

# Simon Fraser University

## SA 360-4: Special Topics in Soc/Ant: Sociologies of Food and Hunger

Fall 2013: Tuesday, 8:30-12:20, Burnaby SWH10051

Professor: Gerardo Otero. Office: A.Q. 5100. Office Hours: Tuesday 1:00-2:00 or by appointment. Phone: 778-782-4508. E-mail: [otero@sfu.ca](mailto:otero@sfu.ca).

### Course Content

Capitalism is full of commodities, but none is as intimate as food. Whether we are aware of it or not, food puts us in contact with a multiplicity of people and institutions, each inserted in a variety of social relations to produce, process, distribute and consume food. Given the wealth of relations generated around food, steeped in social inequality, this is becoming a booming theme in sociology and other social-science disciplines. One of the paradoxes of the contemporary food system is that it generates both hunger and obesity at the same time. Hunger is often blamed on insufficient food production, but the root cause is in fact inequitable food distribution. Two broad sociological approaches to the study of food are the constructivist and structuralist perspectives. This seminar will introduce both of these perspectives, ultimately proposing that a synthesis of the two approaches offers the richest scope for a sociological analysis of food. Emphasis will be placed on society's structures of inequality, as these are key determinants of not only whether people have access to food, but also to its amount and quality. Socioeconomic inequality itself is pervasive and growing between and within the global North and the South. One of the key driving forces of hunger is, paradoxically, the very technology that has been developed to increase food production. The so-called "Green Revolution," launched in the 1970s as a purported solution to Third World hunger, resulted in further social and regional disparities in food availability . . . and increased hunger. Since the 1990s, many have argued that "Gene Revolution" biotechnology, specifically the genetic engineering of crops, now holds the contemporary technological solution to global hunger.

We will explore the links between agricultural technologies, trade, hunger, and the reconfiguration of the global agri-food system, with a focus on the Americas. Food Studies has become a growing field of scholarly interest for many disciplines beyond the social sciences, including those in health and nutrition, in addition to agricultural and environmental disciplines. Indeed, this course includes a diversity of students from Health Sciences, Arts and Social Sciences, Environmental Science, and Communications.

Each of us as individuals can hardly hope to apprehend the complexity of the "food system" in its entirety. Yet, we can make a collective effort to gain a greater understanding through cooperation in this class. Besides our weekly seminar discussions, much of our collective effort will culminate in the last two sessions, when students will give presentations on their own specific findings. I have high hopes that these presentations will result in considerable teaching and learning effects. Students will be encouraged to focus their research on one of the major topics specified below, each of which has a series of suggested readings. These readings are by no means exhaustive, but their number does highlight how important and diverse the topics of food and agriculture have been in a wide number of scholarly disciplines. Weekly seminars will consist of a combination of lectures by the instructor, watching films, presentations by students, and structured discussion of extensive readings.

## Learning Goals:

This seminar has several learning goals beyond the substantive topic of its title as specified in the course content. Other learning goals include the following:

*Critical synthesis.* One of the main abilities that any university student must acquire is to gather, classify, analyze and synthesize large amounts of information. Information is usually abundant, so what you need is the ability to process it. Most assignments in this course are geared to enhance this ability.

*Peer review.* Scholarly life progresses largely as a dialogue, discussion and debate in the community of peers. Peer review is the process by which a scholarly contribution is subjected to the reading by other scholars in a similar field with the goal of assessing its merits and identify areas in which it could be improved. There are several essential conditions to engage in fair peer review. One is to read materials generated by others with an open mind, looking for both strengths and weaknesses. Rendering a synthesis of core strengths is a condition to then engage in a discussion of weaknesses. Another condition for doing a fair peer review is to humbly subject one's own work to the review of others, get their feedback, and try to make the best of it in revising our work. This reciprocal back-and-forth process among scholars makes for a cooperative mode of advancing in the production of knowledge. Unfortunately some feedback is negative and ill-intended but, in my view, most scholarly exchange tends to be constructive and well-meaning. This is the type of feedback that I hope to promote in this seminar, both in relation to all of its members and the authors that we will be reading, reviewing, and discussing.

*Group interaction.* Most settings in the world of work will involve discussion, dialogue, debate, and group interaction. Fruitfully interacting with other students or colleagues is a skill to be learned or developed. The class will thus be divided into 4-5 groups composed of five people each for the seminar part of each session. The membership of these groups will be established the first week of class and will remain the same throughout the semester. These groups could also be the basis for thematic research focus, but they do not have to coincide (see below). Our group discussions will also involve that each student will take different roles in each seminar, which shall be rotated weekly among group members: **moderator**, chooses questions, introduces readings, and coordinates discussion, making sure that no two people speak at one time and that everyone gets a fair share of time to contribute; **time keeper**, makes sure that discussion is flowing at an adequate pace to finish assignment on time; **participation encourager**, makes sure that everyone in the group contributes in some way to the discussion; **concept clarifier**, checks the readings as needed to make sure that the group is properly understanding the key concepts under discussion; and **reporter** to class, records the names of group participants and keeps minutes of the discussion with a view to give a summary of conclusions to the entire class, and hand in an outline of the group's discussion with the names of participants to the professor. In groups with only four members, one person will play the roles of participation encourager and moderator.

*Presentation skills.* A presentation of about 5-7 minutes using power point with no more than 7 slides, assuming that you take a minute per slide, will be done in the last two sessions of the course. **Technical guidelines:** Each slide should not contain much more than 3-5 lines, with not more than 3-4 words per line, always using a 36-point font in the main text and 40 points for slide titles. If you use pictures or images, then shorten the text within those slides or leave them without a text. **Content guidelines:** (1) Introduce your topic, why you were interested in the book you chose to review, its relevance, and how it relates to your research question (1-2 minutes). (2) Go over the main theoretical positions in which the book is inserted and what is the

author's position in the debate. What is your own position in this debate and with respect to the book's author (2-3 minutes). (3) Briefly describe the empirical evidence used by the author as it relates to the debate and/or to your own stance (1-2 min.) (4) Finally, what are your main conclusions and ideas for your future research? (1 min.) This exercise will prepare you for making coherent future presentations in other classes and in your professional practice.

### **Grading:**

Discussion papers (five, every other week, 5% each)	25%
Responses (five, <b>alternate</b> weeks, 2% each)	10%
Book Review (600-800 words, DUE October 22, 9:30)	15%
Draft presentation of review essay	10%
Review Essay (2,000-2,500 words, DUE Nov. 29, 4:30)	25%
Class participation	15%

All graded assignments in this course must be completed for a final grade other than N to be assigned.

### **Academic Dishonesty and Misconduct Policy**

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology follows SFU policy in relation to grading practices, grade appeals (Policy T 20.01) and academic dishonesty and misconduct procedures (S10.01- S10.04). Unless otherwise informed by your instructor in writing, in graded written assignments you must cite the sources you rely on and include a bibliography/list of references, following an instructor-approved citation style. It is the responsibility of students to inform themselves of the content of SFU policies available on the SFU website:

<http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/student.html>.

### **Required Readings** (the following books plus some articles available on Canvas):

- Amy E. Guptill, Denise A. Copelton, and Betsy Lucal. 2013. *Food and Society: Principles and Paradoxes*. Cambridge, UK; and Malden, MA: Polity Press. ISBN-13: 978-0-7456-4282-0 (pb)
- Barry Popkin. 2009. *The World Is Fat: The Fads, Trends, Policies, and Products that Are Fattening The Human Race*. New York: Avery. ISBN: 1583333134 (pb)
- Julie Guthman. 2011. *Weighing In: Obesity, Food Justice, and the Limits of Capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press. ISBN: 9780520266254 (pb)
- Gerardo Otero. 2008. *Food for the Few: Neoliberal Globalism and Biotechnology in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press. ISBN: 9780292726130 (Available online from the SFU library. A few copies will be made available from instructor at author's cost, \$15.00)
- Kathleen C. Schwartzman. 2013. *The Chicken Trail: Following Workers, Migrants, and Corporations Across the Americas*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. ISBN: 9780801478093 (pb)

### **Course Expectations and Requirements (PLEASE READ VERY CAREFULLY)**

This syllabus is a contract between each individual student and the instructor. By taking this course you agree to the requirements and terms stated here. These requirements may be modified

or supplemented later in minor ways, and you are responsible for those changes. This course will generally follow a combination of lecture, documentary films, and participatory-learning discussion. The purpose of lectures is to provide necessary background material on each week's themes and readings. The seminar part of the class will be devoted to clarify concepts from lecture and readings through class discussion and small-group activities. The lectures will supplement—not substitute—the assigned readings. The readings are extensive, complex, sophisticated and will require hours of hard work and effort. You may discover that the readings appear to be difficult to understand at first. You should, however, continue to read, making notes about concepts and ideas that you do not understand. During the lectures these concepts and ideas may become clarified. If they do not, then **please** ask questions. If you do not understand something, chances are many of your fellow students do not understand and all will benefit from your questions. You are also encouraged to use my office hours for further conceptual clarification.

Everyone is encouraged to participate in seminar discussion and questions by sharing thoughts and ideas, observations, and assessments during class time. Thoughtful and active participation means **regularly** attending class and being prepared to discuss the assigned subject matter. My assumption, and I hope yours too, is that education is not a “banking” process whereby an instructor “deposits” a bunch of information into the heads of passive receivers (students). Learning is a collaborative process in which information and knowledge is to be shared between the professor and students.

**Grading** will be determined by your performance on the following aspects:

**Discussion Papers** (a total of five): These typewritten, single-spaced papers, in 12-point font are due by Monday at noon of each week. Choose even-numbered weeks to post your discussion papers if your SFU student number is an even number; or odd-numbered weeks if your i.d. is an odd number. If there is a topic on which you strongly prefer to write a discussion paper but it is outside of your corresponding weeks, you are allowed to do it; just let me know about it in advance. It is essential to post discussion papers on time because half the class needs to read them in order to write and post their own “responses” by 7 p.m. on the same day. Discussion papers should be kept to one page single-spaced (350-450 words) and posted on our course's Canvas space under “discussions” on the left side. Save an electronic copy for your files. Please note that there are specific spaces for Discussion Papers and Responses, respectively, for each week. Make sure to post your assignment in the relevant week's container. I will use the “Announcements” feature of Canvas to communicate important matters related to the course, such as any changes to this syllabus or deadlines, when applicable. If you would like to communicate something to the entire class, please send me an email and I will post your message in Announcements—this feature can only be used by the instructor.

Please follow these guidelines when posting your discussion papers and responses: (1) Include your name and week for which you are writing on the top line, and use **only one line** for this information: the fewer pages I have to print the better. (2) There is no need to include the bibliographic reference for these assignments. (3) The discussion papers should be written **EXCLUSIVELY** on the basis of required readings.

**Organizing the content.** Discussion papers should include **4 explicit** sections, resembling the following model in format and space:

First name, Last. Week X. Core theme: XYZ.

(1) **Introduction.** Brief paragraph raising a paradox or central question about the topic of the readings. Provide a **brief agenda or outline** of what you will write in the rest of your mini-essay (i.e., a synthesis, an assessment and two discussion questions). (Write 30-40 words.)

(2) **Synthesis.** Provide a brief *synthesis* of what the author is saying. Identify the central questions, main points, concepts, and/or core arguments. Rather than presenting an inventory of all the ideas presented by the author, you should focus in depth on the most significant aspects of the text, always mentioning the key concepts used by the author. Brief definitions of such concepts would help, and you should include a reference to a specific page number or provide the author’s most synthetic rendering of the concept(s) by using a textual quotation (with page number). A synthesis is not the same as a summary. The latter is an attempt to provide an account of the entire text. A synthesis is not as easy because it presupposes that the text has been understood, and focuses on the core, most central parts. In contrast to an inventory that simply lists topics, a good synthesis of a text requires that you give the reader a good idea of what the author means, not just the particular facts that are presented to support an argument. Providing citations and quotations is essential in this part of the assignment, as the text constitutes your “empirical” evidence of what you are writing about. (Write 200-280 words.)

(3) **Assessment.** Make a brief *assessment* of the *strengths* and/or *weaknesses* of the authors’ central arguments or concepts. Without being authorities, comment here on whether the authors’ evidence or analysis really supports what they set out to do and their conclusions. How does their viewpoint colour the interpretations they make? Rather than giving your opinions, say why you agree or disagree with their argument and conclusions, or what you thought was particularly illuminating. I encourage you to be contentious and take a risk by taking a strong stand that will get debate going in class, and be ready to defend your stance with relevant evidence and/or analysis. (Write 60-100 words.)

(4) **Questions.** Finally, provide two discussion *questions* that will help us further disentangle the readings, e.g., a lingering question whose answer would further clarify the author’s theory, and one that will promote class discussion. (Write 30-40 words.)

### Discussion Paper Evaluation

Name: \_\_\_\_\_.

Grade: \_\_\_\_\_.

POOR		EXCELLENT			
1	2	3	4	5	
					Contains four <b>explicit</b> sections, as requested.
					Introduces main topic and sets up clearly defined <b>agenda</b> .
					Focuses on <b>core</b> arguments, concepts and perspectives (rather than a superficial summary or inventory of themes).
					<b>Coherence</b> of explanation. Clear statements. Succinct (i.e. thorough on core points, yet stays within word limit).
					Key terms and concepts are <b>defined and explained</b> .
					Assertions and arguments supported with specific <b>cites</b> to required readings.
					Assertions and arguments supported with specific <b>quotes</b> from required readings.
					<b>Reasoned</b> assessment of strengths and weaknesses (rather than merely agreeing or disagreeing).
					<b>Questions</b> help disentangle readings conceptually, referring back to text rather than eliciting opinion or application.
					<b>Depth</b> of coverage of required readings.

**Note: Late discussion papers and responses will not be marked or counted.**

I am looking for well-written papers which critique the readings directly, or support their arguments, and which draw in questions and issues that have been raised in other readings, lectures, films, and/or discussions from earlier in the course. The form above will be used for marking by the professor, so please try to address all of these explicit expectations in your discussion papers. (25% for five papers, or 5% each).

Students not writing a paper for a given week are required to write a **response** on the ideas of *at least* two of the other students' discussion papers. Send at least five sets of responses in as many alternate weeks. The ideal responses are those that will promote further disentangling and understanding of the readings, rather than simply rendering an opinion. **All** responses should be based on your peers' rendering of the text, **using citations and quotations** from the text as needed to make your points. Assume that the texts constitute your "empirical evidence," which must be referred to in order to back up or reinforce your statements and main arguments. In a sense, students writing discussion papers are accountable to those writing responses. Respondents will make sure that the right interpretations are being conveyed in discussion papers, or point out their disagreements (or agreements with reinforcement or elaboration). Responses without some cites or quotes will automatically be marked with a zero. Post your responses in Canvas by 7:00 p.m. on the Monday before class. Make sure that you post your response as a single paper in its own weekly container under "Responses" (10%, or 2% each).

**Book Review.** This is a book review (600-800 words) in which the central task is to present a neutral point of view, or what Wikipedia calls NPOV, of the book you choose for discussion: a straight forward synthesis of the author's perspective and arguments without yourselves being argumentative. This is akin to what could be required in a policy analysis position in the form of a "policy brief." While a policy brief is expected to cover a wide range of debate and discussion on a given topic, the writer must present a neutral rendering of such debate. In this case you are expected to develop the ability to engage in this type of writing in a book review. Notice that actual book reviews published in scholarly journals are expected to do this kind of neutral presentation plus an assessment of strengths and weaknesses, which is usually argumentative. You can point to the book's main strengths and weaknesses in the book review, but leave the argumentative part with your own position and that of other scholars for the final review essay (see below). If you prefer to gain more breadth in this course, you may choose a different book for each of the two assignments. (15% of final mark.)

The **final review essay** is more than just a book review and always entails citing more readings than the central book in question. Suggested readings for research may be used to write your review essay, either as the central focus or in support of it. You can consult review essays published in a recent issue of *Contemporary Sociology* to see how this is done. If you would like to review a book that is not contained in this syllabus, this should be discussed and approved by the instructor. The **review essay** is intended for students to think through the various theoretical approaches and interpretations of your specific theme in a comparative perspective, while focusing the discussion on a single book. Please note that the "essay" part of this assignment should be taken seriously: the essay should **engage** the book under consideration and you are also encouraged to make an original argument while discussing the book's perspective by placing it in the context of its broader debate. You are welcome to focus on a single central issue of the book and support your arguments with citations or quotations from the book and other readings. Each essay must resort on at least **three** of the required and/or supplementary readings for sustained discussion (2,000-2,500 words, double-spaced, 12-point font, times roman). This is your chance to integrate your views on a central topic. (25% of the final mark.)

Submit a **printed and an electronic version** of each essay and attach a sociological-evaluation sheet to the printed version for the book review and the final review essay. The electronic version will be for my files.

**Class participation.** Seminar participation will involve the organization of discussion groups to do a textual analysis of a required readings for the day's assignments, or apply some theoretical concepts to a current-event news article, and turn in an outline at the end of class. Regular class attendance is expected of all students and is merely a precondition for **active participation** unless you have a documented emergency. Effective class participation requires that one keep up with assigned readings and lectures, and that one come prepared to speak thoughtfully about these materials. My goal in seminar discussions is to avoid the two extremes that one finds in most classes: the extroverted that are **too eager** to participate and the introverted that are **too shy** to speak their minds. In the world of work we all have to learn how to listen to others' opinions and also how to give our own, so I want this course to contribute to this learning. In order to promote equitable participation, I will bring index cards with each of the students' names. After shuffling the name cards, the student whose name is selected at random will either raise or respond a question. Two additional students will be allowed to voluntarily respond or comment on the previous intervention. Then, another name card will be drawn, and so on. It is thus essential to come to class well prepared to participate. In deference to the entire class and to avoid disruptions, it is extremely important to **arrive to class on time**. Attendance will be taken at 8:30, after breaks, and/or at 12:15. Two late arrivals count as one absence. (15%)

### **Questions for discussing films on food and agriculture**

Not all of these questions will be applicable for all of the films that we will be seeing in this class, but most will. In the cases in which the films deal with central issues that not captured by these questions, Discussion Groups are encouraged to design their own specific questions, so as to be able to extract the most substantial lessons from the films. For discussing each film, a first task for Discussion Groups is to choose which of the following questions are the most relevant to focus on. After the group discussion, the whole class will reconvene to share and discuss each group's perspective.

1. What are the main agricultural technologies that have prevailed through time?
2. What is the shape of food commodity chains depicted in the film, and what do these say about the market structure (e.g., competitive, oligopolistic, monopolistic)?
3. What are the market structure and central economic agents portrayed?
4. Who owns and controls the intellectual property of new technologies, including seeds, e.g., though patents?
5. What are the relations between government and industry, and how do they become operationalized?
6. What is the role of science and scientists in the development of food and agriculture?
7. Why is plant biological diversity important for humanity?
8. What alternatives are offered by the film to the dominant food and agricultural paradigm?

## Research Topics for Book Review and Final Review Essay

Each student should choose one of the following topics to concentrate their readings for the mid-term book review and the final review essay. Note that these are just sample research questions and you are **NOT** expected to complete each and all of the questions in each thematic group. You can choose only one or two of those questions, or elaborate your own, but make sure you get the instructor's approval for your research question in advance. It should be analytically framed and challenging enough, so you can write an interesting book review and, especially, an interesting final review essay, as per specifications above. Feel free to consult with me during my office hours to help you elaborate your individual question, depending on your specific interests on food.

*Research questions on obesity:* To what extent are overweight and obesity a matter of individual choice, so that people with these health issues have only themselves to blame for overeating? To what extent is obesity a social construction as the “otherness” of beauty? Has obesity become a new basis for social inequality in the form of “fatism”? How do individual and collective politics of “fat identity” interact with social power relations of gender/ queerness/ racialization/ culture / age /disability? To what extent is the diet based on a high energy-dense content promoted by neoliberal public policy and by the food industry? In what ways have agricultural subsidies in the United States contributed to turning corn into the favoured livestock feed, and how is this related to overweight and obesity?

Suggested readings:

- Kristian Bolin and John Cawley, eds. 2007. *The Economics of Obesity*. Oxford: JAI Press.
- Jan Wright and Valerie Harwood, eds. 2009. *Biopolitics and the 'Obesity Epidemic': Governing Bodies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Michael Gard and Jan Wright. 2005. *The Obesity Epidemic: Science, Morality and Ideology*. New York: Routledge.
- Kelly D. Brownell and Katherine Battle Horgen. 2004. *Food Fight: The Inside Story of the Food Industry, America's Obesity Crisis, and What We Can Do About it*. New York: Contemporary Books.
- Geoffrey Lawrence, Kristen Lyons, and Tabatha Wallington. 2010. *Food Security, Nutrition and Sustainability*. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Kathleen Lebesco. 2004. *Revolting Bodies: The Struggle to Redefine Fat Identity*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lee F. Monaghan. 2008. *Men and the War on Obesity: A Sociological Study*. London: Routledge.

*Research Questions on food politics:* Who are the main economic and political actors shaping food politics, and through what means? To what extent do individual consumers actually have a choice in what they eat? How do inequalities of power and lobby groups from the food industry shape public policy? What is the relationship between political projects to increase biofuel production and global hunger? How has the balance of power between state, economic and civil society actors generated the contemporary phenomenon of “land grabbing”?

Robert Paarlberg. 2010. *Food Politics: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York: Oxford

- University Press.
- Marion Nestle. 2002. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Anthony Winson. 2013. *The Industrial Diet: The Degradation of Food and the Struggle for Healthy Eating*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Mustafa Koç, Jennifer Sumner and Anthony Winson, eds. 2012. *Critical Perspectives in Food Studies*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
- Michael Moss. 2013. *Salt, Sugar, Fat: How the Food Giants Hooked Us*. New York: Random House.
- Michael Pollan. 2006. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin Press
- William D. Schanbacher. 2010. *The Politics of Food: The Global Conflict Between Food Security and Food Sovereignty*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Wenonah Hauter. 2012. *Foodopoly: The Battle over the Future of Food and Farming in America*. New York: New Press.
- Vandana Shiva. 1999. *Stolen Harvest: The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Saturnino M. Borrás Jr., Philip McMichael, and Ian Scoones. 2013. *The Politics of Biofuels, Land and Agrarian Change*. London: Routledge.

Research Questions on agricultural biotechnology and food: Who are the key economic actors proposing to solve hunger by increasing agricultural productivity, and how do they operate? What have been the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the Green Revolution and “Gene Revolution,” and how has this varied by region and culture? What are the key sociocultural narratives and discursive frames that have legitimized or challenged these proposed technological solutions to hunger? To what extent has the Green Revolution contributed to ending world hunger? What socioeconomic agents have been the main beneficiaries of the Green Revolution and biotechnology, and why?

Suggested readings:

- Jack Ralph Kloppenburg, Jr. 2004. *First the Seed: the political economy of plant biotechnology, 1492-2000*. Second Edition. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gabriela Pechlaner. 2012. *Corporate Crops: Biotechnology, Agriculture, and the Struggle for Control*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Thomas Bernauer. 2003. *Genes, Trade, and Regulation: The Seeds of Conflict in Food Biotechnology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fitting, Elizabeth. 2011. *The Struggle For Maize: Campesinos, Workers, and Transgenic Corn in The Mexican Countryside*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Research Questions on food-commodity chains: How are food chains designed to get commodities from agricultural producers, who in turn purchase agricultural inputs from large corporations, to food processors and distributors (also huge corporations)? What role have large supermarket chains played in shaping the “neoliberal diet” or “industrial diet”?

Suggested readings:

- David Bursch and Geoffrey Lawrence. 2007. *Supermarkets and Agri-Food Supply Chains: Transformations in the Production and Consumption of Foods*. Cheltenham, UK; and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Warren Belasco and Roger Horowitz, eds. 2009. *Food Chains: From Farmland to Shopping Cart*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Corinna Hawkes, et al., eds. 2010. *Trade, Food, Diet and Health: Perspectives and Policy Options*. Chichester, UK; and Ames, IA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Supermarkets and the Meat Supply Chain: The Economic Impact of Food Retail on Farmers, Processors and Consumers*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Deborah Barndt. 2008. *Tangled Routes: Women, Work, and Globalization on the Tomato Trail*. Second Edition. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Deborah Valenze. 2011. *Milk: A Local and Global History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Melanie DuPuis. 2002. *Nature's Perfect Food: How Milk Became America's Drink*. New York: New York University Press.

*Research Questions on Alternative Food Movements:* Can the dominant food regime be challenged in the market, the state, or in production? How effectively have contemporary grassroots food movements and models of alternative food supply chains (e.g. freeganism, Community-Supported Agriculture, Farm-to-School programs) addressed issues of food politics and hunger? To what extent have dominant agents in the food system co-opted countercultural and alternative food movements? How do the goals of alternative food movements conflict or coincide with those of other social movements, such as Indigenous, labour, environmental, or racial justice movements? Does fair trade make a difference for producers or consumers in challenging the dominant food paradigm? How have Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) from advanced capitalist countries interacted with food and agricultural communities in developing countries? What are the prospects for the food sovereignty movement to reconnect producers and consumers, humans and nature?

- Julie Guthman. 2004. *Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Warren J. Belasco. 2007. *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry*. Second Updated Edition. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- David Goodman, E. Melanie DuPuis, and Michael K. Goodman. 2012. *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice, and Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi. 2013. *Hungry for Change: Farmers, Food Justice and the Agrarian Question*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Daniel Jaffe. 2007. *Brewing Justice: Fair Trade Coffee, Sustainability, and Survival*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fridell, Gavin. 2007. *Fair Trade Coffee: The Prospects and Pitfalls of Market-Driven Social Justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Henry J. Frundt. 2009. *Fair Bananas: Farmers, Workers, and Consumers Strive to Change an Industry*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Laura T. Raynolds, Douglas Murray, and John Wilkinson. 2007. *Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Wittman, Hannah, Annette Aurélie Desmarais, and Nettie Wiebe, eds. 2010. *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

- Eric Holt-Giménez, ed. 2011. *Food Movements Unite! Strategies to Transform our Food Systems*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.
- Annette Aurélie Desmarais. 2007. *La Via Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.
- Mark Winne. 2008. *Closing the Food Gap: Resetting the Table in the Land of Plenty*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Joseé Johnston and Shyon Baumann. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Patricia Allen. 2004. *Together at the Table: Sustainability and Sustainance in the American Agrifood System*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Vandana Shiva. 2008. *Soil Not Oil: Environmental Justice in a Time of Climate Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Raj Patel. 2012. *Stuffed and Starved: The Hidden Battle for the World Food System* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). New York: Melville House.
- Silvia Giagnoni. 2011. *Fields of Resistance: The Struggle of Florida's Farmworkers for Justice*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Seth Holmes. 2013. *Fresh Fruit, Broken Bodies: Migrant Farmworkers in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

## Percentage-Letter Grade Equivalence:

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology has the following percentage equivalences:

Excellent:		
A+	=	96-100%
A	=	90-95
A-	=	85-89
Good:		
B+	=	80-84
B	=	75-79
B-	=	70-74
Satisfactory		
C+	=	65-69
C	=	60-64
C-	=	55-59
D	=	50-54
Unsatisfactory		
F	=	0-49

**LATE ASSIGNMENTS:** Deadlines are firm and late assignments will receive a grade of zero (0). Extensions may be granted in the direst of circumstances provided (1) you contact me in person, by phone, or email 24 hours prior to the deadline; and (2) have appropriate documentation to back up your request. Please note: the direst of circumstances include illness, death, or some other equally significant event. Technical difficulties associated with computers (not being able to print a document, a crashing computer, whatever) or scheduling (the number of papers or exams you have due during a given period or work commitments or family commitments like weddings, trips, or birthdays) do not constitute the direst of circumstances.

## Tentative Course Schedule

### Week 1 (Sept. 3): Introduction.

Required readings:

- *Food and Society*, start reading.

Film: The Future of Food (2004, 88 min.)

### Week 2 (Sept. 10): Sociological Perspectives in the Study of Food

Required readings:

- *Food and Society*, Chs. 1-5

Film: We Feed the World (2009, 96 min.)

### Week 3: (Sept. 17): Food Industrialization and Globalization

Required readings:

- *Food and Society*, Chs. 6-9

Film: Forks over Knives (2011, 60 of 96 min.)

### Week 4 (Sept. 24): Are Overweight and Obesity a Problem? I

Required readings:

- *The World Is Fat*, read first half.
- Film: *The weight of the world: facing obesity* (2003, 51 min.)

**Week 5 (Oct. 1): Are Overweight and Obesity a Problem? II**

Required readings:

- *The World Is Fat*, read second half.
- Film: *Big Sugar* (2006, 60 min. portion of 120 min. film).

**Week 6 (Oct. 8): Obesity: Construction or Reality? I**

Required Readings: From Gerth and Mills. *From Max Weber*.

- *Weighing In*, read first half.
- Film: *Food War* (2008, 52 min.)

**Week 7 (Oct. 15): Obesity: Construction or Reality? II**

- *Weighing In*, read second half.
- Film: *Food Matters: You Are What You Eat*. (2008, 80 min.)

MID-TERM BOOK REVIEW DUE NEXT WEEK: OCTOBER 22

**Week 8 (Oct. 22): Green Revolution and Agricultural Biotechnology I**

Required Readings:

- *Food for the Few*, read Chs. 1-3 and one chapter from 4-7
- Film: *The Contract* (2003, 51 min.)

**Week 9 (Oct. 29): Green Revolution and Agricultural Biotechnology II**

Required Readings:

- *Food for the Few*, read any four chapters from 8-12, including the conclusion.
- Film: *Deconstructing Supper* (2002, 47 min.)

**Week 10 (Nov. 5): Following the Chicken Trail, I**

Required Readings:

- *The Chicken Trail*, Preface and Chs. 1-5
- Film: *Food, Inc.* (2009, fragments of 94 min.)

**Week 11 (Nov. 12): Following the Chicken Trail, II**

Required Readings:

- *The Chicken Trail*, Preface and Chs. 6-9
- Film: *The Biofuel Myth* (2009, 44 min. stream)

**Week 12 (Nov. 19): Class Presentations, I** (Dates assigned at random for weeks 12 and 13 according to the ending of your student i.d., as with the discussion papers and responses. Students are allowed to swap dates, but please let me know so we have a clear list of presenters well ahead of time.)

**Week 13 (Nov. 26): Class Presentations, II**

FINAL REVIEW ESSAY DUE THIS WEEK: NOVEMBER 29 at 3:30 in SA main office for time stamp.

**Sociological Essay Evaluation (for Book Review and Final Review Essays)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_.

Essay grade: \_\_\_\_\_.

Analysis and Criticism:

POOR		EXCELLENT			
1	2	3	4	5	Follows the directions of the assignment (e.g., answers questions sufficiently).
1	2	3	4	5	Clearly defined agenda to demonstrate the thesis or hypothesis.
1	2	3	4	5	Coherence of explanation. Clear statements. Succinct.
1	2	3	4	5	Key terms and concepts are defined and explained.
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific <u>cites</u> to bibliographic sources.
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific <u>quotes</u> from bibliographic sources.
1	2	3	4	5	Creative use of insights from lecture and class discussion.
1	2	3	4	5	Various parts and paragraphs of paper well structured and interconnected.
1	2	3	4	5	Depth of coverage of existing literature and original works.
1	2	3	4	5	Analyzes literature beyond summarizing.

Technical presentation:

X denotes that attention should be paid to this problem.

XX denotes that extra attention is warranted.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Late paper (one letter grade is deducted for each day the paper is late).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Paper format: pages numbered in top right hand corner, one-inch margins, double-spaced.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Appropriate citation format not followed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Text is too long.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Text is too short.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Redundancy (wordy; can be trimmed without loss of meaning).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some statements are unsupported (e.g., undeveloped and/or vague statements).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Insufficient coverage of existing literature.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Insufficient depth of coverage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Typographic errors, misspelled words, punctuation errors.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Incomplete sentences, awkward sentence structure.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some paragraphs are too long.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some paragraphs are too short.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Major? \_\_\_\_\_ Year/Class \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Other courses taken this semester (names, not numbers):

Home town and/or country? \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you studied at Simon Fraser University? \_\_\_\_\_ If you come from another college or university, please name: \_\_\_\_\_

Why are you interested in this course? (check one:)

- It is required
- Interested in subject
- Fit my timetable
- Looked easy
- Other   Specify \_\_\_\_\_.

Please name two to three courses taken at Simon Fraser University or other universities or colleges that have influenced your thinking the most. Write course names, not numbers.

The **body mass index** (BMI) is defined as an individual's body mass divided by the square of her/his height - with the value given in units of kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Anyone with a BMI above 25 is considered overweight while obesity is above 30. In your estimation, what is the percentage of SFU students that are “underweight,” i.e. a BMI under 18.5 \_\_\_\_; “optimal weight”, i.e., a BMI between 18.5 and 25 \_\_\_\_; “overweight,” 25-29 \_\_\_\_; or “obese,” i.e., a BMI above 30 \_\_\_\_?

What are your current definitions of food and junk food, respectively? (2-3 sentences)