policies and programs that advance the

status of hungry people-people who do not just suffer from hunger but from other injustices such as institutionalized racism.

6.8 GROW FOOD JUSTICE IN GUATEMALA

This section will show how the GROW campaign literature in Guatemala silences race in their explanation of food injustice in the country and through silencing race, fail to analyze the structural barriers of achieving food injustice for their target populations in Guatemala. My analysis will specifically examine the claims by Oxfam of food injustice against indigenous peoples in Guatemala within the GROW report "The struggle for a pro-poor food policy in Guatemala (Oxfam, 2011)." The report, similar to other GROW reports, deems that the food system is broken in Guatemala due to lack of land rights of poor and indigenous people to grow food, land control and land dispossession by large corporations, the poor disproportionally affected by rising hunger from the 2008 hunger crisis and how most food grown is exported from economic profit (Kilpatrick, 2011). It is also important to note that Guatemala is considered to be the site for one of GROW's successful campaigning efforts, where land-grabbing of land in the Polochic valley by corporation led to the government compensating some of the families (O'Neil, 2013). The report considers land to be the most important factor contributing to hunger amidst the poor, as the report claims that an elite 8 percent of agricultural producers own up to 80 percent of the land (Oxfam, 2011). The most vulnerable group affected by the land grabs are indigenous people, and the report claims that 70 percent of indigenous children experience hunger and indigenous experience the most land dispossession and forced relocation (Oxfam, 2011). Overall, the report considers effective policy-making to consider the needs of indigenous people that "involve[s] a review of the current highly-concentrated pattern of land ownership, and

fiscal reform in order to generate higher state revenues" (Kilpatrick, 2011, pg. 4). Hence, it is important to understand the historical processes of the concentrated land ownership in Guatemala that leaves indigenous people with little land and more hunger.

First, as the report states that the best land is kept for the plantations that export food as a cash crop, this indicates the contemporary importance of the colonial food and agricultural system that thwarted natural resources such as food, land, and water away from original populations. It is also important to understand the historical context about the "forced and ongoing" relocation and displacement of indigenous people. Subsequently, this means acknowledging relocation and displacement of indigenous people as a part of the colonial and racial projects of Guatemala. After Guatemala became an independent state, the Guatemalan elites prioritized economic development and believed that private ownership of land titles could produce more profit for the newly established state. Hence, the government declared that the lands of indigenous people were empty, due in large to the fact that indigenous people did not practice written land titles or private ownership-ideas introduced by European colonizers (Ybarra, 2014).Elites invited Germans to operate plantations or other firms on the land for free, and as Germany industry grew, Germans began to possess the land on their own without regard for indigenous people's lands. Additionally, the state considered the indigenous people to undermine their project of making Guatemala to be seen as an improving nation worthy of investment. Therefore, the state considered the whitening of its population to be an important racial project in order to create an image of itself that would increase chances of starting economic development (Ybarra, 2014). It can be argued that the elites' racist viewpoint towards indigenous people because they were different than them, less white and "developed" as them, and not

willing or desired to be incorporated in the political and economic formation of the state (Ybarra, 2014). Thus, the definition of land rights and whose land rights are respected and deemed legitimate is a direct result of European colonization in Guatemala. Consequently, indigenous groups in Guatemala affirm that they were dispossessed of their land because of their race and class (Ybarra, 2014). This shows that current land dispossessions is historically rooted in a colonial, racial, and historical contexts; this is also the history most likely in play in the GROW campaign site of Polochic Valley, Guatemala, as "'demands for land and indigenous people fought for land claims" since colonial times (Alpizar, 2013)."'

Secondly, this demonstrates that an ongoing indigenous land dispossession implies that ideologies and structures of racism and marginalization that prompted indigenous land dispossession from early-post colonial times are still apparent in Guatemala (GHRC, 2013) as these land dispossession continue to occur as highlighted in GROW's Polochic Valley case. It appears as if the racism against indigenous people due to perceived social inferiority is apparent as Casaus Arzu argues that racism is an integral and naturalized attitude adopted by all groups and classes in Guatemala (Mendez, 2013). Even though the Guatemalan government signed the Peace Accords in 1996 that ended the country's civil war and promised to fix problems of land and poverty for indigenous people, many claim that the accords did little to address the structural problems that cause issues and hence those issues tend to persist today (Nacla, 1997) (DeLuca, 2012). The key structural problems are racial discrimination and economic development that dispossesses indigenous people of their land in order to use the land to create profit for private companies or government (DeLuca, 2012). This provides implications to the GROW campaign's work with indigenous people in Guatemala in order to prevent land

dispossession.

First, by silencing race, the report ignores a major structural, as well as psychological, barrier to gaining rights for indigenous people. If the elite consider indigenous people to be inferior and not truly apart of the state based upon racist ideology, they will be less likely to promote policies that give them land rights at the expense of halting an economic development project. In the GROW Guatemala report, Oxfam acknowledges that elites are a problem and say that "They exclude the interests of indigenous people (Oxfam, 2012, pg. 3), but that only say that this is the case because "they follow a rural growth model" (Oxfam, 2012, pg. 3) that prioritizes economic growth above the well-being of small farmers, women, and indigenous peoples. Although the prioritization of economic growth over those vulnerable communities is an issue, it is important to understand why elites choose to prioritize economic growth despite the detriment it causes to these communities. Ultimately, the elites' reinforcement of the racial project stemming from colonialism to racially discriminate against indigenous people is arguably the reason why elites choose to facilitate economic growth harmful to these marginalized groups. Even the GROW external evaluation recognizes elites as a barrier to food justice to a certain extent stating that "Guatemala is a country with significant discrimination against indigenous people…and the middle to upper middle class is most likely less concerned that the government is eliminating indigenous land because they see these communities as interfering with development and prosperity (O'Neil, 2013, pg. 56) which aligns with the previous literature of Ybarra and Deluca. Systemic, ongoing racism against indigenous people is surely an issue that would prevent a proper evaluation of land ownership and fiscal reform in Guatemala.

Furthermore, the external evaluation reports that elites and land grabbing are a sensitive issue in Guatemala, and that Oxfam should have addressed the private sector, which is controlled by the elites who maintain institutional racism and discrimination against indigenous people (O'Neil, 2013; Ybarra, 2014). GROW in Guatemala could be strengthened by identifying racism and discrimination as a key barrier to pushing indigenous and small-scale producers' rights and incorporate that into their strategies. It is apparent that elites' unwillingness to pass policy due to their racism against the indigenous poor is hindering the success of their campaign, and acknowledging and incorporating anti-racism and discrimination strategies or policy into their GROW campaign seems necessary to accomplish the structural solutions they aim to push for in Guatemala which includes shifting to vulnerable community centered development (Oxfam, 2012).

6.8 ADDRESSING STRUCTURAL ISSUES THROUGH POLICY IN GUATEMALA

As GROW and its evaluators to some extent consider the Polochic Valley case a success for indigenous people in Guatemala, it is important to note that unfortunately, land dispossession is still occurring. In fact, although GROW efforts led to the Guatemalan government publicly stating that they would return the land to the people displaced in Polochic Valley, the government has not actually followed through on their vocal commitment or created a plan to return land (O'Neil, 2013). The only policy mentioned in the report is the La Iniciativa de Ley de Desarrollo Rural Integral or Initiative for Integrated Rural Development Law which GROW states that part of what is covered in the policy "reflects the demands of rural, indigenous, and environmental organisations and contains specific policies to address the structural causes of hunger and famine (Oxfam, 2012, pg. 4)." The law would have supported the markets of local producers (Abbott, 2015) and

groups other than GROW were hoping to get it passed, but the bill was eventually blocked by the congress of Guatemala (Abbott, 2015). However, some civil society organizations and international organizations have stated that the government co-opted the original policy to leave out policies that would address the structural issues contributing to the poverty and marginalization of indigenous people. For example, the International Policy Center for Inclusive Growth quotes the Guatemalan government saying that the law "does not address agrarian or land reform (Barry, 2012, pg. 4), "raises false hopes for indigenous communities (pg. 4)," "have not satisfied the socio-political needs of the country, nor remedied historical injustices (pg. 4)" and is vague in its structural changes in order to preserve a neoliberal path of land ownership (Barry, 2012). Hence, this supports that the Integrated Rural Development Law imposed by the government may not fully address the structural issues impacting indigenous people such as the hierarchical inequalities based upon racialized corporate investment facilitated by elites at the expense of the indigenous people. Furthermore, it is important to note that the bill in question was blocked in congress due to opposition from elites (Molina, 2013). Considering the interests of the private sector elites led to the bill being altered, and then eventually blocked, it would strengthen and enrich the GROW campaign by addressing the institutional racism and opposition from elites against policies that benefit small-scale farmers in indigenous groups.

Ultimately, addressing land reform in Guatemala in the long-term requires an incorporation of structural solutions that consider the deep rooted problems of structural racism in Guatemalan politics and society that lead to the disenfranchisement of small-scale farmers and indigenous people through land dispossession which leads to hunger.

Although Oxfam hints that reform would be problematic for business owners and elites because of loss of economic profit, they need to analyze the intertwinement of racism and neoliberalism in facilitating land dispossession and food injustice. Elites' claims of racial inferiority of indigenous people naturalize their disregard for indigenous rights and their affirmation that economic development is good for Guatemalans because they do not consider indigenous people to be Guatemalan and have equal and legitimate claims of citizenship as them(Ybarra, 2014). Additionally, in order for economic development projects that rely on land and natural resources to exist, business owners must get their land, and offshoot the environmental and social detrimental cost of business, from someone and somewhere; hence systemic racism facilitates the process of capital accumulation from land dispossession of indigenous people. Even though the GROW campaign calls for a review of land and financial assets and reorganization of resources for poor people (Oxfam, 2012), structural issues such as uneven developmental capitalism and systemic racism will most likely prevent those efforts. Without proposing a solution that addresses and acknowledges the intersectionality of systemic racism and uneven capitalism in land dispossession (Collins, 1991), it is difficult to propose a solution necessary to prevent land dispossession that indigenous people need to secure land and food for themselves in the current and future (DeLuca, 2012). Ultimately, GROW's suggestions for pro poor policy to reduce hunger in Guatemala do not address the structural problems inherent in preventing progressive change from happening in the first place.

6.10 GROW IN THE UNITED STATES

This section will examine the GROW campaign in the Global North, specifically in the United States and Europe. I will analyze GROW's conceptualizing the United States and Europe as the places responsible for producing food injustice for the Global South through corporations and policies yet GROW ignores the fact that these powerful entities also produce food injustice for people in the United States. Furthermore, it creates a classic, dichotomous, and inaccurate depiction of the world that hunger and poverty caused by the unjust food system only exists in the Global South. Therefore, considering the food justice movement started in the U.S. to draw attention to food injustice of racial minorities in the U.S., ignoring food justice efforts in the U.S. weakens GROW's efforts to accomplish their goal of building a global, interconnected food justice movement. Lastly, I will argue in response to criticism in the external evaluation that that global north consumers were not engaged in the campaign in a more meaningful and sustainable level and had "limited public interest" (O'Neil, 2013, pg. 34) that connecting food injustice in the United States to the Global South would deepen Global North citizens' participation in the GROW campaign.

As mentioned in previous sections of this paper, the GROW campaign operates the GROW method and Behind the Brands campaign in Global North countries such as the United States, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Australia, and some middle income countries where the other GROW outreach programs operate such as the Philippines. Throughout the reports, governments, consumers, and corporations in the Global North are seen as the powerful actors responsible for shaping the food system, and that they should use their power to solve food injustice in the Global South. Even though GROW states that the "system is failing us all (Bailey, 2011)," they fail to include examples of how Global

North government and corporate policies are failing citizens in the Global North and contributing to food injustice. Firstly, by ignoring the negative impacts of food injustice for people living in the Global North, the campaign perpetuates the false truth that hunger and poverty caused by food injustice exclusively exist in the Global South. It imagines a world where power is concentrated in the Global North causing detriment to the Global South and Global North consumers can help suffering people in the Global South participating in the campaign. Oxfam's assessment of power inequality is indeed true, but by ignoring the power, hunger, and income inequality in Global North countries such as the United States, the campaign displays an overly simplified case of events. As development practice should incorporate and address place-based struggles(Lawson, 2012), GROW should incorporate food justice struggles into the GROW literature in the United States as the food justice movement started in the United States as a response to food inequalities in the U.S. It appears to be more than a misstep or miscalculation to not consider the food justice struggle in the United States in the GROW campaign literature. In my interview with the GROW staff member, the main social movement that they have worked with in the U.S. is the Slow Food Movement and foodies (Personal Communication, 2015), representing actors from the alternative food movement that represent an upper middle class positionality with minimal regard for the oppression of people of color in the food system (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011; Guthman, 2011; Alkon; 2012). If that is specifically the key food movement GROW is working with in the Global North, I would argue that the constructed identity of the GROW Global North consumer is of a socially aware, middle to upper middle class, most likely white person. I argue this because if the consumer was a Global North person of low income, or of color, who is more likely to have experienced

some sort of hunger, poverty, and food injustice, the messaging of the campaign would have to be reflective of food injustice experiences in the United States in order to get people involved with the campaign. Similar to Alkon and Guthman's analysis of the alternative food movement allowing whiteness and making color invisible, I argue that by GROW ignoring race and embracing ethical consumerism to achieve food justice, it furthermore creates a space that perpetuates whiteness and privilege. For people, like myself, who have been involved in the food justice movement and personally affected by food injustice, the GROW campaign's exclusion of the U.S. context makes the campaign's use of the term food injustice incomplete as GROW's definition of food justice is dissociated from the current movement and its historical origins of racial justice (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014; Heynan, 2009; Guthman, 2014). When a term such as food justice that is rooted in a radical and racial justice history (Ramirez, 2015) is disassociated with its origins, it risks being appropriated into a concept that does not make the claims of the original term by not challenging and reinforcing the racial structural causes that the term originally challenges (Reynolds, 2015)

Ultimately, these actions can be analyzed within a critical geographic development studies that argues that development usually ignores northern countries with high inequality and ignores connections between political action, economic policies, and inequality (Lawson, 2011). Critical development geographic perspective supports that a global food justice campaign that does not consider the effects of food injustice in the Global North produces a development knowledge about food justice that does not reflect their interconnected message of the food justice campaign. Secondly it seems contradicting that Global North consumers are imagined as having all the consumer power to change the

food system, yet the GROW method focuses primarily on consumers changing personal behaviors (Oxfam, 2012). Furthermore, suggesting solutions that consumers can participate in food justice by buying local and seasonal foods suggests a food justice solution laced in a neoliberal market-based solution. These seem out of alignment with the overall food justice movement, which demands that people practice awareness on how their food choices affect the food system (IATP, 2011), but advocate for a bigger and deeper involvement in the movement than their purchasing power. The food justice movement is about interdependence of struggles and is essentially a grassroots, people movement (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011); a food justice campaign that does not require more of its followers than personal behavior changes such as eating sustainably or signing petitions for food injustice in other parts of the world seems counterintuitive to the people organizing core of the food justice movement. Although GROW states that ethical consumerism is just a way “to get people in the door about food justice so they can go into political action around the issues” (Personal Communication, 2015), GROW will need to refine and outline what they will expect of their participants in the future of the campaign in order to build a grassroots movement based upon achieving structural change..

Additionally, GROW’s exclusion of the food justice struggles in the United States prevents a cross-actor social movement alliance from happening between Oxfam and food justice movements in the U.S. Consequently, it is a missed opportunity to intertwine a food justice campaign taken out on the global scale with local food justice movements in the United States. It seems as if Oxfam’s exclusion of U.S. food justice inhibits a potential alliance between existing food justice social movements in the Global North and Oxfam’s movement. Additionally, it is a missed opportunity to push Global North participants to not

only get involved with the GROW campaign, but to become involved with the food justice movement in their local communities. GROW's encouragement of consumers to become involved in local food justice efforts could potentially drive up deeper engagement in GROW's campaign, as consumers begin to connect local-global food justice struggles and potentially intertwine their efforts.

6.11 "You can't just leave those who created the problem in charge of the solution." -Tyree Scott: Neoliberal Tendencies of the GROW campaign

Overall, the discourse of the GROW campaign is oftentimes framed as governments and corporations will be the ones to bring food justice to the people instead of change being driven by the people or social movements. It is also important to note that much of the GROW campaign's discourse implies that their method of food justice is to have powerful actors like governments and corporations give rights to poor people to ensure food justice. Although powerful actors' participation is necessary to achieve food justice, GROW imagines a food justice where poor people must receive those rights and goods from powerful actors; this does not align with the greater food justice movements of people organizing amidst themselves to establish food justice in their communities while simultaneously pushing for large scale policy changes. Food justice believes that the food system should be reclaimed, organized, and produced in a democratic process with marginalized communities at the center of the decision-making (IATP, 2011).

Out of all of Oxfam's "First Steps Agenda" in the GROW campaign, virtually all of their steps but one or two to achieve food justice require large institutions such as governments, corporations, and financial bodies to take action (Bailey, 2011). For example, their key points for building a new agricultural future include "Major donors should adopt

policies that promote sustainable, resilient and inclusive agriculture and adaptation. National governments (and regional bodies) should agree adaptation strategies and agricultural development policies and frameworks that promote sustainable, resilient and inclusive agriculture. Companies invest in the productivity, resilience and sustainability of small food producers (Bailey, 2011, pg. 62)." Although the engagement of powerful actors is critical in achieving food justice, centering change around actions only stemming from powerful actors seems to be in contrast with GROW's agenda of growing a global food justice movement where people are directly involved (Bailey, 2011), as the steps provide little information on how to organize people and social movements to push in accomplishing these steps. Ultimately, GROW imagines a food justice activism where powerful actors will determine whether or not food justice will occur by funding initiatives or deciding to end harmful practices or pass policies. Considering social movements such as the food justice movement imagines solutions without the influence of capitalism and where politics "extend beyond state and markets" (Silvey and Rankin, 2010), it seems as if GROW's framing of how the food justice movement will occur is different from the general social movement because of its lack of challenging of neoliberal tendencies of these actors (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014). Governance of poor people's lives are continuously held in the hands of the most powerful such as government and non-government actors such as corporations or NGOS (Lawson and Elwood, 2013) and it appears that the GROW campaign does not offer an alternative for the governance of food justice. Ultimately, this calls into question whether or not GROW's conceptualization of food justice is committed to systemic-based alternative changes if the very institutions Oxfam critiques for their wrongdoings and causing food injustice are deemed to be the sole providers of food justice.

I argue that Oxfam's use of the term food justice does not provide an alternative development practice that prioritizes people and social movements, but its upholding of power structures of society or organization of providing services deems it as another development alternative-a different way of accomplishing the same neoliberal solutions (Bebbington, Hickey, and Mitlin, 2008).

6.12 Neoliberal Constraints in GROW Campaign

This section draws upon information given to me in the interview with the high ranking GROW staff member about the challenges that the GROW campaign faced/faces in facilitating the campaign. GROW's implementation and conceptualization of food justice are limited by neoliberal constraints of funding in order to implement projects. One constraint identified was the need for GROW to prove that the campaign was effective before gaining adequate funding to implement the project in its full capacity. When I asked the staff member about the criticism found in the external evaluation that GROW had become too broad and moved away from their ultimate goal of building a food justice (O'Neil, 2014, pg. 7), the GROW staff member stated: "What we have done is focus on more of the issues and given our time bound mandate of every five years, [there] is the need to see tangible outcomes of this movement. It doesn't mean we walk away from building a large food movement...it's more of how we operate…" (Personal Communication, 2015). This shows that GROW felt the pressure to show that they were accomplishing tangible outcomes within the time frame they had in order to maintain existence and attract funders for the next phase of the project; ultimately, this push for tangible outcomes seemed to distract away from less measurable outcomes such as building a food justice movement.

Additionally, the staff member went further on about the constraints of funding for the project,

"For GROW, we determined what GROW is about and what pillars and issues are and see what funding is out there instead of seeing what funders would fund to the broad umbrella of food justice and see what they would fund. So it's harder to find funders...funders are more willing to come on in the second phase. For example with Behind the Brands, no funders wanted to give us money...you know putting pressure on the companies, but once we got the companies to commit and we see positive influence on the ground, funders have been able to come through, so we can go through our theory of change, and we can see the capacity to for that part through…finding foundations is difficult, we see funders once we get our initial agreement from campaigns (Personal Communication, 2015)."

This quote illustrates the pressure to show tangible outcomes in order to receive funding as GROW and that the original food justice-oriented goal of GROW is compromised due to the need to have measurable outcomes in order to "prove" their "effectiveness" and to frame their agendas in alignment with the priorities of funders (Silvey and Rankin, 2010). Although GROW took measures to not have funding shape the original priorities of the project, funding shaped what priorities they chose to focus on in the campaign. Additionally, funding appears to be a constraint for GROW in linking food injustice in the Global North and Global South for their campaign. The GROW staff member said that the reason they do not discuss food injustice or hunger in the U.S. is that it is not covered by the funding, and they have a separate program that talks about the food system in the U.S. (Personal Communication, 2015). As previously stated, connecting food injustice and hunger in the Global North and Global South is necessary to start an interconnected global movement where people organize together to fight the injustices that are harming them all; funding mechanisms are acting as another constraint in accomplishing GROW's goal of building a global food justice movement.

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

Overall, this thesis has illustrated the ways in which Oxfam's GROW food justice campaign falls short of reflecting the key initiatives of the food justice movement by ignoring the role of race and racism in the creation and maintenance of the broken global food system. Specifically, this thesis has demonstrated the intricate and inseparable role that historical, institutional and internalized racism has in shaping the distribution, organization, and consumption of the global food system (Agyeman and Alkon, 2011), the role of racist institutions such as colonialism, slavery and apartheid in shaping the current capitalistic and unequal food system (Shields, 1995) in determining what populations go hungry. Additionally, this thesis has nonetheless shown that offering meaningful policy recommendations towards food justice requires solutions that confront, address, and attempt to dismantle the historical and ongoing legacy of racism on the food system (IATP; 2012; Slocum, 2014; Alkon, 2014), that challenge the neoliberal tendencies and attempt to shift the unequitable power distribution of the food system (Wilson, 2012; Bebbington et al, 2008), and organize action around a people agency centered movement that interconnect oppressions (Agyeman and Alkon, 2012; Collings, 1991). Additionally, this thesis has shown that any organization looking to identify within the food justice movement must address historical racial traumas and its effect on hunger and poverty (Alkon, 2014; Ramirez, 2015). Through the case studies of South Africa and Guatemala, race and racism act as a foundation for the creation and understanding of food injustices that marginalized people of color face. Race and racism also act as the foundation of seeking justice after the negative impact of racial projects, are the foundation to legal and social movement claims for land reform, agricultural support, and equitable distribution of

land resources as a legacy of racial projects.

It appears that Oxfam is more comfortable talking about difference in identities in who is hungry in the world and who isn't by identifying women, indigenous people, ethnic minorities, and the poor, even though these identities are racialized in their experiences (Mollett and Faria, 2011). Considering there is strong similarity and connection between colonialism and development as both consist of the white, western actions on the non-white developing world (Wilson, 2012) , development practice must be racialized and race needs to be considered in development practice (Mollett and Faria, 2011). However, talking in terms of difference does not fully help to understand the phenomena of food injustice because those groups' experiences with food justice are deeply connected to experiences with institutionalized racism and racial struggles. This is illustrated in the discourse of GROW's report about Hidden Hunger in South Africa, where the report highlighted the supposed irony of having so many poor people and women go hungry, yet South African data show that 95 percent of those people are black. Furthermore, this thesis illustrates shows that many of the structural hindrances causing food injustice such as unequal land distribution are absolute direct legacies of apartheid and a system in which resources were diverted to whites and lighter skinned elites in the name of racism and capital accumulation. Ultimately, this thesis highlights the importance of applying historical trauma analysis, critical race theory, and intersectionality theory in examining food injustice and addressing structural causes of inequities in the global food system. It also highlights how these theories and analytical approaches enrich the GROW campaign in understanding and addressing the root causes of food injustice and the experiences of marginalized peoples, and help the campaign and Oxfam accomplish its goals of building a

global food justice movement and offering structural solutions to hunger and poverty.

Furthermore, the GROW campaign seems to participate in an appropriation of food justice that silences the racial struggles behind the food injustice of the people and countries represented in their campaign. It appears that the conceptualization of food justice in the GROW campaign is created in a way that targets a middle to upper middle class conscientious consumer who may not want to be implicated in injustice or be made aware that food injustice occurs in their community. The lack of race in this conceptualization of food justice may make the GROW campaign more attractive to Global North consumers engaged in the alternative food movement (Guthman, 2008), but the lack of an emphasis on racial justice removes the term from its historical origins, removes the term of its intended purpose of criticizing the role of institutional racism in shaping hunger and food injustice, and is at risk of reproducing the racial inequalities that the movement intends to dismantle (Ramirez, 2015; Reynolds, 2015). In GROW's conceptualization of food justice, privileged Global North consumers are able to maintain the classic image that poor, disenfranchised Others in the Global South need their help to bring about justice and they can help through ethical consumerism such as donating to the GROW campaign, signing petitions, and eating local and seasonal.

In summary, Oxfam's GROW campaign represents a food justice framework that exists between traditional food security and food justice frameworks. In alignment with the traditional food justice movement, the GROW campaign believes that unequal power causes hunger and poverty, the poorest people in the world are most affected by food injustice, advocacy of agroecologically produced food, pushing rights to food access and land, more funded and sustainable emergency food reserves, and better business models.

However, their food justice claims are weakened because the campaign does not examine how these experiences are racialized. For example, there are indeed unequal power relations and unequal supplies of food between the Global North and Global South, yet these were created within the racist and capitalist process of colonialism. In order to address how to dismantle unequal power relations, one must address the driving forces historically and currently behind the structures such as racism and neoliberal capitalism that maintain the food system. In the case of Guatemala, GROW must consider the role of racism and capitalism in the land grabbing of indigenous people to understand the structural causes of the problem in attempt to solve the food injustice problem. Overall, food justice promotes the idea that all actors including government, corporations, and communities should contribute to establishing food justice, yet food justice solutions must be people-centered and specifically tailored to each country and community's needs. Considering the state and corporation actors in the name of capital accumulation and racism have played a major role in building the current unequal and unbroken food system, food justice based solutions must hold them accountable and acknowledge the ways in which they have historically contributed to the current food system. However, food justice movements must do more than call out and acknowledge the unequal power relations of the food system and what actors disproportionately hold that power. Food justice movements need to propose solutions that challenge the current power status quo and redistribute power back to communities in order to provide real alternatives to the food system. Governments, non-governmental organizations, and corporations spend billions of dollars a year on anti-hunger and food security programs, yet 805 million people around the world, mostly poor people of color, remain malnourished and hungry (FAO, 2014). It is

important that any organization that aligns themselves with food justice must provide alternatives to neoliberal solutions for hunger that maintain the structural causes of why hunger and racism exist in the first place.

7.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING GROW'S PROGRAMS

Ultimately, the findings suggest that the infusion of the role of race and institutional, neoliberal critique, people-driven change in the food system could strengthen GROW's programs and provide solutions for the flaws of the campaign as outlined in the external evaluation report in 2013. The evaluation report wrote that "The biggest challenge has been to "deeply engage" with a global audience of 50 million on one or more of the GROW themes; more success has been seen in building national networks or cross-country initiatives, that while effective, haven't constituted a global movement on food (O'Neil and Goldschmid, 201, p 23,)." These thesis findings suggest that a huge barrier in constituting a global movement on food is the lack of connection between food injustice in the Global South to food justice struggles in the Global North. As evidenced in this paper, racial injustice is at the foundation of food injustice around the world and making the connection of how the same structural problems producing hunger and food insecurity in the Global South is affecting the poor and racial minorities at disproportionately high rates in the Global South will surely contribute to a global movement where people are fighting against institutional racism worldwide. Additionally, engaging a global audience, particularly a Global North audience, in a deep and meaningful manner will benefit from Oxfam drawing attention to food injustice in their own backyard. Global North consumers can become involved with GROW and food justice by getting involved or organizing for food justice in their own communities; this provides a deeper engagement than signing petitions for far-

away places that the consumer may not have a connection to or practicing self-reflexivity in food purchasing by eating organic and local. Another aspect that will contribute to a deeper engagement is also focusing on people-driven and people-centered activism in the Global North and South. Most of Oxfam's goals for GROW require government and corporations to be the ones to initiate food justice; their participation in initiating food justice is helpful, but relying too heavily on powerful entities responsible for food injustice to be the ones to trigger food justice.

Another issue that the evaluation addressed was the lack of a fully effective integration of gender into the GROW campaign. I would argue that applying intersectionality theory into the experiences of women and food injustice will make gender integration more effective. Intersectional analysis of gender and how women specifically experience food injustice and the gendered factors of causes of food injustice (i.e. the connection of gender-based violence and land dispossession for indigenous communities in Guatemala) should be considered in the GROW campaign. Additionally, acknowledging that the experience of gender is connected to the experience of other identities, i.e. being low-income, being of color, being of a certain sexuality, being indigenous, etc., and understanding and addressing the intersection of those identities in relation to the problems of and solutions to food injustice.

GROW is set to be renewed for at least five more years and has expressed intent to initiate more political action from GROW participants (Personal Communication, 2015). Consequently, this thesis offers insight on how GROW can strengthen their programs and approaches to food injustice that can hopefully be incorporated into the reconfiguration of the campaign in the next phase. As previously stated, NGOs have the incredible ability to

link different places and scales simultaneously, and this thesis can help GROW use the theories and frameworks presented in this paper to offer tangible, structural solutions to food injustice and grow a global food justice movement that maintains food justice's commitment to organize marginalized people together to challenge the institutional racism in the food system.

CHAPTER 8. CONSIDERATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Overall, this thesis brings up several considerations for future thought and engagement with this topic. These findings suggest there could be various reasons of why Oxfam chooses not to address race in their food justice campaign. I concur that one of the reasons Oxfam chooses not to address race in its food justice campaigns is because racial justice is difficult to measure, not attractive to talk about (Guthman, 2008), and NGOS are compelled to prove their campaigns have measurable results to receive money and support from funders (Silvey and Rankin, 2010). Many of these funders are government and private bodies, actors that produce and maintain structural problems that contribute to food injustice, racism, and poverty, may be less likely to publicly and support organizations that call for a redistribution of resources that leads to a loss of power and profit for them. Another reason why they do not bring up race is because they suffer from an institutionalized whiteness where race has been deemed invisible or not necessary in explaining issues in the developing world. Although many international development organizations such as Oxfam are full of racially and ethnically diverse staff, this does not make them immune to the whiteness inherent in institutional policies and practices (Mollett and Faria, 2013). (More added to this section after interview).

There were several limitations in the study of this thesis topic. First, I was only able to conduct my research over a nine month timeline in conjunction with my studies and employment, so time was constrained in terms of expanding my methods and gaining more interviews. Although I was able to interview the leader of the GROW campaign in the U.S., it would have been helpful to interview other Oxfam offices in order to gain their thoughts on

the GROW campaign. Additionally, I did not have the time or connections to interview grassroots partners of the GROW campaign.

<u>Bibliography</u>

Abbott, J. (2015). Young Guatemalan farmers fight for land rights, local food, and sustainable traditions endangered by global trade deals. YES! Magazine.

Acosta, A. and Haddad, L. (2014). The politics of success in the fight against malnutrition in Peru. Food Policy, 44, 26-35.

ActionAid International. (2012). Fueling the food crisis: the cost to developing countries corn ethanol expansion.

Agarwal, B. (2014). Food sovereignty, food security and democratic choice: critical contradictions, difficult conciliations. Journal of Peasant Studies, 41, 6.

Agyeman, J. & Alkon, A. (2011). Introduction: the food movement as polyculture. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability,* (pp 1-21). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Agyeman, J. and McEntee, J. (2014). Moving the Field of Food Justice Forward Through the Lens of Urban Political Ecology. Geography Compass, 8, 3, 211-220.

Ahmadi, B. Racism and food justice: the case of Oakland. (2011). In E. Holt-Gimenez, *Food movements unite!: Strategies to transform our food system*, (pp 149-162). Oakland, California: Food First Books.

Alkon, A. and Norgaard, K. (2009). Breaking the food chains: an investigation of food justice activism. Sociological Inquiry, 79, 3, 289-305.

Alkon, A and Mares, T. (2011). Food sovereignty in food movements: radical visions and neoliberal constraints. Agriculture and Human Values.

Alkon, A. and McCullen, C. (2010). Whiteness and Farmers Markets: Performances, Perpetuations … Contestations? Antipode, 43, 937-959.

Allen, P. (2008). Mining for justice in the food system: perceptions, practices, and possibilities. Agricultural and Human Values, 25, 157-161.

Amin, S. (2011). Food movements unite! Food First Books.

Anderson, M. (2008). Rights-based food systems and the goals of food systems reform. Agricultural and Human Values, 25, 593-608.

Atuahene, B. (2011). South Africa's land reform crisis eliminating the legacy of apartheid. *Foreign Affairs.*

Atuahene, B. and Brophy, A. (2015). South Africa's land inequity. *New York Times:* New York. Published January 5th, 2015.

Atkinson, J. and Scurrah, M. (2009). Globalizing social justice: the role of non-governmental organizations in bringing about social justice. Palgrave MacMillan: London

Alpizar, A. (2013). Guatemala Genocide Trial: Women seeking justice and open debate about racism in Guatemalan society. Association for Women's Rights in Development.

Ayres, J. & Bosia M. (2011). Beyond global summitry: food sovereignty as localized resistance to globalization. Globalizations, 8, 1, 47-63.

Bailey, R. (2011). Growing a better future: food justice in a resource-constrained world. Oxfam International.

Barry, B. (2011). Guatemala and integrated rural development: towards inclusive growth in the rural sector. International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth.

Batta et al. Transforming NGO roles to help make food sovereignty a reality. (2011). In E. Holt-Gimenez, *Food movements unite!: Strategies to transform our food system*, (pp 93-114). Oakland, California: Food First Books.

Barrett et al. (2013). Recipients' Satisfaction with Locally Procured Food Aid Rations: Comparative Evidence from a Three Country Matched Survey. World Development, 49, 30-43.

Bauer, N. (2012). ANCYL warns of Zim-style land invasions in South Africa. Mail & Guardian.

Black, M. (1995). A cause for our times : Oxfam : the first 50 years. Oxford University Press.

Borras, M. (2010). The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements. Development and Change, 41, 5, 771-803.

Bebbington, A., Hickey, S., and Mitlin, D. (2008). Introduction: Can NGO's really make a difference? In Can NGOs make a difference? The Challenge of Development Alternatives. Zed Books: New York.

Bebbington, A. (2007). Social Movements and the Politicization of Chronic Poverty. Development and Change, 38, 5, 793-818.

Bread for the World. (2012). Fact Sheet Hunger and Poverty Hurt African-American Women and Children.

Bremmer, N. (2001). The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. Progress in Human Geography, 25, 4, 591-614.

Brown, D. (2003). Critical race theory: cases, materials, and problems. Thomson West.

Brown, S. & Getz, C. (2011). Farmworker food insecurity and the production of hunger in California. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*, (pp 121-146). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Bryant, R. (1998). Power, knowledge and political ecology in the third world. Progress in Physical Geography, 22, 1, 79-94.

Bryant, R. L. (2009), Born to be wild? Non-governmental organisations, politics and the environment. Geography Compass, 3,1540–1558. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00248.x

Center for American Progress. (2008). The Straight Facts on Women in Poverty.

Clark, J. (1986). *For Richer For Poorer: An Oxfam report on western connections with world hunger.* Oxfam Great Britain.

Cohen, D., de la Vega, R., and Watson, G. (2001). Advocacy for social justice: a global action and reflection guide. Oxfam America and Advocacy Institute.

Collins, P. (1991). Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment. Routledge.

Cornell University. (2015). “Origin of the system of rice intensification.” [Webpage].

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G. and Thomas, K. (1996). Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement. New Press.

Crush, J. (2005). Imagining Development in *Power of Development*. Taylor & Francis.

Dahlberg, K.A. (2001). Democratizing society and food systems: or how do we transform modern structures of power. Agriculture and Human Values, 18, 135-151.

Delahunty, M. (2009). “Oxfam’s press ads from the 1950s and 60s.” SOFFII.org

Delgado, R., and Stefancic, J. (2001). Critical Race Theory: An Introduction. New York University Press.

DeLuca, D. (2012). Human rights violations in Guatemala: hearing indigenous voices. Cultural Survival.

Dupraz, C. and Postiole, A. (2013). Food sovereignty and agricultural trade policy commitments: how much leeway do West African nations have? Food Policy

Edelman, M. (2014). Food sovereignty: forgotten genealogies and future regulatory challenges. Food sovereignty: a critical dialogue. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 6, 959-978.

England, A. (2015). South Africa: Staking a claim. Financial Times.

Figueroa, M. (2010). Distributed intensities: Whiteness, mestizaje and the logics of Mexican racism. *Ethnicities*, 10(3) 387–401.

Frankovits, A. (1996). Rejoinder: the rights way to development A national human rights NGO speaks on donor aid policy. Food Policy, 21, 1, 123-128.

Fraser, N. (From redistribution to recognition: Dilemmas of justice in a “postsocialist” age. In K. Olson (Ed.),

Galt, R. (2013). Placing Food Systems in First World Political Ecology: A Review and Research Agenda. Geography Compass, 7, 9, 637-658.

Gill, P. (1970). Drops in the ocean: the work of Oxfam 1960-1970. Macdonald & Co.

Gottlieb, R. and Fisher, A. (1996). Community Food Security and Environmental Justice: Searching for a Common Discourse. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 13, 3, 23-32.

Grey, S. and Patel, R. (2015). Food Sovereignty as Decolonization: Some Contributions from Indigenous Movements to Food System and Development Politics. *Agriculture & Human Values,* 32, 1.

Gregory et al. (2009). Dictionary of Human Geography, Fifth Edition. Wiley.

Guthman, J. (2011). “If they only knew”: the unbearable whiteness of alternative food. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*, (pp 263-282). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Gottlieb, R. and Joshi, A. (2010). Food justice. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Gill, P. (1970). Drops in the ocean? The work of Oxfam 1960-1970. Macdonald Unit: London

Grada, C. (2011). Famine’s Past, Famine’s Future. Development and Change, 42, 1, 49-69.

Guthman, J. (2014). Doing justice to bodies? Reflections on food justice, race, and biology. *Antipode*, 46, 5, 1153-1171.

Guthman, J. (2011). Weighing in: obesity, food justice, and the limits of capitalism. University of California Press.

Havice, E. and Reed, K. (2012). Fishing for Development? Tuna Resource Access and Industrial Change in Papua New Guinea? Journal of Agrarian Change, 12, 2-3, 413-435.

Hart, G. (2002). Disabling globalization: places of power in post-Apartheid South Africa. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Harvey, D. (1996). Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference. Blackwell Publishers: Melden, Massachusetts.

Harvey, D. (2000). Spaces of hope. California Studies in Critical Human Geography.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610, 21.

Harvey, D. (2011). Geographic Disruptions and the Uneven Development of Political Responses. Economic Geography, 87, 1, 1-22.

Hankivsky, O. et al. (2014). An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework: critical reflections on a methodology for advancing equity. International Journal of Equity Health, 13, 119.

Heilig, J., Brown, K., and Brown, L. (2012). The illusion of inclusion: a critical race theory textual analysis of race and standards. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82, 3, 403-424.

Holt-Gimenez, E. & Shattuck, A. Food movements unite: Making a new food system possible. (2011). In E. Holt-Gimenez, *Food movements unite!: Strategies to transform our food system*, (pp 315-324). Oakland, California: Food First Books.

Holt-Gimenez, E. and Patel, R. (2009). Food rebellions! Crisis and the hunger for justice. Pambazuka Press.

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. (2012). Draft Principles of Food Justice.

Jarosz, L. (2011). Defining world hunger: scale and neoliberal ideology in International food security policy discourse. Food Culture and Society, 14, 11, 117-139.

Jarosz, L. (2014). Considering Food Security, Sovereignty and Systems Narratives in Colin Sage's Environment and Food. Sociologia Ruralis, 54, 1, 105-108.

Kaimowitz, D. (1993). The role of nongovernmental organizations in agricultural research and technology transfer in Latin America. World Development, 21, 7, 1139-1150.

Kilpatrick, K. (2011). The struggle for a pro-poor food policy in Guatemala. Oxfam Policy and Practice: Agriculture, Food and Land, 11, 3, pp. 9-14.

Kothari, U. (2006). Critiquing 'race' and racism in development discourse and practice. Progress in Development Studies, 6, 1, 1-7.

Lahiff, E. (2010). Q&A: Land Reform in South Africa. Promised Land. Public Broadcasting Corporation.

La Via Campesina. (2014). What is La Via Campesina? [Webpage].

Lappe, F. (1986). World hunger: twelve myths. Food First.

Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA). (2014). Historical context of land reform. [Webpage].

Lawson, V. (2007). Making development geography. Bookpoint LTD.

Lawson, V. and Elwood, S. (2014). Encountering poverty: space, class, and poverty politics. *Antipode*, 46, 1, 209-228.

Lehohla, P. (2011). Provincial profile: Limpopo. Statistics South Africa.

Leitner, H. and Miller, B. (2007). Scale and the limitations of ontological debate: a commentary on Marston, Jones and Woodward. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 32, 1, 116-125.

Lovell, T. (2007). (Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: Nancy Fraser and Pierre Bourdieu. Routledge.

Macartney, S., Bishaw, A., Fontenot, K. (Census Bureau). (2013). Poverty Rates for Selected Detailed Race and Hispanic Groups by State and Place: 2007–2011. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acsbr11-17.pdf

Marston, S. (2000). The social construction of scale. Progress in Human Geography, 24, 2, pp 219-242

Marston, S., Jones, J., and Woodward, K. (2005). Human geography without scale. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 30, 4, 416-432.

Massey, D. (1994). A Global Sense of Place. Space, Place and Gender. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.

Mendez, L. (2013). Study Finds Link Between Land Grabs and Sexual Violence Against Q´eqchís Women. America's Program.

McClintock, N. (2011). From industrial garden to food desert: demarcated devaluation in the flatlands of Oakland, California. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*, (pp 89-120). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

McMichael, P. (2011). Global development and the corporate food regime. Research in Rural Sociology and Development. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 11,265 – 299.

McMichael, P. (2014). Historicizing food sovereignty. Journal of Peasant Studies, 41, 6, 933-957.

Minkoff-Zern, L., Peluso, N., Sowerwine, J., & Getz, C. (2011). Race and regulation: Asian immigrants in California agriculture. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*, (pp 65-87). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Molina, C. (2013). Closing the policy gap for small-scale farmers in Guatemala. Oxfam Great Britain.

Mollett, S. and Faria, C. (2013). Messing with Gender in Feminist Political Ecology. Geoforum, 45, 116-125.

Mosse, D. (2014). A relational approach to durable poverty, inequality and power. *Journal of Development Studies*, 46, 7, 1156-1178.

NACLA. (1997). The Guatemalan Peace Accords: NACLA Report on the Americas, May/June 1997. Retrieved from http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/140.html.

Nielson, JR. and Martin, R. (1996). Creation of a new fisheries policy in South Africa: the development process and achievements. Retrieved from oceandocs.org

Norgaard, K., Reed, R., & Van Horn, C. (2011). A continuing legacy: institutional racism, hunger, and nutritional justice on the Klamath. In J. Agyeman, & A. Alkon, *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*, (pp 23-46). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Ntsebeza, L. (2003). Land Redistribution in South Africa: the property clause revisited. University of Cape Town.

Nyeleni. (2015). Newsletter. Retrieved from http://nyeleni.org/DOWNLOADS/newsletters/Nyeleni_Newsletter_Num_21_EN.pdf

National Development Agency of South Africa. (2001). Land redistribution for agricultural development.

Omi, M. and Winant, H. (2008). Once more, with feeling: reflections on racial formation. *Modern Language Association*, 123, 5, 1565-1572.

Oxfam Australia. (2011). Why does GROW focus on small-scale food producers?

Oxfam International. (2012). The food transformation: harnessing consumer power to create a fair food future.

Oxfam International. (2011). Weathering the crises, feeding the future: Philippine Food Justice Report.

Oxfam International. (2013). Behind the brands: food justice and the Big 10 food and beverage companies.

Patel, R. (2009). Food sovereignty. Journal of Peasant Studies, 36, 3, 663-706

Pearce, J. and Eade, D. (2000). Development, NGOs, and civil Society. Oxfam International-Political Science.

Ramirez, M. (2015). The elusive inclusive: black food geographies and racialized food spaces. Antipode. (Forthcoming).

Rao, J. (2009). Challenges Facing World Agriculture: A Political Economy Perspective. Development and Change, 40, 6.

Reynolds, K. (2015). Disparity despite diversity: social injustice in New York City's urban agriculture system. Antipode, 47, 1, 240-259.

Roberts, D. and Mahtani, M. (2010). Neoliberalizing race, racing neoliberalism: Placing "Race" in neoliberal discourses. Antipode, 42, 2, 248-257.

Rodriguez-Silva, I. (2012). Silencing race: disentangling blackness, colonialism, and national identities in Puerto Rico. Pargrave McMillan.

Roy, A. (2012). Ethical Subjects: Market rule in an age of poverty. Public Culture, 24,1, 1-4.

Rubenstein, J. (2009). Humanitarian NGOs' Duties of Justice. Journal of Social Philosophy, 40, 4, 524-541.

Rubenstein, J. (2014). The Misuse of Power, Not Bad Representation: Why It Is Beside the Point that No One Elected Oxfam. Journal of Political Philosophy, 22, 2, 204-230.

Sandler, R. (2014). Food ethics: the basics. Routledge: New York.

Slocum, R. (2008). "Race in the study of food." *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(3), 303–327.

Schiavoni, C. (2009). The global struggle for food sovereignty: from Nyleni to New York. Journal of Peasant Studies, 36, 3, 682-689.

Sheppard, E. (2002). The Spaces and Times of Globalization: Place, Scale, Networks, and Positionality, Economic Geography, 78, 33, 307-330.

Silvey, R. and Rankin, K. (2011). Development geography: Critical development studies and political geographic imaginaries. Progress in Human Geography, 35, 5, 696-704.

Shields, D. (1995). The color of hunger: race and hunger in national and international perspective. Bowman and Littlefield Publishers: Lanham, Maryland

Shutt, C. (2010). Changing the World by Changing Ourselves: Reflections from a Bunch of BINGOs. IDS Bulletin. IDS Practice Papers, 2009, 3.

Smith, N. (1992). Geography, difference and the politics of scale.

Stephenson, N. (2003). Interrupting neo-liberal subjectivities. Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies, 17, 2.

te Lintelo, D. (2012). Measuring Political Commitment to Reducing Hunger and Under-nutrition: Can it be Done and Will it Help? IDS Bulletin, 43, 1, 65-73.

Temudo, M. and Abrantes, M. (2013). Changing Policies, Shifting Livelihoods: The Fate of Agriculture in Guinea-Bissau. Journal of Agrarian Change, 13, 4, 571-589.

Thakurta, P. and Chaturvedi, S. (2012). Food and nutrition justice: how to make it more newsworthy? IDS Bulletin, 43, 1, 58-64.

Tsegay, Y., Rusare, M., and Mistry, R. (2014). Hidden Hunger in South Africa: The Faces of Hunger and Malnutrition in a Food-Secure Nation. Oxfam International.

USDA. (2013). Food security in the U.S. [Webpage].

Uvin, P. (1995). Fighting hunger at the grassroots: paths to scaling up. World Development, 23, 6, 927-939.

Waterstone, M. (2010). Geography and social justice.

Whitehead, A. and Tsikata, D. (2003). Policy discourses on women's land rights in sub-saharan Africa: the implications of the re-turn to the customary. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3, 1-2, 67-112.

Williams-Forson, P. (2006). *Building houses out of chicken legs*: black women, food, and power. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press

World Food Programme. (2014). Who are the hungry?

World Hunger. (2015). Hunger in America: 2015 United States Hunger and Poverty Facts.

Venot, J. and Clement, F. (2013). Justice in development? An analysis of water interventions in the rural South, Natural Resource Forum, 37, 1.

Ybarra, M. (2014). Through the Ladino looking glass: national racial politics in international conservation & development. Chapter.

Young, E.M. (1997). World hunger. Routledge: London.

Young, E.M. (2012). Food and development. Routledge: London.

Appendix

A) INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your position at Oxfam? How long have you worked there? How long have you worked on the GROW campaign?

2. How does food justice fit into Oxfam's overall mission and purpose? Why did Oxfam choose food justice as its focus?

3. Have you received any feedback about the GROW campaign? What have been the main critiques? How have you addressed them in your programming? What have you been hearing from people in the field? Other NGOs? Governments? Corporations?

4. Is there a difference between the GROW campaign and previous hunger/food campaigns Oxfam has been involved with in the past? What is the difference? What are the similarities?

5. Throughout the GROW literature, Oxfam talks about inequalities contributing to the broken food system that affect vulnerable populations such as women, small-scale producers and farmers, and ethnic minorities in certain countries. Given the extensive literature and roots of the food justice movement that center on racial injustice and inequities as a main food justice problem, is there a particular reason why race does not appear in any GROW campaign literature? What is Oxfam's stance on how race shapes the broken food system and how racial inequalities influence food justice?

6. It appears that GROW campaign engages with consumers and citizens in the Global North by asking them to sign petitions and consider their own purchasing actions in the global food system. Have there been other ideas about engaging consumers? Would the GROW campaign consider asking them to support food justice organizations in their community?

7. I understand that Oxfam programs in the past have targeted problems in the U.S. such as New Orleans post-Katrina. Is there a particular reason why the GROW campaign does not address food injustice and hunger in the U.S. or the Global North?

8. Is there anything that we did not talk about in the interview that you would like to say about the GROW campaign?