

**Cultivating Local Food:  
Knowledge, Power, and (Trans)Formations in American Policy and Society**

**By**

**Erica Cecily Morrell**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Public Policy and Sociology)  
in the University of Michigan  
2016**

**Doctoral Committee:**

**Associate Professor Shobita Parthasarathy, Co-Chair  
Assistant Professor Sandra R. Levitsky, Co-Chair  
Assistant Professor Rachel K. Best  
Assistant Professor Sara B. Soderstrom**

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to the incredible advisors I have had the privilege of learning from and working with throughout my dissertation and broader graduate school career, especially Shobita Parthasarathy and Sandra Levitsky.

Thank you also to my other two helpful dissertation committee members, Sara Soderstrom and Rachel Best.

I have such gratitude towards my broader community of support within and outside of academia, particularly my wonderful and steadfast husband, Tom Morrell, mother, Zsuzsa Blom, and my supportive sister, joyous daughter, and other family, friends, and colleagues.

Most importantly, I have to thank the dozens upon dozens of people who allowed me to interview them for this study, who assisted me at archives, and who otherwise helped support my data collection; without you, none of this would exist.

Thank you for sharing your time, your candor, and your knowledge.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Local Civic Epistemology and the Politics of Food: ..... Subnational Knowledge Production and American Science and Technology Policy</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Constructing Experience: ..... Boundary-work and the Politics of Expertise in Detroit’s Food System</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Direct and Indirect Policy Feedback Effects..... and the Transformation of Local Food Movement Participants in Two American Cities</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>95</b>

## **Abstract**

This dissertation compares the politics of food (re)localization—the (re)making of food systems decision-making among municipal actors—in Cleveland and Detroit, USA. The data for this dissertation is qualitative and includes hundreds of primary source documents, over forty-eight hours of observation, and over seventy-two in-depth interviews. Three particular areas are ultimately addressed through this data’s analysis: (1) what local food policy looks like between places, including the actors, forms of knowledge, standards of evidence, and levels of transparency favored in governance; (2) how actors variously engage in strategic knowledge production to become authorities in each city’s local food system and food policy; and, (3) how the rise of local food governance is creating direct and indirect policy feedback effects that are together variously (re)making social understandings and action by place. In evaluating these dynamics, this dissertation comes to argue that local ways of knowing differ from each other and the national context within which they are situated; that boundary-work among and between different experiential experts helps to construct these different ways of knowing by place; and that local battles over knowledge production have significant consequences not only for governance but also society at large. This dissertation thus builds on and contributes to scholarly and practitioner notions spanning social movements, sociology of knowledge and expertise, policy studies, and food studies.

## Introduction

Alternative food efforts, including “local”, “slow”, “organic”, and “fair” food initiatives, are accelerating across the United States and much of the globe. These efforts generally attempt to move away from dominant industrialized, corporatized, and nationalized approaches to managing, producing, delivering, and consuming food. In so doing, involved actors hope to better (re)instate into food systems values around health, the environment, and social equity (e.g. Cockrall-King 2012). In recent years, for instance, popular media has frequently featured spokespeople lauding organic, local, and sustainable food systems as especially beneficial for people and the environment. Farmers’ markets and cottage food businesses are rapidly rising, promising to get higher quality ingredients to consumers than when major distributors are involved. First Lady Michelle Obama began gardening on the White House lawn for the first time since World War Two and, with this, contributed to a growing interest in (re)gaining control over foods’ production towards battling unhealthy food systems trends. Meanwhile, all over the world, activists are fighting against genetically modified foods, seed privatization, and chemical uses in agriculture while simultaneously promoting smaller-scale food operations void of these practices, which they argue are subsequently safer and more ethical.

Many claim that often marginalized groups, interests, and forms of knowledge and expertise will have a larger role in the food system via the alternative food trends now characterizing much of the U.S. and other parts of the world. For example, actors involved in alternative food efforts tend to argue that through such undertakings small and indigenous farmers will have the land and support they need to thrive; inner-city communities will have enhanced access to and control over fresh, healthy produce; and consumers of all kinds will experience an improved say in the food policies and programs deeply shaping their everyday experiences.

Can such alternatives truly be?

While efforts to foster alternative food’s inclusivity and broad benefits are coming from multiple different sectors (e.g. grassroots, government, and industry), there are also concerns that

these efforts and the system(s) they (re)create are in fact elitist and marginalizing. There are critiques, for instance, that white, middle-class Americans are leading the alternative food movement in the U.S. to “save”, in a “missionary-like fashion”, lower-income people of color from food systems ills while leaving these minorities, and the distinct knowledge they hold in light of their social, cultural, and economic position, to nonetheless lack meaningful agency in alternative foods’ developments (Yakini 1/22/2014). Many also raise worry that as alternative food efforts gain momentum, dominant structures of power in the food system—including those based in corporate consolidation and national regulation—are again taking over, in turn prohibiting the bulk of citizens and their values and expertise from shaping any lasting food systems (re)development (e.g. Obach 2007). Consequently, questions about how ‘alternative’ alternative food really is in terms of who gets to participate, how, why, and with what impact at times cast a dark shadow on the abovementioned trends.

In this dissertation, I evaluate the politics of alternative food via an analysis of food (re)localization—the (re)making of food systems decision-making among municipal actors—through a focus on Cleveland and Detroit, USA. What actors and whose knowledge are driving food (re)localization in Cleveland and Detroit? Are these dynamics replicating or remaking dominant structures and cultures of power and inclusion? Why do certain groups, interests, and forms of expertise come to shape local food policy, or not? How is food (re)localization impacting future policymaking? Social order? Food, itself?

## **Research Design**

### ***- Why Food?***

In many ways, food, and local food specifically, is an intriguing research focus on its own, but it is also an ideal means to address theoretical questions spanning the fields of social movements, science and technology studies, and political sociology, more generally. Indeed, food is a particularly interesting and fruitful arena to illuminate if and how various groups clash and collaborate toward shaping social and political change and to what effect. This is in part because the technologies and social norms around food and food management are rapidly changing and highly complex, often requiring diverse groups and perspectives to engage more deeply in food systems’ development than at any other time and unlike many other issue areas. Additionally, food is a basic, centuries-old component of the human experience. That all people

have a stake in battles over its management renders food an especially contentious issue among society and also an integral component of social order, more generally. Additionally, examining the politics of *local* food and its governance is especially intriguing because (re)localization is rapidly expanding across the U.S. (along with much of North America and the globe) around not only food but also fracking, abortion, minimum wage, climate change, transgender bathroom use, and gun control, among other issues. Nonetheless, neither (re)localization, the policy structures and cultures emerging around it, nor its broader implications are widely studied. Consequently, evaluating local food offers an opportunity to clarify the nature and impact of shifting policymaking dynamics and contribute to scholarship and practitioner approaches concerned with these issues.

- ***Why Cleveland and Detroit?***

This research is constituted primarily of a qualitative, comparative analysis of food (re)localization in Cleveland and Detroit. A successful comparison allows for enough variables to be held constant so that interesting points of similarity, difference, and possible causality can be homed in on and thoroughly explained (Paige 1999; Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003). I thus chose Cleveland and Detroit because they are similar in many ways yet differ along their very dimensions I wished to explore further through my study. For example, the two cities are alike in their geographic location in the Midwest, have high levels of minority and low-income residents, are both classified as shrinking, Rustbelt urban centers, have faced severe economic and social decline in recent decades, and are now experiencing a similar rise in food (re)localization as various actors aim to use food as a tool for remaking their cities, more generally. Nonetheless, food (re)localization appears to be developing quite differently in the two places. Even before undertaking my data collection, I noticed, for example, more overt racial justice tones in the media stories coming out of Detroit about food than in Cleveland. I also heard about major food and sustainability initiatives launching in Cleveland, yet a focus on the environment seemed absent from what I knew about Detroit's food system. Additionally, I noted clear differences in the two cities' approach to governing food, such as that non-governmental actors initiated Cleveland's food policy coalition to guide decision-making there but, within the same year, it was officials who launched Detroit's.

## **Data**

The data informing this dissertation are qualitative, including primary source documents, observation, and in-depth interviews in both Cleveland and Detroit (and occasionally, as relevant, nationally).

### **- *Primary Sources***

Primary source documents used to inform this study were collected as they relate to local food and food policy in Cleveland and Detroit particularly from 1998, the earliest time at which contemporary activity around city food production appears to have emerged, to the present. Initially, the bulk of documents included media articles and non-governmental paraphernalia (e.g. flyers, pamphlets, websites), which were obtained through Internet searches using the terms: “local food Cleveland”, “local food Detroit”, “food policy Cleveland”, and “food policy Detroit”. More documents were then obtained during observations (e.g. informational packets given away at a city’s food summit) and from interviewees themselves. Official documents, including policies, government transcripts, and legislative reports, were gathered from the Cleveland City Council Archives, the Detroit City Clerk's Archives and Records Management Division, and from the online archives of both the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition and the Detroit Food Policy Council. Ultimately, primary sources fall into three main categories:

- **Media Articles**—includes feature articles, opinion pieces, video broadcasts, and blogs found through the abovementioned search terms and spanning several news outlets (including local mainstream media, local independent media, and national media).
- **Non-Governmental Documents**—includes websites, informational packets, advertisements, annual reports, press releases, data analyses, and more from nonprofits, for-profit enterprises, foundations, and banks as relevant to Cleveland and Detroit’s food systems and sourced largely through the abovementioned search terms. Some flyers and pamphlets were obtained at observations and from interviewees. Additional, often confidential, documents (such as survey results from food summits and various organizations’ strategic planning sessions) were also obtained from interviewees by request.
- **Official Records**—includes archival documents such as past city council meeting transcripts, planning commission letters and reports, draft and final legislation; also



includes documents from the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition and Detroit Food Policy Council's archives, such as reports, meeting minutes, and planning agendas.

- ***Observation***

Whenever possible, I attended and observed city hearings on food policy and food systems events in Cleveland and Detroit. In Cleveland, for example, I attended a Cleveland Food Policy Coalition quarterly meeting and the opening of the Terrence M. Ryan Agricultural Education Center at Stanard Farm. In Detroit, I attended a public hearing on the Hantz Farm land sale, a Detroit City Council meeting on the city's proposed urban agriculture ordinance, and multiple Detroit Food Summits, for instance. In both cities I visited and was given tours of their large markets (Westside Market, in Cleveland, Eastern Market, in Detroit), several urban farms (e.g. Ohio City Farm, Hough Vineyards, Rid-All Green Partnership, Earthworks Urban Farm, Michigan Urban Farming Initiative), and other spaces linked to each city's local food system (e.g. community kitchens, K-12 food programs, local eateries). At all the events I attended I took notes on what I witnessed, with a particular focus on the individuals and groups who were present, the main food issues highlighted/discussed, how various actors participated, how people defined and advocated for their views on food and food policy, and if and how individuals and groups confronted, addressed, and/or variously engaged perspectives alternative to their own.

- ***Interviews***

I completed over 72 in-depth interviews with food systems actors representing structured categories pertinent to Cleveland and Detroit's food system (about half of these interviewees were drawn from each city). From my initial document analysis and observation, I began to build an overview of the main players in each city's local food system. This included locating policymakers involved in local food policy, food entrepreneurs, urban farmers, food systems non-profits, and banks and foundations providing resources to local food initiatives, for instance. Out of this, I identified and interviewed initially about forty-five individuals. As I conducted these interviews, continued content analysis and observations, I identified and interviewed about twenty additional actors in the two cities. Finally, I used my two cases against one another to help identify potentially overlooked interviewees in one context or the other and locate any other gaps; from this, I identified and interviewed a handful of additional actors in Cleveland and

Detroit as well as a couple outside of but relevant to each. While some actors might still be overlooked in this mode of identifying interviewees, that is likely reflective of the dynamics of power and inclusion in each city's food system; this approach thus contributed to my analysis in part by helping to highlight who was systematically excluded from food systems influence in each place so that I could then home in on why. Ultimately, interviewees included:

- Representatives from government (e.g. municipal agencies): around 5 in each city
- Representatives from large food institutions (e.g. school systems, hospitals): around 3 in Cleveland, 6 in Detroit
- Grassroots community members and groups (e.g. garden clubs and neighborhood food justice coalitions): around 7 in Cleveland, 10 in Detroit
- Representatives from for-profit food ventures (e.g. restaurants and cottage businesses): around 5 in each city
- Representatives from food nonprofits (e.g. greening efforts, job-training programs, educational initiatives): around 20 in each city
- Funders (e.g. banks, private foundations): around 6 in Cleveland, 3 in Detroit

\*\*total interviewees as categorized here exceed 72 due to cross-affiliations

All interviewees were asked the same set of open-ended questions spanning five themes: (1) the interviewee's background, involvement, and perceived role in the local food system; (2) the interviewee's main motivations, goals, and challenges in this involvement and perceived role; (3) the interviewee's strategies and approach to achieving their stated goals and addressing expressed challenges; (4) the interviewee's views on other individuals and groups' participation and engagement in the local food system; (5) any additional comments from the interviewee about local food and/or local food policy. Interviews lasted between thirty-five minutes and two and a half hours. The majority of interviews were recorded (at the interviewee's consent) and later transcribed. About eighty percent of interviews were conducted in-person, another twenty percent via phone. I hired a professional transcriber to assist in transcribing about sixty percent of the interviews.

### **Coding and Analysis**

I coded documents, observation notes, and interview transcripts, tagging instances when, for example, moments of controversy occurred (including who and what issues were involved,

how a resolution was attempted or reached), beliefs about what food is and should be, references to the knowledge and authority various actors trust in others and/or believe they themselves hold, and the types of evidence (data, narratives, etc.) used to support various food systems initiatives, debates, and policymaking. Out of this, repeated ideas, concepts, and themes were drawn out, categorized, and together have come to inform the basis of evidence used to support the findings in this dissertation.

### **Theoretical Approach and Organization of Chapters**

#### ***- Chapter 1: What does local food policy look like?***

As new policy arenas are conceived of, constructed, and established, multiple actors compete, collaborate, and negotiate to determine what these arenas should achieve and how—including vis-à-vis food policy, itself (1). Ultimately, though, only certain actors, interests, and forms of knowledge gain standing. Several studies explore these battles and their outcomes particularly in the national context (e.g. Arnason and Simpson 2003; Daemmrich 2004; Jasanoff 2011). This work often demonstrates that out of such struggles and regardless of issue area there are somewhat entrenched, enduring, and stable features of political decision-making that seem to dominate policy consistently by place.

In the American context, scholars demonstrate that the consistent features characterizing national governance tend to generally be technocratic, with scientific and technical experts and expertise privileged throughout (often at the expense of ‘lay’, experiential, and indigenous forms of knowledge and knowledge-holders) (Jasanoff 1990; Wynne 2002). Moreover, associated literatures indicate that such technocratic dynamics might only become more powerful and entrenched over time (e.g. Baum and Lant 2003; Meyer *et al* 1997), since the American approach to dealing with social problems and their solutions seems largely incapable of making sense of issue areas beyond distinct and rigid scientific and technical terms (e.g. Kysar 2010; Nowotny, Scott, and Gibbons 2001; Rayner 2003; Ottinger 2009). The strength of the technocratic American decision-making approach suggests that local level policymaking—including that concerned with food in Cleveland and Detroit—may too be characterized by a favoring of scientific and technical elites and input (e.g. see the literature on institutional change, including DiMaggio and Powell 1983).

Despite the potential for the homogenization of governance approaches, existing scholarship also acknowledges that policymaking is constantly open to public debate and outside challenges. This complicates the potential for similarity between food policy in places like Cleveland and Detroit as they are situated within the same technocratic national context. In fact, in the U.S. historically excluded epistemic communities are employing diverse strategies—at both the local and federal level—that work against dominant dynamics of power to achieve a different quality of democratic participation than has traditionally been witnessed (e.g. Beckert 2010; Bocking 2004; Brown 2009; Brown *et al* 2004; Epstein 1996; Ottinger and Cohen 2011; Parthasarathy 2010; Pralle 2006). These studies suggest that intellectual dynamics in Cleveland and Detroit’s food policy might in fact be more complex and varied than at first glance.

The varied research on policy development leaves unclear what actors and whose expertise are favored in political decision-making, including as it relates to Cleveland and Detroit’s food systems. Are dynamics of knowledge and inclusion in food policymaking similar across these cities and the national context within which they are situated, or not? Why, and with what implications?

Chapter 1 of this dissertation takes up answering these questions through a comparative analysis of what Sheila Jasanoff (2005) terms “civic epistemology.” Civic epistemology refers to the cultures and social and institutional practices that shape both what kinds of knowledge count in policy processes and how this knowledge is evaluated. Civic epistemologies are coupled with political culture, emerging from and helping to constitute a given groups’ political attitudes and practices. Because civic epistemologies are so deeply rooted, studying them is particularly useful to make sense of the entrenched, enduring, and relatively stable features of knowledge and power that characterize a bounded political domain—including not only at the national level but, I argue, at the local level, as well (2).

- ***Chapter 2: Why and how is local food policy emerging?***

The dynamics of expertise and influence that come to characterize a given political domain—including food policy in Cleveland and Detroit—emerge from social processes around which substantial social science scholarship is concerned. Part of this research includes a focus on the active knowledge construction in which various actors engage to establish their and their perspectives’ authority in decision-making. The theoretical concept of and framework associated

with “boundary-work” helps capture this, connoting the ideological activities individuals and groups participate in to demarcate certain intellectual dynamics as particularly credible and relevant over others (e.g. Gieryn 1983). Boundary-work recognizes that an individual and/or groups’ knowledge is itself a critical resource that can be beneficial or limiting in effecting policy depending on how one strategically develops this knowledge within the broader socio-cultural and political milieu (e.g. Morrell 2015).

Currently, the bulk of boundary research occurs in the context of science, exposing, one, how various scientific elites work to establish and maintain their cultural, moral, and institutionalized power by appealing to science’s objectivity and truthfulness and, two, how outsiders variously challenge this (e.g. Gieryn 1999; see also, Allen 2004; Brown *et al* 2004; Epstein 1996; Guston 2001; Huitema and Turnhout 2009). This work demonstrates that out of various meaning-making attempts, the authority of science and scientific experts and expertise tends to prevail. This appears true even in the case of direct challenges to science’s dominance. Ottinger (2013), for example, shows that residents in a Louisiana town at first challenged industry scientists in belief that their own experiences were more valid to establishing the health effects of a local oil refinery; over time, however, refinery scientists and engineers’ strategic boundary-work compelled these citizen-activists to move away from challenging these experts to accepting their and their science’s overall authority. Corburn (2005) similarly shows that even as local residents asserted their first-hand experience in working with various scientists to address environmental health problems, the “street science” they together produced in fact served to (re)inforce the epistemological authority of science and not that of experience.

Knowledge dynamics especially in Detroit’s food system seem to defy the patterns of epistemological authority scholars frequently note, however. Here, intellectual actors whose authority is based in what I term “embedded experiential expertise” successfully established their and their respective knowledge’s power to shape food and food policy over the other, more technical, knowledge forms that originally held dominance. Experience is now the favored epistemological force guiding Detroit’s food system, including its policymaking. For example, members of Detroit’s food policy council are chosen in part for their expertise as based in experiences living in Detroit and representing “the ethnic/cultural, economic, generational, and gender diversity of the city’s residents” (City of Detroit 2008) and its Food Security Policy and Urban Agriculture Ordinance were both written with substantial community input in recognition

that policy elites whose knowledge is based in qualified training do not “quite yet understand the complexity of what’s going on in the food system...they don’t know. People in the community doing this [(re)localization] work, they tell that story [based on their first-hand experience]” (Underwood 9/20/2013).

How did the power of experience, experiential experts, and experiential expertise in Detroit’s food system come to be? In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, I take up answering this question through an analysis of boundary-work in Detroit’s food system; this examination offers new ways of thinking about knowledge production and the maintenance of meaning by focusing on these dynamics when experience, not science, is the epistemological authority.

- ***Chapter 3: What are the implications of rising local food policy?***

The local food movement tends to be decentralized with most involved actors engaging in independent activities that similarly promote (re)localization but for different economic, environmental, and/or social reasons (e.g. Starr 2010). Initially, this was true of Cleveland and Detroit’s food movement. Involved actors in both places engaged in disparate for- and nonprofit enterprises, for instance, with diverse aims including fostering jobs, enhancing ecological sustainability, and achieving racial equity. Over time, however, movement participants in Cleveland and Detroit generally aligned their goals around sustainable economic growth and social justice, respectfully. Given the dispersed nature of both cities’ original local food movement and the social, economic, and historic similarities between Cleveland and Detroit, more generally, what accounts for this difference?

The complex ways in which certain knowledge dynamics have become stable vis-à-vis food in Cleveland and Detroit are intertwined with core elements that stabilize society—such as identities, institutions, and representations (a notion Shapin and Schaffer 1985, for instance, identified decades ago in relation to debates about science and scientific experimentation). Scholarship which takes this position would encourage the establishment of local food policy (as I examine in chapters 1 and 2) to be regarded not as an end point for analysis but rather part of an ongoing process in which knowledge, policy, and social order are constantly made and (re)made alongside one another (e.g. Jasanoff 2005). From this perspective, food movement participants engaging in boundary-work as examined in chapter 2, for example, may not only shape food policy but also be *shaped* by this policy; indeed, food policy itself may wield influence on these

activists' very strategies and goals by place and over time (e.g. McAdam 1982; 1995; Mettler and Soss 2004; Mooney and Hunt 1996). Chapter 3 takes this notion as its starting point, examining local food policy as a potential source of explanation for how and why food movement participants in Cleveland and Detroit came to align their understandings of and responses to food systems problems similarly within their respective cities but quite distinctly between the two.

### **Outline of the Dissertation**

Chapters 1, 2, and 3 follow this introduction. After all chapters are presented, I conclude the dissertation by reviewing some of the key findings of this research and the project's broader contributions. I also consider avenues for future research that will strengthen this study and maximize its scholarly and practitioner merit.

### **Notes**

1. Research spanning the fields of sociology, science and technology studies, and political science offers insights into what a bounded governance domain concerning issues related to the management, production, distribution and/or consumption of food—what I term “food policy”—consists of. This variously includes: (1) *bureaucratic forms*, such as municipal planning commissions; (2) *actors*, including lawmakers, (3) *decision-making structures*, for instance food policy councils, (4) *policies and programs*, like urban agriculture ordinances and local food grant funding initiatives, and a (5) *cultural base*, comprised of specific accepted discourses, rhetorics, and norms that help guide what conditions are understood as problems, why certain solutions are pursued over other, and the individuals, groups, and forms of knowledge and expertise considered legitimate to shaping political determinations (e.g. Andrews and Edwards 2004; Burstein 1991; Freeman 1985).
2. Emerging scholarship shows that political culture varies by locality (e.g. DeLeon and Naff 2004; Oliver 2001; 2012; Sharp 1999), yet neither Jasanoff nor similarly oriented scholars have examined what institutionalized knowledge-ways might look like at the local level.

## Works Cited

- Alkon, Alison Hope and Julian Agyeman. 2011. *Cultivating Food Justice: Race, Class, and Sustainability*. MIT Press.
- Allen, Barbara L. 2004. "Shifting Boundary Work: Issues and Tensions in Environmental Health Science in the Case of Grand Bois, Louisiana." *Science as Culture*. 13(4): 429-48.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. and Bob Edwards. 2004. "Advocacy Organizations in the U.S. Political Process." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 40: 479-506.
- Arnason, Arnar, and Bob Simpson. 2003. "Refractions through culture: the new genomics in Iceland." *Ethnos*. 68(4): 533-53.
- Baum, Joel A. C., and Theresa K. Lant. 2003. "Hits and Misses: Managers' (Mis)categorization of Competitors in the Manhattan Hotel Industry." Pp. 118-55 in *Geography and Strategy: Advances in Strategic Management*, eds J. A. C. Baum and O. Sorenson. JAI Press/Elsevier.
- Beckert, Jens. 2010. "Institutional Isomorphism Revisited: Convergence and Divergence in Institutional Change." *Sociological Theory*. 28(2): 150-66.
- Bocking, Stephen. 2004. *Nature's Experts: Science, Politics, and the Environment*. Rutgers University Press.
- Brown, Mark. 2009. *Science in Democracy: Expertise, Institutions, and Representation*. MIT Press.
- Brown, Phil, Stephen Zavestoski, Sabrina McCormick, Brian Mayer, Rachel Morello-Frosch and Rebecca Gasior Altman. 2004. "Embodied health movements: new approaches to social movements in health." *Sociology of Health & Illness*. 26(1): 50-80
- Burstein, Paul. 1991. "Policy Domains: Organization, Culture and Policy Outcomes." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 17(3): 327-50.
- Cockrall-King, Jennifer. 2012. *Food and the City: Urban Agriculture and the New Food Revolution*. Prometheus Books.
- Daemmrich, Arthur A. 2004. *Pharmacopolitics: Drug Regulation in the United States and Germany*. University of North Carolina Press.
- DeLeon, Richard and Katherine Naff. 2004. "Identity Politics and Local Political Culture: Some Comparative Results from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey." *Urban Affairs Review*. 39(6): 689-719.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. (1983). "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*. 48: 147-60.
- Epstein, Steven. 1996. *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gieryn, Thomas. 1983. "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review*. 48(6): 781-95.
- Gieryn, Thomas. 1999. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gottweis, Herbert. 1998. *Governing Molecules: The Discursive Politics of Genetic Engineering in Europe and the United States*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Guston, David H. 2001. "Boundary Organizations in Environmental Policy and Science: An Introduction." *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 26(4): 399-408.
- Huitema, Dave and Esther Turnhout. 2009. "Working at the science-policy interface: a



- discursive analysis of boundary work at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency.” *Environmental Politics*. 18(4): 576-594.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 1990. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2005. *Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2011. “Cosmopolitan Knowledge: Climate Science and Global Civic Epistemology.” Pp. 129-143. in J. S. Dryzek, R. B. Norgaard, and D. Schlosberg, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Kysar, Douglas. 2010. *Regulating from Nowhere: Environmental Law and the Search for Objectivity*. Yale University Press.
- Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1996. “Political Opportunities: Conceptual Origins, Current Problems, and Future Directions.” Pp 23-40 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movement: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. “World Society and the Nation-State.” *American Journal of Sociology*. 103: 144–81.
- Morrell, Erica. 2015. “Unpacking Frame Resonance: Professional and Experiential Expertise in Intellectual Property Rights Contention.” *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*. 20(3): 361-78.
- Nowotny, Helga, Peter Scott, and Michael Gibbons. 2001. *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Polity Press.
- Oliver, Eric. 2001. *Democracy in Suburbia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Oliver, Eric. 2012. *Local Elections and the Politics of Small Scale Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ottinger, Gwen. 2009. “Buckets of resistance standards and the effectiveness of citizen science.” *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 35(2): 244-70.
- Ottinger, Gwen, and Benjamin Cohen. 2011. *Technoscience and Environmental Justice: Expert Cultures in a Grassroots Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Parthasarathy, Shobita. 2010. “Breaking the Expertise Barrier: Understanding Activist Strategies in Science and Technology Policy Domains.” *Science and Public Policy*. 37(5): 355-67.
- Paige, Jeffery. 1999. “Conjuncture, Comparison, and Conditional Theory in Macrosocial Inquiry.” *American Journal of Sociology*. 105(3): 781-800.
- Pralle, Sarah B. 2006. *Branching Out, Digging In: Environmental Advocacy and Agenda Setting*. Georgetown University Press.
- Rayner, Steve. 2003. “Democracy in the age of assessment: reflections on the roles of expertise and democracy in public-sector decision making.” *Science and Public Policy*. 30(3): 163-70.
- Shapin, Steven and Simon Schaffer. 1985. *Leviathan and the Air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Princeton University Press.
- Sharp, Elaine. 1999. *Culture wars and local politics*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Starr, Amory. 2010. “Local Food: A Social Movement?” *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical*

*Methodologies.*

Underwood, Kathryn. 9/20/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.

Wynne, Brian. 2002. "Risk and Environment as Legitimatory Discourses of Technology: Reflexivity Inside Out?" *Current Sociology*. 50(3): 459–77.

Yakini, Malik. 1/22/2014. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.

## Chapter 1

### **Local Civic Epistemology and the Politics of Food: Subnational Knowledge Production and American Science and Technology Policy**

#### **Abstract**

Scholars acknowledge that there are entrenched, enduring, and stable intellectual dynamics which shape both what kinds of knowledge count in policy processes and how this knowledge is evaluated by place. But as policy (re)localization rises around issues as varied as food, climate, and energy, these “civic epistemologies” are scarcely explored in the local context. This paper begins to address this gap through a comparison of the knowledge-ways in food governance between two American cities, Cleveland and Detroit, and in consideration of the national context within which they are situated. Disparate types of experts, standards of evidence, and levels of transparency are shown to characterize decision-making in each place, which indicates that local civic epistemologies do in fact exist. These epistemologies are explained to have the potential to remake governance, social order, and technology both locally and between different levels of government. Greater scholarly attention to knowledge in local science and technology policy is consequently called for going forward.

#### **Keywords**

Civic epistemology, Governance, Local, Food, Cleveland, Detroit

#### **Introduction**

We now know much about how standards of evidence, forms of knowledge, and battles over expertise variously shape science and technology (S&T) policymaking by country (e.g. Arnason and Simpson 2003; Daemmrich 2004; Gottweis 1998; Harrison and Hoberg 1991; Jasanoff 1986; Parthasarathy 2007; Rabinow 1999). Sheila Jasanoff (2005) identifies these entrenched, enduring, and stable knowledge-ways “civic epistemology”. Yet as subnational S&T governance

risers around issues as varied as genetically modified organisms (GMO), climate change, and energy extraction, scarce research examines the knowledge-ways *local* communities are coming to view as constituting sound S&T decision-making.

The failure of S&T scholars to better regard civic epistemologies in the subnational context is concerning, as growing efforts to (re)localize S&T policy appear to have deep epistemic dimensions. In the case of food in the U.S., for instance, states and localities are challenging the very knowledge-ways underlying federal approaches to GMO labeling, invoking public opinion and citizens' right to know as fundamental to this regulation rather than the historic reliance on "scientific evidence" and "novel risks"; often, these challenges work to remake authority over labeling altogether as a subnational governance concern (e.g. Wohlers 2013; p78). Yet without further research, we know little about the epistemic communities involved in these battles; what and why certain intellectual dynamics prevail in a given context over others; and how (re)localization might be remaking governance, society, and technology, more generally. As (re)localization gains further momentum, exploring the potential for local civic epistemologies and their implications thus merits greater consideration amongst scholars concerned with understanding knowledge production and S&T governance.

Towards addressing local knowledge-ways in S&T policy, the following comparative analysis regards the regulatory politics of food in two U.S. cities, Cleveland and Detroit, against one other and in consideration of the American federal level within which they are nested. Data for this analysis is qualitative and includes, primary source documents, over forty hours of observation; and over seventy semi-structured interviews with actors from structured categories relevant to both cities' food systems (1). Food is the at the center of this study in part because it has multiple S&T policy dimensions, including in relation to its genetic modification and/or impacts on human and environmental health (e.g. Boyce *forthcoming*; Moore and Wittner 2014; Winickoff *et al* 2005). Furthermore, in the local context food policy is often concerned with technical adaptations to facilitate agricultural production on rooftops and vertically in large warehouses, to address urban soil quality and water access issues, to manage farm waste, and to accommodate new forms of food preparation and distribution, for example. Analyzing municipal food policymaking is thus useful to provide insights into subnational S&T policy, more generally. Finally, Cleveland and Detroit, as nested within the U.S., were chosen as cases for this analysis in part because the two cities are alike geographically, demographically, economically,

and historically (2), which suggests they would define politically relevant knowledge-ways for S&T policy quite similarly. Nonetheless, how Cleveland and Detroit think about and enact food governance has, in fact, varied substantially between the two (and against the federal level). Indeed, in each place, different forms of knowledge are deemed politically relevant and there are altogether alternative notions about the level of transparency necessary to achieve legitimate policymaking, for instance (see Table 1). That such disparities persist even in light of the cities' broader similarities makes the Cleveland and Detroit intriguing sites for analyzing local civic epistemology.

Because scarce research regards knowledge production in the context of local S&T policy, the bulk of the ensuing analysis centers on identifying the knowledge-ways that have come to characterize Cleveland and Detroit. The primary aim here is thus to provide evidence for the existence of locally unique civic epistemologies upon which additional studies can build. Indeed, it is important to effectively outline local epistemic dynamics before considering their implications. Nonetheless, implications of course do matter; the broader importance of local civic epistemologies for Cleveland, Detroit, and beyond is therefore considered in this paper's closing discussion along with directions for future research.

### **Political Culture and Civic Epistemology: Approximating How Governments “Think”**

Civic epistemology concerns the cultures and social and institutional practices of knowledge construction and constitution in political life—including how people make, receive, interpret, and (re)make knowledge claims to determine what is ‘believable’ particularly in modern, democratic contexts. Civic epistemologies are intimately connected to a geo-political arena's political culture; indeed, a given public's political beliefs and behaviors give way and are, in turn, (re)enforced by entrenched and enduring political ways of knowing. These civic epistemologies matter because the knowledge that counts in policymaking and how is deeply intertwined with social order. Indeed, such knowledge-ways are critical in the formation of political imagination and identity, shape and are shaped by social and political authority, often characterize and account for the form and frequency of political conflict, and fundamentally underlie how democracy is understood and enacted in a given context. Civic epistemologies thus have implications not only for how S&T policies are constructed but also for how society and

socio-technological objects are simultaneously co-produced (Jasanoff 2005; see, also, e.g., Miller 2004).

Given their importance, S&T scholars have regarded elements central to civic epistemology—including analyzing institutionalized forms of evaluating knowledge and their ties to distinct political cultures—particularly at the national level (e.g. Bandhauer *et al* 2005; Brickman *et al* 1985; Daemmrich and Krucken 2000). Jasanoff (2005), for example, points out that significant differences exist in the way Western countries' citizens receive and react to scientific and technological information. In the U.S., for example, she shows that collective judgments about science are resolved through adversarial 'contention' among S&T elites; British citizens, in contrast, rely on a 'communitarian' approach predicated on shared perceptions; and in Germany, the public evaluates scientific claims through negotiated 'consensus-seeking' among all affected viewpoints. In the context of GMOs in the food system, these differences have contributed to political framings and action in the U.S. of GMO foods as largely a technical and market phenomena while in the European countries they have been imbued with greater social and legal meaning. In looking at patent domains, Parthasarathy (*forthcoming*) too underscores differences in technical decision-making that are bound to unique political cultures, particularly as she contrasts the U.S. national approach with the E.U.'s. For instance, she demonstrates that in the American context a public trust in highly specialized scientific and technical knowledge has helped produce a patent system extremely difficult for outsiders to penetrate, while in Europe greater transparency, accountability, and inclusion on behalf of member states and the European public has contributed to a patent system considerate of a greater diversity of knowledge forms (see, also, Parthasarathy 2015). Similarly, Daemmrich (2004), emphasizes that nation-states have different cultures and structures between the government, medical profession, patients, and industry, which he emphasizes underlies variation in pharmaceutical markets and medical care by country.

Despite that much S&T literature on knowledge and policy focuses on the national level, scholars acknowledge that the knowledge-ways comprising civic epistemology can vary across any well-defined cultural domain (e.g. Jasanoff 2005: 249). There are thus calls to expand analyses of knowledge politics, including civic epistemology, itself, beyond country-level dynamics to include other geo-political arenas concerned with S&T governance (e.g. Miller 2008). This paper argues for localities to be included in this expanded research. Indeed, S&T is

not only a national and increasingly global policy matter, but it is also rapidly (re)localizing. In addition to food in America, for example, hydraulic fracking has become a political issue among cities and states (e.g. Freilich and Popowitz 2012; Davis 2012) along with the governance of autonomous vehicle research (e.g. Sloane 2014) and several other S&T matters. Furthermore, there appear to be significant epistemic battles underlying these shifting governance dynamics, which has implications for policy, society, and the environment not only at the local level but also between cities, states, and nations. In the case of fracking, for example, Hudgins and Poole (2014) argue that subnational entities are reorganizing knowledge on the topic of energy extraction to shift the balance of power away from national and also direct citizen control. In case such as this, (re)localization thus represents a challenge to standing relationships of expertise, power, and citizenship with impacts across multiple geo-political levels. Added to this, a nascent but growing body of work outside of S&T studies supports that localities represent the very type of bounded cultural domain in which distinct civic epistemologies might thrive; this should encourage S&T scholars to look into local knowledge-ways further. Oliver (2001; 2012), for example, uses diverse measures to show that, by design, urban and suburban decision-making approaches are distinct from nation-states. DeLeon and Naff (2004: 690) agree that “place matters;” using the Social Capital Benchmark Survey, they demonstrate that political cultures vary across thirty urban American communities and against the national level. This research also suggests that local political cultures are tied to the very nature and success of different area groups’ civic pursuits (e.g. Bailey 1999; Ferman 1996; Lieske 2009; Liu *et al* 2010; Sharp 1999). Events on the ground and emerging research thus urge for those interested in knowledge production and S&T governance to take seriously the epistemic dimensions of local decision-making. In illustrating that Cleveland and Detroit exhibit alternative knowledge-ways from each other and the U.S. federal level when it comes to food policy, the following analysis offers a step in this direction.

## **Brief Background: Political Culture and Civic Epistemology in American Food**

### **Governance**

#### **The American Federal Level**

An extensive literature on the political culture and civic epistemology supports that, at the national level, American food governance tends to take place technocratically (on the

technocratic U.S. civic epistemology generally, see, e.g. Jasanoff 1990; Kysar 2010; Nowotny, Scott, and Gibbons 2001; Ottinger 2009; Rayner 2003; Wynne 2002). Indeed, American political communities have tended to focus on issues of safety and risk when it comes to the responsibility of government in the food system. Over time, this focus has become integrally coupled with the valuing of technical elites whose valid political expertise is based in their S&T training and standing along with the soliciting and use of quantitative scientific data to substantiate decision-making (e.g. Busch 2011; Hess 2004; Ingram and Ingram 2006). Decision-making then tends to occur via a somewhat contentious, moderately transparent, give-and-take approach to policymaking (see Table 1). For example, in the case of genetically modified salmon, potentially the first engineered animal permitted for human consumption, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has relied on a handful of scientists and other technical elites to consider scientific and quantitative data on the fish's proposed forms of physical and biological containment and particular rDNA construct in determining if the fish should be approved for human consumption (e.g. U.S. Food and Drug Administration 2016). Or consider, for instance, the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB), tasked with regulating organic food. In order to guide political determinations, members are chosen based in part on their demonstrated ability to evaluate technical information, including Material Safety Data Sheets, substance reports from the National Institute of Environmental Health Studies, and information on food production materials' physical properties and chemical mode of action. NOSB members then deliberate amongst one another towards making their regulatory recommendations both privately and twice a year in a public forum free and open to the community (e.g. Amaditz 1997; Bostrom and Klintman 2006).

Given the entrenched, enduring, and stable nature of national civic epistemologies and the tendency for convergence across certain policy institutions, many scholars would assume that the technocratic U.S. knowledge-ways described above would be present in shaping the country's localities' political determinations, as well. Yet the following analysis provides evidence that local epistemological dynamics instead vary between Cleveland and Detroit and against technocratic federal decision-making. This suggests that there are distinct local knowledge-ways that persist even under the context of commanding national intellectual structures and cultures, the nature and implications of which are also discussed.



## **Empirical Analysis: Civic Epistemology and Cleveland and Detroit’s Food Governance**

### **Cleveland’s Political Culture**

Cleveland had for years faced severe economic, social, and urban decline, when—starting around the mid-1980s—a number of partnerships between politicians, industry representatives, and other applied professionals helped the city make a “comeback” (Mahn Center for Archives and Special Collections 2015). Indeed, Cleveland’s population was at its height in 1950, but changes in manufacturing and racial upheaval led many more well-resourced residents fleeing a city increasingly subject to unemployment, crime, and corruption (e.g. Michney 2006). Throughout the 1980s and beyond, then, both the public and officials became focused on renewing the urban center through large-scale, capital-intensive revitalization projects such as the Key Tower, Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, and Browns Stadium along with massive environmental cleanups and investments in technology and health industries. Owing to strategic partnerships between policymakers, business representatives, and non-profits, these efforts were often widely deemed successful as Cleveland cleared its debt and was named an “All American City” multiple times (Mahn Center for Archives and Special Collections 2015). A public trust in collaboration amongst applied professionals as best suited to guide decision-making consequently grew among Clevelanders (e.g. Stockmann 2012) (3). It is out of, coupled with, and (re)constructing this culture that an equally unique “applied civic epistemology” is argued to have come to characterize food governance in this city, below.

### **Constructing Cleveland’s First Food Policy**

Despite its earlier comeback, the 2000s brought to Cleveland—as with much of the U.S.—economic decline as the housing market collapsed and land vacancy, unemployment, and other ills ensued. At the same time, a so-called “local food movement” was gaining momentum nationwide (e.g. Starr 2010). These events together helped motivate Clevelanders to view food as a potential means for urban renewal, and actors across Cleveland thus began expanding food systems efforts to achieve diverse goals vis-à-vis the economy, leisure, health, social justice, and sustainability. In the mid-2000s, for example, faculty at Ohio State University Extension and Oberlin College, farmers, food entrepreneurs, emergency food providers, and government

officials all came together to mobilize a comprehensive plan towards achieving greater economic growth for Northeast Ohio's food system. Around the same time, local chefs and restaurants were gaining national attention for homing food as an experience in and of itself by incorporating area-grown produce into their menus. Various non-profits also came together to launch mobile grocers and expand food assistance programs towards improving food access in the inner city, while Cleveland residents themselves expanded garden plots citywide for a variety of recreational, health, and economic reasons.

Yet alongside the flourishing food system initiatives in Cleveland were also challenges, especially for the city's community gardens and gardeners. Specifically, for-profit developers saw different opportunities with which to use area land, including for investment properties rather than food production, and often had greater resources than gardeners to pursue their aims for various urban plots. Many gardens were consequently razed little by little across the city. When a group of gardeners learned that a particularly beloved, longstanding plot in Cleveland's Ward 3 would soon be destroyed so the land could be turned into market-rate housing that residents sought a broader solution to save their plot and others like it.

Concerned resident gardeners immediately approached applied professionals for their assistance in protecting urban agriculture plots. In particular, they contacted Morgan Taggart and Julia Barton, program specialists in agriculture and natural resources at Ohio State University Extension, Kristen Trolio, urban outreach coordinator with the Cleveland Botanical Garden, and Marge Misak, executive director at the Community Land Trust, for their help. Misak (4/1/2015), explained that it was a public trust in professionals as best suited to guide food systems decision-making that provided the impetus for this move, stating that she and the other three "did a lot with community gardens, had a very long history with this [issue] and lots of staff, resources, and knowledge from [where we were working]. So I think residents knew and trusted [us] because of this." In an interview, representatives from the Cleveland Botanical Garden (Sanchez, Ferguson, and Barrett 5/23/2013) support this growing public confidence in professionals' relevance and capacity vis-à-vis food:

*With the economic struggles in 2006, 2008, there was a change in the surrounding community in terms of people looking to address their needs by becoming more self-sufficient. But to do that, a lot of residents, foundations, and [other] people looked at us [applied professionals] and our programs [with institutions such as the Botanical Garden and Ohio State University] as a way to build some of those skills...people in the community really began to appreciate us being in their neighborhoods and value our*

*knowledge—they started approaching us to say ‘hi’, and with questions, and to ask for help.*

Receptive to this public confidence, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak agreed to help protect community gardens.

With a general understanding of land use policy from their respective work experience and training, it was quickly that Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak determined that the best way to protect urban gardens was via an amendment to the city’s zoning code. The four consequently began pursuing this avenue through what would become Cleveland’s first contemporary food legislation: the Urban Agriculture Garden District ordinance. It was thus applied professionals that initiated food governance in Cleveland.

To secure their desired legislative change, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak first worked to recruit a strategic coalition of officials for their policy input and backing. Initially, this included approaching Councilmember Joe Cimperman. While Cimperman’s formal education is in the Jesuit priesthood, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak viewed him as relevant to decision-making due in part to the integral role he played in the creation and adoption of Cleveland’s Open Space and Recreation Zoning District, which mirrored some of what they hoped to achieve with urban gardening, and his knowledge of and skill vis-à-vis the policy process in Cleveland, more generally. Taggart (7/24/2013) explained some of this in an interview: “[Cimperman] had worked on this open space recreation district zoning for parks and green space...and he was just a very willing partner and a very savvy legislator and politician that really had strong alliances...And I thought ‘whoa, ok, let’s work with him;’ he can really help us learn how to navigate that policy process.” Soon after, they also sought input from Cleveland Planning Director Robert Brown, viewing him too as a pertinent expert to inform their decision-making based in his decades-long career in land use regulation. Indeed, it was based in this professional experience that the four expressed Brown best knew the “language” of zoning ordinances and felt his participation was thus valid and important (Misak 4/1/2015). Moreover, Cimperman, Brown, and the other lawmakers Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak approached agreed to help the four in turn based in the same valuing of applied professional experience, skills and standing as a pertinent basis of expertise. In an interview, for example, Cimperman stated:

*It was Marge Misak, at the Community Land Trust, Kristen Trolio, who is a community organizer and a farmers’ market pioneer, and Morgan Taggart from [Ohio State University] extension, who said...‘change the zoning code.’ And I thought...‘these are*

*people who I admire and trust. I'm learning from them.' So we did it. (in Wallace 2011)*

His confidence in Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak was thus based largely in their professional work experience and standing, which he (5/28/2014) went on to explain rendered the four in his view politically relevant “experts.”

With the support of both the municipal public and officials, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak went on to spearhead the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance’s drafting in 2006. Much of the policy’s writing took place among the four, alone, via a largely informal, off-the-record process. This allowed Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak to write the legislation as they “ideally would want it to be” and reflected the public’s trust in applied professionals alone as adequate to guide decision-making (Misak 4/1/2015). The four also collaborated at times with the lawmakers they had initially recruited for support. After putting together a draft ordinance, for example, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak consulted Brown to provide comments that would strengthen the policy’s likelihood of passing into law. He offered comments on the ordinance’s overall structure to satisfy standards laid out in the rest of the city’s zoning code and also provided specific input concerning elements such as the accessory structures allowed on urban plots. Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak then worked to have gardeners join in the process, too, including offering to host a public listening session where they would circulate a draft of the ordinance. Yet the four “struggled” to mobilize grassroots direct participation (Misak 4/1/2015). In an interview, Taggart (7/24/2013) linked the public’s failure to participate more directly in the policy process in part to their support of and confidence in applied professionals, explaining, “there was a lot of community enthusiasm at the time, we [applied professionals] were getting great outcomes [throughout our various food systems efforts].... So I think [the public] saw our ability as change agents and our value to represent...the larger community [in decision-making].” The four, along with the additional professional experts like Brown and Cimperman they consulted, thus continued to inform policymaking largely on their own.

In light of the actors and knowledge-ways favored in Cleveland’s food policymaking, applied professionals’ own insights and social science research constituted the bulk of evidence informing the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance. Indeed, testimony from actors like Brown, as based in his applied professional experience, helped shape the legislation. Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak too drew on their several years of work around urban agriculture,

development, and planning to justify elements of the ordinance. For instance, throughout their work, resident growers had approached the four in frustration at having little agency in determining whether their plots would be razed or not. From these encounters, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak thought it suitable to include a requirement in the policy for public hearings ahead of potential redevelopment of land where a garden already existed. Additionally, through their professional training and standing, the four had particular exposure to and understanding of both qualitative and quantitative social science research relevant to urban agriculture, and they consequently leveraged such studies as evidence to inform and substantiate their proposed ordinance. For example, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak included in the legislation an allowance for the selling of goods from gardens, supporting this with data from a planning survey out of Seattle and from the Cleveland Cuyahoga County Planning Commission's own food availability mapping process which demonstrated the economic benefits of market stands. The four also leveraged research on the determinants of neighborhood revitalization and crime reduction from sociologists and urban planners to support the ordinance's opening argument that there are several instances where "urban gardens represent the highest and best use for the community" (City of Cleveland 2007).

In 2007, Taggart, Barton, Trolio, and Misak joined with Cimperman to present the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance to City Council, and lawmakers in turn voted unanimously to pass the legislation into law. Councilmembers supported the policy in part as a reflection of their and their constituents' trust in collaboration among applied professionals as suited to guide policymaking. Jenita McGowan (7/24/2013), Chief of Sustainability with the City Cleveland, confirmed in an interview, "nothing in Cleveland gets done without [professional] collaboration. *Nothing...* That people like Morgan Taggart and Cimperman worked together was essential to this local food legislation [passing]." Additionally, that local professionals' own know-how and social science research informed the ordinance too compelled Councilmembers to move forward with the policy. In an interview, Councilman Cimperman (5/28/2014) acknowledged, for example, that the social science research used to inform the ordinance helped persuade policymakers' support:

*[The four] present us with data... so we know for a fact from the planning [research] that neighborhoods that have prominent urban agriculture are safer. They tend to be more vibrant, people vote more, they're more engaged... [Once officials] understood the policy's [basis], they tended to support [the Urban Agriculture Zoning District*

*ordinance*].

Brown (8/7/2013) corroborated Cimperman's sentiments, explaining, "it was just a matter of educating the Councilmembers and their colleagues [with this research, and then] the reaction from a lot of Councilmembers was towards understanding the value of urban gardening...it was then we changed the policy." Both who was involved in the policy process and the evidence leveraged throughout it thus persuaded officials' to pass the ordinance.

Unlike the technocratic civic epistemology characterizing the national level, the development and passing of the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance in Cleveland demonstrates that an applied civic epistemology dominates here locally. Indeed, in this city's food governance, applied professionals have been favored over S&T elites, and decision-making tends to be much less formal, visible, and transparent. Moreover, the experiences of applied professionals and the communities with which they work tend to inform political determinations along with social science research particularly from urban planners, policy scholars, and sociologists; standards of evidence in Cleveland's food governance thus too tend to contrast the scientific quantitative data preferred nationally (see Table 1).

### **Detroit's Political Culture**

Much like Cleveland, changes in manufacturing and racial upheaval contributed to severe economic, social, and urban decline in Detroit throughout the later 20<sup>th</sup> century. And here, too, emerged partnerships between politicians, industry representatives, and development corporations towards renewing the urban center. Large-scale, capital-intensive revitalization projects such as the People Mover, One Detroit Center, and Motor City Casino thus came to characterize Detroit. Yet unlike in Cleveland, these broad efforts failed to improve Detroit's economy, society, or environment in any widely laudable way. Rather, economic and social tension remained strong features of the city, with many citizens increasingly skeptical of the very applied professionals favored in Cleveland or of other qualified elites (e.g. Mast 1994). Instead, Detroit citizens focused on themselves as the only trusted participants to inform governance. It is out of and comprising this distinct "culture of distrust" (Bockmeyer 2000) in non-grassroots leadership that an equally particular "popular civic epistemology" is demonstrated below to have and come to characterize Detroit's food governance.

## Constructing Detroit's First Food Policy

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Detroit, much like Cleveland, saw a variety of new, non-governmental local food initiatives taking off, ranging from food justice non-profits to greening initiatives to farm-to-table restaurants. Perhaps because of the city's sheer size or its positioning in the American imagination as a pillar of economic hardship, media, funders, and academics paid particularly high attention to these rising food efforts. Often, however, such attention centered on white, well resourced, non-native Detroiters' food systems participation despite that the city is over 80% black. Such particularized attention consequently tended to feed the sense of distrust and alienation many Detroiters, particularly African-Americans, had felt for decades. T.R. (7/10/2013) a black Detroiters involved in several local non-profit food systems initiatives, explained some of this frustration in an interview:

*In an 85% black city...some feelings...of disagreement...are harbored by a section of the community [with regards to] the local food movement. There are people in the city who have been doing [local food work] for many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many years and when, for some reason, you put it in the hands of young white people it gets a lot more attention from the media...and [from people] gate keeping different funds, in leadership positions.*

Combating these dynamics in the food system by ensuring greater participation of longstanding Detroit residents, particularly from the city's African-American community, thus soon became a driving focus for many area citizens.

In 2006, just as Clevelanders were drafting the Urban Agriculture Zoning District ordinance, Detroiters too worked to initiate their city's first contemporary food policy; yet unlike in Cleveland, in Detroit it was grassroots, African-American residents themselves who chiefly drove these efforts. These residents came from diverse professional and recreational backgrounds, not all of which had direct food systems applications. Nonetheless, they shared a commitment to black self-determination and the same dependency on food we all share. They also shared a common distrust in officials and other elites' authority in the local food system, and in part because of this they felt it was important to themselves guide any potential municipal food governance. A statement from those involved touched on these dynamics:

*It was and is our view that the most effective movements grow organically from the people whom they are designed to serve. Representatives of Detroit's majority African-American population must be in the leadership of efforts to foster food justice and food*

*security in Detroit. While our specific focus is on Detroit's African-American community, we realize that improved policy and an improved localized food system is a benefit to all Detroit residents. (Detroit Black Community Food Security Network 2016).*

Moreover, this belief that Detroit's grassroots, predominantly African-American population should guide decision-making was rooted not only in a distrust in so-called outsiders, but also a deeper trust in the former, based in their very socio-cultural identity, as having the valid, relevant, and needed expertise to inform policymaking. Lila Cabbil (2014), a leader in several Detroit-based social and political justice initiatives, explained some of this in an interview, articulating that the grassroots black community has "lived experience" based particularly "as African-American U.S. Citizen[s]...in Detroit," and that this type of knowledge, from these types of knowledge holders, is what should inform government: "it's unfair for white people to have control of black people... as the city has become blacker and blacker, [African-Americans] should have control" (9/5/2013). Malik Yakini (1/22/2014), executive director of DBCFSN, affirmed this common perspective, explaining, "we [the majority Detroit population] believe...the people are the expert practitioners." Consequently, these grassroots actors formed the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network (DBCFSN) with the explicit aim of bringing about what would become known as the city's Food Security Policy to help foster "a more just food system" that would include and advance grassroots residents, and African-Americans particularly, and their knowledge as such throughout (Yakini 1/22/2014).

DBCFSN members themselves next approached the Neighborhood and Community Service Standing Committee of City Council directly to petition for their proposed Food Security Policy. Speaking to lawmakers, these members drew largely on their and other African-Americans residents' experiences, culture, and history to justify the need for local food governance. They underscored inequities within the local food system, testifying to the Committee about their experiences with inadequate food access and health disparities disproportionately disadvantaging black and lower-income citizens, for example. They also touched on the alienation of African-Americans from land and capital, referencing both present barriers to citizens' ability to purchase city lots as well as the historic treatment of blacks as slaves whose labor was exploited to profit others. DBCFSN members closed their arguments by then urging officials to address the ills they had outlined through their proposed policy idea. Detroit officials accepted residents' lived perspective, as communicated largely in the form of



testimony, anecdotes, and narratives, as legitimate evidence to justify food governance: they agreed on the spot to move forward with the Food Security Policy. In fact, councilmembers reiterated DBCFSN members' own statements when substantiating their willingness to move forward with the Food Security Policy (e.g. Watson 2008). Officials then appointed DBCFSN's grassroots black members themselves as the taskforce charged with writing the legislation. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), senior official at the City Planning Commission, explained this move in an interview, citing that many lawmakers recognized the value of these types of experts and expertise in decision-making and aimed to advance their meaningful participation in government:

*We [city officials] realized there's still a lot of folk, black folk, other folk of color, that have...the knowledge and expertise, already in the community, and we need to be intentional about bringing it together [in policymaking].*

Creating the policy taskforce based on a person's socio-cultural identity was thus officials recognizing and validating the authority of grassroots black residents and their lived knowledge in local food governance.

The DBCFSN members comprising the Food Security Policy taskforce and their neighbors' own lived perspective then went on to inform the bulk of this legislation. Indeed, while the taskforce conducted some research into Toronto and Chicago's food security policies, their primary focus was on ensuring local residents and their experiential, cultural, and historical knowledge shaped policymaking. They achieved this in part by implementing a generally transparent and inclusive legislative drafting process, which included circulating a draft of the policy directly among the community for public review, critique, and input. In particular, the taskforce presented the draft legislation to attendees at the 2007 DBCFSN Harvest Festival. This festival tends to attract grassroots members of Detroit's black community, and circulating the legislation here was thus an attempt to ensure that "the people most affected have access to the conversation and the decision-making," as Gloria Rivera (8/19/2013), whose organization co-sponsored the festival, emphasized in an interview. Attendees had the opportunity to view the proposed legislation in full, to ask questions about the drafting process, and to inform changes to the policy through verbal and written comments. Participants recalled this as being a "very inclusive and respectful process of the community members who gathered. We all had plenty of opportunity to understand the document as well as to give input" (P.C. and G. R. 2015). The

taskforce then incorporated much of the commenting public's perspectives into the legislation, valuing their perspective, as based in their socio-cultural identity, as sufficient evidence to inform legislation. The Food Security Policy's section on economic injustice, for instance, states conditions in Detroit's food system from the perspective of black residents as told primarily by DBCFSN members and Harvest Festival attendees:

*It is unknown whether any food wholesalers, farmers, distributors or food processing facilities providing food for the city of Detroit are owned, operated, or even hire Detroiters, specifically African-Americans; or if any of the food products consumed in our community were developed by people from our community. Aside from cashiers, baggers, stock persons and a few butchers, Detroiters, specifically African-Americans are absent from the food system. Our primary and predominant role is that of consumer. (City of Detroit 2008)*

This clause demonstrates the importance of African-American residents' experiences and beliefs to Detroit's policymaking; the inclusion of "our", for example, legitimizes the legislation as written by and for Detroit's majority black population, and that certain dynamics were "unknown" yet still included upholds that lived perspectives are more important to inform and justify the city's policymaking than more qualified forms of quantitative or qualitative data, for instance.

Finally, the taskforce consulted Dr. Kami Pothukuchi, a participatory researcher and associate professor of urban studies and planning at Wayne State University in Detroit, for her input into the Food Security Policy, as well. Based in her participatory approach, commitment to the local community, and identity as herself a person of color, the taskforce viewed Pothukuchi as a pertinent "food policy expert" to provide additional assistance in the legislation's drafting (Detroit Black Community Food Security Network 2015). Moreover, rather than turn to the urban planning data or scientific research she may have had access to, Pothukuchi offered comments on the policy reflective of her own experience with and in the community. In familiarity with and appreciation of the local communities' "invisible capital", for example, she urged for the policy to include more "discussion of the very real and powerful assets that exist in Detroit...that can help advance [this policy's] goals." And, in valuing residents' lived testimony as a sufficient basis of evidence to inform policy, she encouraged "anecdotal reports [...from] many Detroiters" on the lacking fresh food options in Detroit to be included in the policy's section on food access (Pothukuchi 2007). The taskforce valued Pothukuchi's perspective and the information she leveraged in her comments, and they thus included the majority of her edits

when producing the final draft legislation (e.g. Detroit Black Community Food Security Network 2015).

In 2008, DBCFSN taskforce members presented the revised Food Security Policy to municipal officials who “enthusiastically” voted to adopt it into law (Watson 2008). Councilmembers approved the policy in part because citizens had informed much of it through a generally inclusive and transparent policymaking process. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), a senior official at the Detroit Planning Commission, corroborated this in an interview, “if you want to see something passed [in Detroit], you want to do the...deep community engagement and involvement work on the frontend...As much as [we officials] are proud of the policy, [we are] more proud of the process [that went into producing it].” Additionally, lawmakers’, like much of the public, valued the lived perspective of Detroiters’ as a sufficient basis of evidence to justify policymaking. In fact, in a City Council meeting, decision-makers emphasized that it was this type of input that encouraged their supportive stance on the legislation, stating “we realize that this [policy] reflects the collective experience, expertise, perspectives and interests of many Detroiters. It is our intent that the recommendations in this document be fully implemented.” (Yakini 2008). It was thus both who informed the Food Security Policy and how that compelled officials to pass the legislation into law.

The knowledge-ways informing Detroit’s Food Security Policy suggests that this city has a unique civic epistemology from the technocratic one common federally or the applied civic epistemology that has characterized Cleveland’s food governance. In Detroit, for example, grassroots residents, particularly those who represent and comprise the city’s dominant African-American socio-cultural identity, tend to guide food policymaking over S&T elites or applied professionals. Moreover, these residents leverage their experiential, cultural, and historical knowledge to substantiate political determinations via decision-making processes that are highly transparent, publicly inclusive, and often driven by citizen, themselves; this contrasts the scientific quantitative data that tends to be preferred in national decision-making and the valuing of social science research and exclusive policymaking that has marked Cleveland’s food governance (see Table 1).

## Same Policy Issue, Different Knowledge-Ways in Cleveland and Detroit

Not only did different knowledge-ways variously shape the first food systems issues taken up politically between Cleveland and Detroit and against what tends to occur federally, but they too disparately shaped the same issue areas as they became governance matters in each city over time. This represents a level of endurance and stability among local civic epistemologies and is thus briefly considered below.

Consider, for example, when Clevelanders aimed to make justice in the food system a policy concern there as had originally occurred in Detroit. In Cleveland, it was again a handful of applied professionals who initiated this effort. This included Kim Foreman, executive director at Environmental Health Watch and a trained sociologist specializing in the disproportional impacts of environmental exposures; Randall McShepard, who holds a master's in urban studies and works on both an urban farm and with a think tank focused on policies relevant to the minority community; and members of Case Western Reserve University's Social Justice Institute. Together, these actors found it problematic that little political attention was being paid to food systems injustices that were predominantly affecting Cleveland's black and lower-income populations. Foreman (8/5/2013) explained in an interview,

*[In government] everybody was talking about the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance, but no one was talking about illegal dumping and residents who were concerned about eating the food [grown where this dumping occurred]...People in the neighborhoods are doing stuff around food justice...but they have been marginalized...They don't have the resources, they don't have the networks, they haven't been invited to the right tables.*

Consequently, these concerned professionals organized a Race, Food and Justice conference with the goal of heightening the visibility of food systems disparities across Cleveland and collaborating on "policies and action that can stem the tide of racial injustice and inequity" (Williams 2013).

Applied professionals leveraged their expertise as such the continued to guide the bulk of ensuing food justice discourse and action in Cleveland. For instance, the Race, Food and Justice conference organizers brought in presenters such as Erika Allen, nationally recognized food justice advocate active at Growing Power and member of the Illinois Food, Farms and Jobs Act Council, Dara Cooper, with the National Black Food and Justice Alliance, and Dr. Julian Agyeman, Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning professor at Tufts University, to draw

on their professional experiences and training towards informing the conference's dialogues. Regardless of their formal training and despite that they were not even local residents, these actors were thus widely viewed as pertinent experts with the appropriate information to inform the city's food equity discourse. Randall McShepard (7/24/2013), who helped organize the conference, explained this in an interview, stating there tends to be "insider/outsider" dynamics in Cleveland which fosters trust in professionals with "big institutions behind them" over others. While no legislation addressing these issues yet exists in Cleveland, applied professionals continue to champion this issue, including working to persuade the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition (described further below) in taking up racial equity as part of their food policy efforts (e.g. Food Policy Coalition Strategic Planning Team 2013).

Meanwhile, as occurred initially in Cleveland, by the 2010s Detroiters began considering land use policies to regulate urban agriculture in their city, as well. Yet in Detroit, it was again residents themselves that initiated and shaped food policymaking. This began especially following John Hantz's proposal to start a massive, private urban farm in Detroit, which motivated residents to call for an urban agriculture ordinance. Indeed, Hantz's idea alarmed many who felt Hantz himself, a white millionaire, did not have the appropriate socio-cultural identity to justify participation in the food system, and it drew concern from community members who felt his proposed farm was really an attempted land-grab that would continue the legacy of disenfranchisement among black and lower-income Detroiters. In part to assert their authority in decision-making and ensure food systems equity, grassroots residents, predominantly African-American longstanding Detroiters, therefore aimed to create legislation that would limit the potential for projects like Hantz's to succeed.

Deploying their experiential, cultural, and historical knowledge, concerned Detroiters approached municipal officials directly with their land use aims and successfully informed the creation of what became known as the Detroit Urban Agriculture ordinance. Persuading lawmakers to take up the ordinance often occurred as residents discussed the idea with policymakers in generally composed interactions at various local food events and community meetings; but at one larger, more contentious public hearing on the Hantz project and land use, more generally, numerous residents stood up in frustration chanting, "remember Black Bottom." This chant represented a critical historical reference, which paralleled potential city support of Hantz to a predominantly African-American neighborhood in Detroit demolished for

redevelopment in the 1960s. Attune to rising community alarm and valuing grassroots actors' historic testimony as relevant to shaping food governance, the Detroit Planning Commission responded to residents concerns by agreeing to amend the zoning code to address urban agriculture. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), senior planner at the Commission, corroborated this, explaining: "it was actually once the big folks got in the room, the Hantz Project and all of those, that city government said, 'oh, maybe we should take a look at this...people in Detroit will decide what happens here and how it happens.'" Officials then pursued the ordinance's drafting through a highly visible, citizen-driven approach. Indeed, a workgroup comprised of local residents and representatives from pertinent area institutions spearheaded much of the legislation's initial development, followed by the inclusion of broader community input obtained through three public listening sessions held throughout the city. In an equally visible final hearing, in 2013 City Council approved the legislation into law to the attending public's wide applause.

### **Institutionalizing Local Civic Epistemologies in Cleveland and Detroit**

Finally, the locally distinct, politically relevant knowledge-ways characterizing Cleveland and Detroit's food policymaking as described above have now come to be formally institutionalized in each place via the Cleveland-Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition (CCFPC) and the Detroit Food Policy Council (DFPC), respectfully. This suggests that local civic epistemologies of each place have enduring and stable qualities that will remain fixed in Cleveland and Detroit's food governance, ongoing. For example, applied professionals initiated the CCFPC in 2007, and it today consists of over fifty non-profit food organization leaders, policymakers, and affiliates from area centers of higher education that collaborate to inform the city's food legislative agenda. The CCFPC operates through informal, often closed-door processes that leverage members' own professional skills and standing to justify resulting determinations. Taggart (7/24/2013), the CCFPC's co-convenor, touched on these dynamics in an interview:

*[The CCFPC's decision-making] really kind of depends what stakeholders are at the table, what the needs are at that time, and that determines what the agenda is gonna be...We don't have any bylaws or official decision-making mechanisms or processes that kind of govern what happens, we just kind of do what we want to do and what we decide through consensus.*

In contrast, Detroit's grassroots residents mandated the creation of the DFPC when they wrote the Food Security Policy in 2008. Today, the DFPC includes—as its by-laws require—four at-large representatives drawn from the community to ensure “the grassroots continues to have a large voice” (Yakini 1/22/2014) along with an additional seventeen members chosen for their socio-cultural identity and expertise as based in their “ethnic/cultural, economic, generational, and gender diversity” (Detroit Food Policy Council 2011). Additionally, all DFPC meetings are advertised in advance, held in rotating locations, open to the community, and include designated times for public attendees to provide input. It is through widely transparent, publicly constituted and inclusive processes that Detroiters' lived experiences, culture, and history thus continues to inform the city's food policy unlike the less visible, professionally driven decision-making the CCFPC continues to advance in Cleveland.

### **Discussion: The Implications of Local Civic Epistemology**

The above analysis emphasizes that different knowledge-ways characterize decision-making around food between Cleveland and Detroit and also against what tends to occur in the U.S. federal context. Nationally, extensive scholarship demonstrates the prevalence of a “technocratic civic epistemology” where S&T elites, whose expertise is based in qualified S&T skills and standing, tend to guide decision-making via moderately transparent, given-and-take decision-making that values highly scientific and technical quantitative data as the primary evidence to substantiate policy (see Table 1). In Cleveland, however, the above analysis provides evidence of an “applied civic epistemology” that contrasts the technocratic one present federally. In this city, for example, both community members and officials tend to trust applied professionals as politically relevant experts based largely in their work skills and standing. Often, these experts collaborate in somewhat informal decision-making processes that occur largely out of the public eye, where they ad-hoc introduce and evaluate the professional perspectives and social science research they deem necessary to substantiate food policy (see Table 1). In contrast to both the American context and Cleveland, in Detroit both the government and policy advocates have placed trust in grassroots residents, particularly those who represent and comprise the city's dominant African-American socio-cultural identity, to guide food policymaking. These residents tend to leverage their experiential, cultural, and historical knowledge to substantiate political determinations via decision-making processes that are highly

transparent, publicly inclusive, and often driven by citizen, themselves. Taken together, these dynamics constitute a “popular civic epistemology” unique to Detroit (see Table 1). Given the geographic, demographic, historic, and economic similarities between Cleveland and Detroit combined with the entrenched and stable U.S. technocratic civic epistemology under which they are nested, that the two cities nonetheless think about and enact valid policymaking altogether uniquely provides evidence that local civic epistemologies do indeed exist.

**Table 1**

<i>Four Features of Civic Epistemology</i> (4)	<b>U.S. National— “Technocratic”</b>	<b>Cleveland— “Applied”</b>	<b>Detroit— “Popular”</b>
<b>Relevant Participants</b>	Qualified Elites	Applied Professionals	Grassroots Residents
<b>Accepted Basis of Expertise</b>	Scientific and Technical Training, Skills, and Standing	Professional Experience, Skills, and Standing	Socio-Cultural Identity
<b>Preferred Evidence</b>	Scientific Quantitative Data	Applied Professional Experience, Social Science Research	Lived Experience, Culture, History
<b>Visibility of Decision-Making</b>	Publicly Visible	Less Publicly Visible	Publicly Visible and Constituted

That local civic epistemologies are present matters because how governments come to know variously constrains and enable social order by place. Consider that in both Cleveland and Detroit the experts and expertise favored in governance appear to be contributing to a (re)making of power across the food system, more generally. In Cleveland, for example, trust in applied professionals seems to have motivated the barring from meaningful inclusion—including in non-governmental efforts such as the Race, Food, and Justice conference—the very grassroots actors professionals themselves affirmed above had once been central to the city’s food justice efforts. And in Detroit, for instance, the favoring of grassroots, predominantly African-American residents and their lived perspective has helped pushed out of the food system actors who defy this socio-cultural identity; under the intense social and political pressure described above John Hantz, for instance, ultimately decided not to go through with his proposed farm that would have produced food intended for human consumption. That subnational knowledge-ways can be formative not only in terms of politics but also society is in part why scholars should be further concerned with local civic epistemology going forward. Indeed, as local S&T policymaking



continues to rise, there will only be more local epistemic contexts and contests emerging with added implications for how democracy, citizenship, and resistance are understood and enacted.

There are many fruitful dimensions along which future research into local civic epistemology might focus. As the above analysis suggests, for example, a key facet of (re)localization is the successful reframing of certain policy problems as capable of being defined, analyzed, and regulated at the subnational level. Yet scholars have scarcely analyzed the intellectual battles that lead to this. How do local communities acquire the power to (re)localize certain issues and epistemologies away from national policy arrangements, in the first place? What, if any, resistance do they face in these endeavors? Additionally, not only have distinct epistemic communities effectively (re)framed certain S&T matters as local political concerns in the U.S. but now national entities are also actively working to (re)construct local issues as ones of federal interest. Over the decade, for example, there has been a rise in federal programming, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Local Food Research & Development and the Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative, and funding which aim to signal national recognition of, support for, and participation in local food systems (e.g. Fitzgerald, Evans, and Daniel 2010). As information, funding, and decision-making norms move between geo-political arenas increasingly under such dynamics, multiple questions about how national knowledge-ways may or may not be (re)shaping local civic epistemologies and vice-versa are raised for future research.

The investigations in this paper centered primarily on two localities, within one national context, and vis-à-vis a single S&T policy issue (food). This design effectively facilitated the demonstration of local civic epistemologies' existence and gave clues into their implications. Now, much more work can be done towards fully understanding what these knowledge-ways imply for governments, societies, and technology as (re)localization continues to gain momentum.

### **Notes**

1. Primary source documents were obtained from the official bodies involved in regulating food in each city (including from Cleveland and Detroit's City Council, the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition, and the Detroit Food Policy Council), along with from online searches (using the term "food policy" and "local food" in conjunction with "Cleveland" and "Detroit") and during observations and from interviewees themselves. Observation took place in Cleveland and Detroit at municipal hearings, food policy

coalition/council meetings, and local food events (e.g. food summits). Interviewees included representatives from municipal agencies and city councils, food policy council/coalitions, food businesses, food systems non-profits, health and educational institutions, and community groups. Interviews were guided along pertinent themes and lasted between thirty minutes and two hours; most were recorded and later transcribed. All data—documents, observation notes, and interview transcripts—was coded and analyzed using a grounded theory approach.

2. For example, Cleveland and Detroit are both Rustbelt cities located just two hours away from one another. They share many demographic characteristics, including majority African-American citizenries and similar population densities, median household incomes, and educational attainment. The two also have parallel histories of racial tension, white flight, crime, corruption, and major changes in manufacturing. In part because of this, Cleveland and Detroit have both lost around 45% of their population since 1960, and they today face economic decline, rising food desert and obesity trends, and substantial land vacancy (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Moreover, food has recently become a tool actors in both places are using to help address these ills and remake their cities, more generally.
3. By applied professionals, I refer to members of a profession, university, industry, government agency, and/or established non-government organization whose knowledge is derived from work experience, training, and standing within these arenas. This contrasts S&T elites, for instance, whose formal education and other qualified training often serves as a basis of expertise irrespective of or in addition to their professional affiliations and experiences.
4. This operationalization is adapted from Jasanoff's (2005) research. As she (259+) emphasizes, such tabulations offer conceptual clarity, but they also risk being reductionist. Civic epistemology is a living thing, subject to change and transformation.

### **Works Cited**

- Amaditz, Kenneth. 1997. "The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 and Its Impending Regulations: A Big Zero for Organic Food?" *Food and Drug Law Journal*. 52: 537-559.
- Arnason, Arnar, and Bob Simpson. 2003. "Refractions through culture: the new genomics in Iceland." *Ethnos*. 68(4): 533-53.
- Bailey, R. W. 1999. *Gay Politics, Urban Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bandhauer, Karen, Julie Curti and Clark A. Miller 2005. "Challenges to Regulatory Harmonization and Standard Setting: The Case of Environmental Accounting in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*. 7: 177-94.
- Bockmeyer, Janice. 2000. "A Culture of Distrust: The Impact of Local Political Culture on Participation in the Detroit EZ." *Urban Studies*. 37(13): 2417- 40.
- Bostrom, Magnus and Mikael Klintman. 2006. "State-centered versus Nonstate-Driven Organic Food Standardization: A comparison of the US and Sweden." *Agriculture and Human Values*. 23: 163-80.
- Boyce, Angie. "'When Does it Stop Being Peanut Butter?': Ruth Desmond, FDA Food Standards of Identity, and the Shifting Politics of Consumer Activism, 1960s-1970s." *Technology and Culture*, forthcoming.
- Brickman, R. and Sheila Jasanoff. 1985. *Controlling Chemicals: The Politics of Regulation in Europe and the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Brown, Robert. 8/7/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Busch, Lawrence. 2011. *Standards: Recipes for Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cabbil, Lila. 2014. "About." Interview for SHINE. Accessed March 15 at: <http://www.whiteprivilegeconference.com/shine.html>.
- Cimperman, Joe. 5/28/2014. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- City of Cleveland. 2007. "Urban Garden District." Chapter 336: Land Use Code.
- City of Detroit. 2008. "Food Security Policy." Available at: <http://detroitblackfoodsecurity.org/policy.html>.
- Daemmrich, Arthur A. 2004. *Pharmacopolitics: Drug Regulation in the United States and Germany*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Daemmrich, Arthur A and G. Krucken. 2000. "Risk vs. Risk: Decision-making Dilemmas of Drug Regulation in the United States and Germany." *Science as Culture*. 9: 505–533.
- Davis, Charles. 2012. "The Politics of "Fracking": Regulating Natural Gas Drilling Practices in Colorado and Texas." *Review of Policy Research*. 29(2): 177-91.
- DeLeon, Richard and Katherine Naff. 2004. "Identity Politics and Local Political Culture: Some Comparative Results from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey." *Urban Affairs Review*. 39(6): 689-719.
- Detroit Black Community Food Security Network. 2015. "About Us." Organizational Website. Accessed October 15, 2015 at: <http://detroitblackfoodsecurity.org/about.html>.
- Detroit Food Policy Council. 2011. "By-Laws." Available at: [http://detroitfoodpolicycouncil.net/sites/default/files/pdfs/DFPC\\_Bylaws\\_Final.pdf](http://detroitfoodpolicycouncil.net/sites/default/files/pdfs/DFPC_Bylaws_Final.pdf).
- Ferman, B. 1996. *Challenging the growth machine: Neighborhood politics in Chicago and Pittsburgh*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Fitzgerald, Kate, Lucy Evans, and Jessica Daniel. 2010. "The National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition's Guide to USDA Funding for Local and Regional Food Systems." National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition. Available at: [http://sustainableagriculture.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/NSAC\\_FoodSystemsFundingGuide\\_FirstEdition\\_4\\_2010.pdf](http://sustainableagriculture.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/NSAC_FoodSystemsFundingGuide_FirstEdition_4_2010.pdf)
- Food Policy Coalition Strategic Planning Team. 2013. "FPC Stakeholder Interviews." Summary Report. Available by Request.
- Foreman, Kim. 8/5/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Freilich, Robert H. and Neil M. Popowitz. 2012. "Oil and Gas Fracking: State and Federal Regulation Does Not Preempt Needed Local Government Regulation: Examining the Santa Fe County Oil and Gas Plan and Ordinance as a Model." *The Urban Lawyer*. 44(3): 533-575.
- Gottweis, Herbert. 1998. *Governing Molecules: The Discursive Politics of Genetic Engineering in Europe and the United States*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harrison, Kathryn and George Hoberg. 1991. "Setting the environmental agenda in Canada and the United States: the cases of dioxin and radon." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 24(1): 3-27.
- Hudgins and Poole. 2014. "Framing fracking: private property, common resources, and regimes of governance." *Journal of Political Ecology*. 21: 303-19.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 1986. "Comparative Risk Assessment: The Lessons of Cultural Variation." Pp. 259-281 in M.L. Richardson, ed., *Toxic Hazard Assessment of Chemicals*. London, UK: Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 1990. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2005. *Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kysar, Douglas. 2010. *Regulating from Nowhere: Environmental Law and the Search for Objectivity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lieske, Joel. 2009. "The Changing Regional Subcultures of the American States and the Utility of a New Cultural Measure." *Political Research Quarterly*.
- Liu, Xincheng, Eric Lindquist, Arnold Vedlitz, and Kenneth Vincent. 2010. "Understanding Local Policymaking: Policy Elites' Perceptions of Local Agenda Setting and Alternative Policy Selection." *The Policy Studies Journal*. 38(1): 69-91.
- Mahn Center for Archives and Special Collections. 2015. "Mayor of Cleveland: The Comeback City." The Voinovich Collections. Ohio University Libraries. Available online at: <http://www.voinovichcollections.library.ohio.edu/>.
- Mast, Robert H. 1994. *Detroit Lives*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McGowan, Jenita. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- McShepard, Randall. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Michney, Todd M. 2006. "Race, Violence, and Urban Territoriality: Cleveland's Little Italy and the 1966 Hough Uprising." *Journal of Urban History*. 32(3): 404-428.
- Miller, Clark. 2004. "Interrogating the Civic Epistemology of American Democracy: Stability and Instability in the 2000 US Presidential Election." *Social Studies of Science*. 34: 501-530.
- Miller, Clark A. 2008. "Civic Epistemologies: Constituting Knowledge and Order in Political Communities." *Sociology Compass* 2(6): 1896-1919.
- Misak, Marge. 4/1/2015. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Moore, Kelly and Judith Wittner. 2014. "Global Obesity and Global Hunger." Pp in *Controversies in Science and Technology, Volume 4*, Kleinman, Kinchy, and Handelsman, ed. Oxford University Press.
- Nowotny, Helga, Peter Scott, and Michael Gibbons. 2001. *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Polity Press.
- Oliver, Eric. 2001. *Democracy in Suburbia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Oliver, Eric. 2012. *Local Elections and the Politics of Small Scale Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ottinger, Gwen. 2009. "Buckets of resistance standards and the effectiveness of citizen science." *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 35(2): 244-70.
- Pothukuchi, Kami. 2007. Edits to the Detroit Food Security Policy draft legislation.
- Parthasarathy, Shobita. 2007. *Building Genetic Medicine: Breast Cancer, Technology, and the Comparative Politics of Health Care*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Parthasarathy, Shobita. 2015. "Co-Producing Knowledge and Political Legitimacy: Comparing the Life Form Patent Controversies in Europe and the United States." In Stephen Hilgartner, Clark Miller, and Rob Hagendijk, eds., *Science and Democracy: Emerging Trends*. Routledge.
- Parthasarathy, Shobita. *Patent Politics: Life Forms, Markets, and the Public Interest in the United States and Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. *Forthcoming*.
- P.C. and G. R. 2015. Personal Communication and via Email. Detroit, Michigan.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1999. *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rayner, Steve. 2003. "Democracy in the age of assessment: reflections on the roles of expertise

- and democracy in public-sector decision making.” *Science and Public Policy*. 30(3): 163-70.
- Rivera, Gloria. 8/19/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Sanchez, Jesus, Julia Ferguson, and Kelly Barrett. 5/23/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Sharp, Elaine. 1999. *Culture wars and local politics*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Sloane, Sean. 2014. “Autonomous Vehicle Legislation.” The Council of State Governments. Available at:  
[http://knowledgecenter.csg.org/kc/system/files/CR\\_AutonomousVehicles.pdf](http://knowledgecenter.csg.org/kc/system/files/CR_AutonomousVehicles.pdf).
- Starr, Amory. 2010. “Local Food: A Social Movement?” *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*.
- Stockmann, Deidra. 2012. “The new food agenda: municipal food policy and planning for the 21st century.” Dissertation. University of Michigan.
- Taggart, Morgan. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- T.R. 7/10/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Underwood, Kathryn. 9/20/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. “QuickFacts.” For Cleveland and Detroit. Available at:  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/>.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 2016. “AquAdvantage Salmon.” Accessed May 8 at:  
<http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/GeneticEngineering/GeneticallyEngineeredAnimals/ucm280853.htm>.
- Wallace, Hannah. 2011. “Cleveland’s Food Justice Hero: Councilman Joe Cimperman.” *Civil Eats*.
- Watson, JoAnn. 2008. Transcript of the March Meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Service Standing Committee. Detroit Municipal Archives. Available by Appointment.
- Winickoff, David, Sheila Jasanoff, Lawrence Busch, Robin Grove-White, and Brian Wynne. 2005. “Adjudicating the GM Food Wars: Science, Risk, and Democracy in World Trade Law.” *Yale Journal of International Law*. 30: 81-123.
- Wohlens, Anton E. 2013. “Labeling of genetically modified food.” *Politics and the Life Sciences*. 32(1): 73-84.
- Wynne, Brian. 2002. “Risk and Environment as Legitimatory Discourses of Technology: Reflexivity Inside Out?” *Current Sociology*. 50(3): 459-77.
- Yakini, Malik. 12/09/2008. Transcript of the December Meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Service Standing Committee. Detroit Municipal Archives. Available by Appointment.
- Yakini, Malik. 1/22/2014. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.

## Chapter 2

### Constructing Experience:

#### Boundary-work and the Politics of Expertise in Detroit's Food System

##### Abstract

This study examines knowledge production in the context of experience in Detroit's food system. Initially, "professionalized experts", whose know-how was based primarily in pertinent work experience, held authority in shaping the city's contemporary food system. Soon, however, a rival group of experiential experts—"embedded experts"—demanded greater power, arguing that their expertise, grounded in socio-cultural identity and geography, rendered them more valid and relevant. Despite being less resourced, embedded experts ultimately gained more authority in Detroit's food system than professionalized ones. Boundary-work helps to account for this success, including embedded experts' strategic engagement in expulsion, expansion, protection of autonomy, and accommodation efforts. Previous studies touch on these three former activities, yet accommodation is novel to the scholarly literature. *Accommodation* occurs when an expert authority strategically facilitates a rival's inclusion within epistemological demarcations. This requires adjustment amongst competing experts, but in doing so the rival is transformed from a resisted "outsider" to an involved "ally" and knowledge-ways in power are generally upheld. Taken together, this analysis contributes to our understanding of knowledge construction in the context of experience and offers new tools for making sense of boundary-work across a range of intellectual dynamics.

##### Keywords

Boundary-Work, Experience, Expertise, Food, Detroit

## **Introduction**

Across the globe, cities are (re)localizing the food system, with grassroots, non-governmental, and official actors taking control of food production, distribution, and regulation at the municipal level. Their efforts aim to secure outcomes variously associated with the environment, economy, and social justice (e.g. Lyson 2004). Since the early 2000s, Detroit, USA has been included in this trend. At the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, predominantly white, non-native Detroiters led the area's food (re)localization, claiming to be suited for this role based in their “professionalized experiential expertise”—what I term the pertinent knowledge derived from employment experience in areas such as agriculture and development (here forward abbreviated professionalized experience). However, by the mid-2000s, a rival group of experts had risen to challenge these “professionalized experts” and expertise's authority. This rival group consisted largely of African-American, generational Detroit residents who believed their unique “embedded experiential expertise”—what I call know-how rooted in experiences associated with identity and geography (here forward abbreviated embedded experience)—rendered them more relevant and valid to shaping food (re)localization. Despite being far less resourced, these “embedded experts” successfully took power from professionalized ones, becoming the dominant actors shaping Detroit's food system by the end of the decade.

How did embedded experts effectively (re)position themselves and their expertise as authorities in Detroit's food system? I argue the answer lies largely in the boundary-work these actors engaged in. Thomas Gieryn (1983) coined the term boundary-work to connote the ideological activities that demarcate certain intellectual dynamics as particularly credible and relevant over others. Gieryn focuses on these delineations as they are developed between science and non-science, yet boundary-work is useful for understanding knowledge dynamics across many contexts. Scholars have thus expanded analyses of boundary-work to, for instance, understand how actors build and maintain intellectual authority in policymaking (e.g. Hilgartner 2000; Jasanoff 1990; Guston 2001; Moore 1996), and how scientific- and citizen-activists blur these lines to include often under-valued knowledge forms (e.g. Allen 2004; Brown *et al* 2004; Epstein 1996; Ottinger and Cohen 2011; Morrell 2015; Parthasarathy 2010). In this paper I build on and contribute to this growing scholarship, underscoring that embedded experts strategically constructed experiential knowledge-ways to achieve authority in Detroit's food system over their rivals. Such active production of experiential experts and expertise is under-explored in much of

the scholarly literature; this study addresses this gap to inform our notions of experience and of boundary-work much more broadly (1).

In analyzing the construction of experiential experts and expertise in Detroit's food system, I focus on four particular elements of boundary-work in which embedded experts engaged: expulsion, expansion, protection of autonomy, and accommodation. The former three of these activities are well studied in the context of science; I further home in on them in the context of experience. The latter, what term *accommodation*, captures instances where an expert authority allows—in fact facilitates—rivals in crossing existing intellectual delineations based on certain conditions. Accommodation is largely unidentified in existing scholarship. I underscore this boundary activity in the case of Detroit, where embedded experts strategically assisted professionalized experts in articulating knowledge associated with their own race and place-based experiences to better qualify as embedded experts, themselves. This boundary-work requires adaptation amongst competing experts, but in doing so a rival is transformed from an “outsider” to an “ally” towards supporting epistemological dynamics in power rather than threatening them.

### **Brief Background: Experience, Expertise, and Detroit's Food System**

The contemporary rise of Detroit's food system, including a wealth of new area food non-profits, urban farms, and local food policies, is part of a broader “local food movement” that emerged in the late 1990s and early 2000s. This national—if not international—movement aimed to circumvent the perceived ills of the dominant food system in part by (re)localizing food systems management at the municipal level (e.g. Goodman, DuPuis, and Goodman 2005; Hinrichs 2003). Through this, actors aimed to advance the epistemological authority of experience and often-coupled social and environmental values rather than the technical expertise and market focus many felt thus far dominated the food system. The manifestation of these efforts is visible across hundreds of municipalities; there are currently over 8,000 registered farmers' markets (up from 3,000 in 2000) in the U.S., for instance, and in North America over 200 sub-national food policy councils now exist (up from a handful two decades ago) (Sauer 2012; United States Department of Agriculture 2012). Yet there is also a less visible expression of these efforts: in places like Detroit, the local food movement has helped spawn battlegrounds



where actors vie to establish whose and what experiential expertise should have authority in shaping the food system going forward.

Initially in Detroit, professionalized experts commanded food (re)localization. These actors argued that the knowledge they gained from pertinent work experience—what I call their professionalized expertise—made them relevant to shaping Detroit’s food system, and often employers, funders, and the media agreed. For example, in 2004 Earthworks Urban Farm hired Patrick Crouch, a white, college-educated, non-native Detroiter, based largely in his prior experience as a farmhand in Maryland. Around the same time, the Greening of Detroit hired Ashley Atkinson, another white, college-educated, non-Detroit native, to advance urban gardening based in the knowledge she gained launching an agriculture and land use organization in Flint, Michigan. Later, in 2007, city administrators brought in Dan Carmody, another white, educated, non-Detroit native, to help spearhead the privatization of what was once Detroit’s largest public market, viewing him as a relevant expert based in his decades long experience in economic, community, and urban development. In an interview, Mike Score (6/18/2013), president of Hantz Farm in Detroit, touched upon the authority of professionalized expertise when explaining why he was hired in the mid-2000s to run this enterprise:

*I’ve worked with farmers as an extension educator at Michigan State University. I went to Zaire to do agricultural work back in the ‘80’s, and I’ve worked in agriculture in southeast Kentucky. I’ve done everything from actually working at a farm to educating farmers, to helping farmers organize to achieve change in the marketplace, to helping people launch agricultural businesses...so when John [Hantz, founder of Hantz Farm] asked for help...with my career background in agriculture, I had established my expertise.*

The media reinforced professionalized experts and expertise’s relevance to the city’s food system at the time. An article in *Oprah Magazine*, for instance, highlighted Crouch and Atkinson as “Gardening to Save Detroit” (Owens 2008), while the *New York Times* praised the influx of professionalized experts as helping to foster the “revitalization of this city” (Ryzik 2010, pD1).

The growing influence of professionalized experts and expertise in Detroit’s food system fed a sense of alienation many residents, particularly African-Americans, felt for decades. These Detroiters had great first-hand experience and engagement with area food system dynamics, yet employers, funders, and the media generally failed to acknowledge them as having relevant or valuable knowledge. T.R. (7/10/2013), an African-American Detroiter involved in several area food initiatives, explained some of this frustration in an interview:

*In an 85% black city...some feelings...of disagreement...are harbored by a section of the community [with regards to] the local food movement...We know that our communities [know best about] people's ability to access food and people's ability to access jobs within the food system...And there are people in the city who have been doing urban agriculture for many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many years, but when, for some reason, you put it in the hands of young white people it gets a lot more attention from the media...and [from people] gate keeping different funds, in leadership positions.*

Out of this, a rival group of experiential knowledge-holders, embedded experts, rose up to assert their authority over professionalized ones, asserting that out of their particular experiences with race and place they had developed a unique, embedded knowledge meriting influence in Detroit's food system. In an interview, Lila Cabbil (2014), program director for the Detroit organization Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice, explained, for example, how her embedded experience comprised the necessary qualifications for this job: "As an African American US Citizen... in a multicultural neighborhood in Detroit... my lived experience [is the foundation] to this work." Many others joined in this sentiment, viewing their embedded expertise as immediately more relevant, valuable, and qualified to the local food system than those with professionalized know-how.

Within just a few years, embedded experts and expertise moved from the periphery of influence in the city's food system to dominating it in almost every way. By 2008, for example, officials signed a Food Security Policy into law which recognized and aimed to augment embedded experts and expertise's standing in the local food system. The Policy explicitly acknowledges black Detroiters' know-how as unique, stating: "African-Americans, who left southern states to provide for their families through factory jobs in the Detroit area, brought with them their connection to the land and their knowledge." Moreover, the legislation affirms this knowledge as meriting particular influence, recognizing that in light of it "Detroit's majority population must be represented at all levels and in all aspects of the food system" (Detroit City Council 2008). Meanwhile, places like Earthworks Urban Farm, a prominent local non-profit, that had for years largely hired professionalized experts shifted to favoring those with embedded expertise, including preferring job applicants with demonstrated knowledge of and experiences in Detroit neighborhoods (Bernardo 7/18/2013). At the same time the grassroots Detroit Black Community Food Security Network, comprised solely of black residents, had become one of the most prominent and well-funded food non-profits in the city. In line with these trends, several

other established food initiatives, such as the Garden Resource Program and Detroit Slow Food, radically changed their organizational structures and leadership to better empower embedded knowledge-ways over the professionalized ones once favored (e.g. Hebron 8/28/2013; Sage 12/5/2013).

### **Boundary-Work and the Construction of Experiential Experts and Expertise**

How did embedded experts and expertise so successfully gain influence in Detroit's food system over professionalized knowledge-ways? I argue that the answer lies largely in the strategic boundary-work embedded experts engaged in to (re)construct themselves and their know-how as particularly relevant, valid, and beneficial to the local food system relative to others.

While few studies focus on demarcations between and within various forms of experience, we know groups of non-scientists and non-engineers have unique expertise that they must construct, defend, and maintain. In their analysis of embodied health movements, for example, Brown *et al* (2004) show that patients, activists, and other "non-scientists" draw on their experiences to strategically blur the boundaries between "lay" and scientific knowledge. Similar is true of the environmental justice movement, whose participants help link those with lived knowledge concerning ecological injustices to the scientific and technical elites that tend to have power in relevant policymaking (e.g. Frickel 2011).

Just as these alternative knowledge-holders engage in boundary-work to transform demarcations around scientific experts and expertise, so too are they likely to employ boundary-work in establishing their particular authority over others seeking influence within the same, alternative, epistemological space. When discussing low-income urban communities in the Greenpoint/Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn, for instance, Jason Corburn (2005, p58) explains that residents asserted their unique knowledge as based in this particular location, essentially arguing, "I live, work, or play here, and therefore I know what is going on." These community members thus articulated a belief that their know-how was more relevant and valid than actors' who lacked place-based knowledge or whose knowledge was rooted in other geographic areas. It is this type of strategic knowledge production I argue accounts for the outcomes in Detroit's food system: since embedded experts had, for example, fewer financial resources and elite connections than professionalized experts (e.g. Edwards and McCarthy 2004; McAdam 1996; Meyer and Minkoff 2004), they instead engaged in boundary-work to achieve

their success, constructing embedded expertise as superior in this context over professionalized ones.

There are three specific elements of boundary-work scholars home in on that can help make sense of experiential knowledge production when applied to Detroit's food system: expulsion, expansion, and protection of autonomy (e.g. Lamont and Molnar 2002). *Expulsion* occurs when an expert authority denies privileges of an epistemological space to others. In Detroit, for example, those with embedded expertise (re)framed professionalized knowledge and knowledge-holders as irrelevant and potentially dangerous to Detroit's food system. This discourse ultimately helped demote professional experts from positions of influence both symbolically in the public's eye and concretely across various organizations. Meanwhile, *expansion* takes place when those claiming to have intellectual authority gain control over a new ontological domain. This occurred in Detroit especially as embedded experts initiated new food governance structures and cultures that privileged embedded experts and expertise throughout. Finally, when established authorities fight exploitation from rival powers, this is labeled as *protection of autonomy*. As embedded expertise gained influence in Detroit's food system, perceived outsiders tried to leverage this standing for themselves; embedded positioned these rivals as inauthentic knowledge-holders and helped block their exploitive attempts through legislative action.

In addition to the three-abovementioned activities, I also identify what I argue is a fourth, under-explored, element of boundary-work—*accommodation*—that significantly shaped experiential knowledge production in Detroit's food system. Accommodation occurred in Detroit as it became clear to embedded experts that constructing boundaries altogether exclusive of rivals might in fact weaken their and embedded expertise's legitimacy. Consequently, embedded experts allowed professionalized experts to cross embedded | professional demarcations provided professionalized experts abide by certain conditions. Specifically, embedded experts facilitated professionalized experts in connecting to their own lived experience with race and place (often as privileged white outsiders) so they could assert some authority as embedded experts, themselves. This strategic inclusion, which turns "outsiders" into "allies", is what I refer to as accommodation. While accommodation requires acquiescence amongst competing expert authorities, it protects a particular epistemological area in the face of outsider challenges when expulsion, expansion, and protection of autonomy could alone threaten this standing.

While accommodation is rarely explicitly acknowledged in the scholarly literature, studies do point to strategic efforts akin to and potentially constitutive of this element of boundary-work in the context of science. Allen (2003; 2004), for example, has documented at length instances where scientific experts strategically facilitate citizen engagement with scientific discourse and practices, including involving community members in research data collection processes. Such efforts can “blur the boundaries between local and cosmopolitan knowledge” (Allen 2004, p437) while leaving the authority of science generally in tact. Additionally, at the science | politics interface, Guston (e.g. 2000; 2001) illuminates how boundary organizations facilitate competing rivals on both sides of the boundary and, if effective, preserves science as “neither a deprived nor a depraved” epistemological authority (Guston 2000, p104). Consider also consensus conferences, which too seem to parallel accommodation. Through these conferences, expert authorities respond to public concern over citizens’ exclusion from science and technology policy by providing these “outsiders” opportunities to acquire technical skills and participate in policymaking (2) (e.g. Einsiedel, Jelsoe, and Breck 2001). Yet as these outsider publics are accommodated within technical boundaries, there is “scant” substantive learning by expert participants, themselves (Guston 1999, p467+; see, also, e.g. Blok 2007; Ferretti and Pavone 2009; Jasanoff 2005). Consensus conferences thus tend to quell rival attacks while maintaining dominant epistemological dynamics (3). The following examination builds on these identified trends to better understand experiential knowledge production and boundary-work, more generally.

### **Data and Methods**

The methods and data for this analysis are qualitative and include primary-source documents, over twenty-five hours of observation, and over thirty-five interviews. Documents include archival records from Detroit’s City Council and Food Policy Council, along with pertinent websites, popular articles, and non-governmental paraphernalia. Observations and corresponding note-taking took place at pertinent Detroit City Council meetings and public listening sessions, Detroit Food Policy Council meetings and events, and various local food venues (e.g. farmers’ markets, community kitchens, and educational initiatives) largely between 2012 and 2014. Finally, interviews were completed with actors from structured categories relevant to Detroit’s food system, including municipal regulatory agencies, the Food Policy

Council, businesses, non-profits, health and educational institutions, and grassroots community groups. Interviews were semi-structured, guided along pertinent themes, and lasted between thirty minutes and two hours. Interviews were recorded and later transcribed. All data was coded and analyzed using a grounded theory approach.

### **Case Study: Constructing Experiential Experts and Expertise in Detroit's Food System**

In Detroit, the authority of experience was generally established as food (re)localization gained momentum at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Indeed, as mentioned above, the broader local food movement itself had in many ways already helped position experience as central to subnational food systems agendas. Battles over knowledge production in Detroit's food system therefore generally did not center on establishing the importance of experience over other epistemological areas (such as science), but rather in demarcating who and what constitutes a "valid" experiential expert and expertise. More specifically, these struggles centered on (re)positioning professionalized experience (and its coupled experts and expertise) as "outside" while simultaneously placing embedded experience (and its respective experts and expertise) as "inside". It is this boundary-work—at the professionalized | embedded interface—that is the focus below.

#### ***(1) Expulsion: Ridding Professionalized Experts and Expertise from Detroit's Food System***

Much of embedded experts' initial efforts to gain power in Detroit's food system centered on expelling professionalized experts from the influence they held at the time.. Specifically, embedded experts engaged in rhetoric that capitalized on the "unusually high...deep distrust" many Detroiters have of individuals, groups, and/or knowledge forms not based in and derived from the community (Bockmeyer 2000, p2418+) and positioned professionalized experts as outsiders whose knowledge was not grounded in, and thus potentially harmful to, the local community. At the same time, embedded experts emphasized they had much more relevant expertise worthy of influence. When commenting on the hiring of professionalized experts to provide input on a would-be influential plan for the city's urban agriculture, for instance, embedded experts criticized this as favoring outsider knowledge at the expense of residents' more pertinent, locally rooted, embedded expertise. Malik Yakini (1/22/2014), who was involved in much of this discourse, expressed in an interview:

*Some consultants who had been hired...had been brought in from New York, [so they] had very little knowledge of what was really happening on the ground... And we [local residents] were insulted by the process: that rather than coming to ask the people who are the expert practitioners what our vision was, we had some people who were not experts at all, who were bureaucrats essentially, presenting these ideas to us.*

Initially, embedded experts spread this type of critique through informal dialogues among “basically every African-American person that [they] knew in Detroit who had some interest in food” (Yakini 1/22/2014) while working garden plots, enjoying musical events, catching up in bookstores, and gathering at various other social spaces.

Embedded experts’ early rhetoric helped foster widespread concern among Detroiters about the nature of expertise in the food system, mobilizing enough residents to formally organize a concrete organization to expand the authority of embedded knowledge-ways over professionalized ones. Specifically, about forty local African-American urban agriculture enthusiasts, chefs, and social justice advocates convened to establish what would become known as the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network (DBCFSN) in mid-2000. A statement from the organization (2015) on its founding emphasizes race and place to frame the relevance of these community members over others:

*DBCFSN was formed in February 2006 to address food insecurity in Detroit’s Black community, and to organize members of that community to play a more active leadership role in the local food security movement. We observed that many of the key players in the local urban agriculture movement were young whites, who, while well intentioned, never the less exerted a degree of control inordinate to their numbers in Detroit’s population...It was and is our view that the most effective movements grow organically from the people whom they are designed to serve. Representatives of Detroit’s majority African-American population must be in the leadership.*

DBCFSN members subsequently engaged in strategic popular, political, and educational efforts to empower embedded experts and expertise over rivals. DBCFSN’s mission and operations (which includes a 7-acre urban farm, youth training program, and several other initiatives), for instance, privileges local residents and their knowledge as such. This has helped legitimize, enhance, and empower embedded experts and expertise by providing the recognition that they can be effective agents for change. Malik Yakini (in Jackman 2013), DBCFSN’s convener, touched on this in an interview:

*African-Americans have a particular problem: viewing agriculture through the lens of slavery and sharecropping and other forms of tenant farming. Those memories are often painful, and many black folks really shy away from that, viewed through the lens of*

*exploitive systems. We're reframing [black locals' knowledge and experience] as honorable... [increasingly] Detroiters have a strong voice within [food systems decision-making]...We're proud to participate in that dialogue, as we reshape food systems.*

Furthermore, in strengthening embedded experts and expertise in this way, DBCFSN has also helped displace professionalized experts from their dominant position of authority. While once employers, funders, and the media viewed only professionalized experts as worthy of attention vis-à-vis Detroit's food system, for example, DBCFSN members were soon becoming widely recognized as “experts [on] various social, political, economic, and legal issues”, themselves, invited over professionalized experts to speak at community food events, inform the media on food systems issues, present at pertinent national conferences, and even receive elite local and national accolades (Smiley 2015).

As their authority in the food system grew, embedded experts moved from expelling professionalized experts indirectly through establishing their own influence to directly displacing them from targeted positions of power. Consider the Detroit chapter of the international organization, Slow Food. Stacy Ordakowski launched Detroit's original Slow Food chapter, Slow Food Detroit, around 2008 to contribute to a healthy food system. Yet Ordakowski and many of Slow Food Detroit's members at the time were white, suburban residents who often staked their relevancy to Detroit's food system in knowledge acquired through employment (Ordakowski, for instance, worked as a health and wellness coordinator in greater Detroit area schools). Embedded experts thus tended to view Ordakowski and many of her colleagues as the very professionalized experts they wanted expelled from influence (Ordakowski 5/24/2013). Accordingly, around 2013, a handful of embedded experts—affiliated with and emboldened by DBCFSN—decided to shutdown Ordakowski's Slow Food Detroit chapter and launch a new one, Slow Food Detroit Central City, with embedded experts at the helm.

Embedded experts approached Slow Food USA, the overseeing national chapter, to urge for Slow Food Detroit's shut down in favor of their envisioned Slow Food Detroit Central City starting. In petitioning for this change, embedded experts again deployed rhetoric framing professionalized experts as—unlike embedded experts—potentially harmful outsiders whose expertise was not based in the appropriate geography or race to guide Detroit's food system. They stated that the existing Slow Food chapter's professionalized experts were exclusionary and unjust, holding meetings far away, “unwilling to allow in new leadership”, and furthering a



professionalized perspective “unable to fully represent Detroit” (Sage 12/5/2013). Phil Jones (2016), prominent chef, activist, and embedded expert, echoed this in a post to the local Slow Food chapter’s website:

*We have a burgeoning food scene here in Detroit that doesn’t see that people of color and our mothers, wives, friends and daughters have voices that are important and soul satisfying, because they do and they are. We, they, you, the underrepresented and underserved are a major part of everyone’s food story, but we are hidden from this significance... My story has value.*

To combat such exclusion, embedded experts argued they instead should lead the city’s Slow Food chapter with their race and residency forming the necessary foundation to effectively lead it.

Ultimately, embedded experts’ strategic boundary-work convinced Slow Food USA to facilitate the chapter re-organization, formally expelling professionalized experts from authority and placing embedded experts in power. Jovan Sage (12/5/2013), Associate Director of Network Engagement at Slow Food USA, explained this in an interview:

*[Embedded experts told Slow Food USA] they were not able to access this chapter and what this chapter is doing is not relevant to what’s actually happening in Detroit... and we firmly believe that each community should decide what are the best ways to build around good, clean, and fair food... So for us, we were just like, ‘okay, we’re committed to, much as we can, ensuring that this chapter can form a board that is representative of the city, that is representative of the makeup of the city... as far as race is concerned and ethnicity.*

Through strategic discursive efforts, embedded experts thus displaced professionalized knowledge-ways from positions of influence and (re)asserted themselves and their embedded expertise as more powerful.

## **(2) Expansion: Empowering Embedded Experts and Expertise through Food Governance**

Embedded experts also worked to advance their and their expertise’s authority in Detroit’s food system by expanding into new ontological domains altogether. In particular, they sought to establish “a policy environment that was supportive of the kind of localized food system that we wanted to build” (Yakini 1/22/2014), one that would favor embedded experts and expertise throughout decision-making. Initially, this effort involved embedded experts engaging in informal rhetoric across the community to develop and diffuse the notion that such a novel food policy arena was necessary. To help facilitate this, DBCFSN members created a policy

workgroup within their organization. This workgroup articulated that in-power professionalized experts had yet to ensure necessary standards (e.g. food security) across the city's food system through policy development and that the locally-rooted, black majority and know-how as such could better bring about these conditions. As these conversations and the participants involved grew, that embedded experts should lead Detroit's food policy gained increasing traction. A local grassroots organization reflected this in a statement:

*Detroit is rich with community, deep with history, and full with resources that reveal a narrative, our story... our "invisible capital" ... This power, while holding great potential for families and communities, is threatened by white supremacy...we witness inequity on the rise as access to good food is turned into a trend dominated by new, predominantly white Detroiters who rarely recognize or respect existing history and culture... In the face of this oppression we must work diligently so that all people are respected and valued...[through] just and equitable policies that inform the practice, governance, economics and allocation of resources within/across the food system. (Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice 2016).*

The notion that professionalized experts and expertise were irrelevant and potentially harmful thus spread throughout the community along with the coupled belief that embedded knowledge-ways could better advance conditions in the city, including through leading (new) food governance.

Members of DBCFSN's policy workgroup next moved to transform their rhetorical efforts into concrete government action. They conceived of what would become known as the Detroit Food Security Policy, expanding embedded experts and expertise's power by requiring officials to "identify and eliminate barriers to African-American participation and ownership in all aspects of the food system," among other things (Detroit City Council 2008). DBCFSN members approached the Neighborhood and Services Standing Committee of City Council with their idea. They chose this committee strategically, believing its chair, JoAnn Watson, would be especially supportive due to her dedication to the very race and place-based intellectual dynamics in which much of embedded expertise is based (Yakini 1/22/2014). To this committee, embedded experts argued that legislation was needed to address multiple ills in the city's food system, and they again positioned embedded expertise as most relevant to guiding such developments. For example, drawing largely on their and other black residents' experiences, culture, and history, embedded experts articulated problems with food access, such as poor grocery options, and the alienation of African-Americans from land and capital, referencing both

present barriers to citizens' ability to purchase city lots as well as the historic exploitation of blacks to profit others. They then criticized officials and professional experts in power for their failure to better ameliorate these conditions, and they urged for the Food Security Policy to be established with embedded knowledge-ways in command (e.g. Detroit Black Community Food Security Network 2015; Yakini 1/22/2014).

The Neighborhood and Services Standing Committee supported the Food Security Policy idea—compelled by embedded experts' framings of the issues at stake—and appointed DBCFSN's own members with drafting the legislation. This endorsement legitimized embedded expertise as a sufficient basis for policymaking and solidified embedded experts as the primary authorities to spearheading food governance. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), a senior official with the City Planning Commission, explained in an interview that these measures were not accidental:

*We [city officials] realized there's still a lot of folk, black folk, other folk of color, that have good ideas that may not have that education [as professionalized experts do], that may not have that access... But there's a lot of knowledge and expertise already in the community, and we need to be intentional about bringing it together [in policymaking].*

With this, embedded experts and expertise thus successfully began expanding into a new ontological domain altogether: municipal food governance.

In drafting the Food Security Policy, those involved worked to heighten the role and impact of embedded experts and expertise throughout Detroit's food system. While they conducted some research into Toronto and Chicago's food security policies, the legislation's drafters primarily leveraged embedded know-how to inform the bulk of the draft. The Policy's (City of Detroit 2008) section on economic injustice, for instance, emphasizes African-American residents' experiences and beliefs as a foundation for policymaking, stating:

*It is unknown whether any food wholesalers, farmers, distributors or food processing facilities providing food for the city of Detroit are owned, operated, or even hire Detroiters, specifically African-Americans; or if any of the food products consumed in our community were developed by people from our community. Aside from cashiers, baggers, stock persons and a few butchers, Detroiters, specifically African-Americans, are absent from the food system. Our primary and predominant role is that of consumer.*

Indeed, even with certain dynamics “unknown” they are included in the policy (in recognition that the public's embedded understandings are important), and the inclusion of “our” supports the legislation's validity as written by and for Detroit's majority black population.

The Food Security Policy drafters next circulated the legislation amongst attendees at DBCFSN's annual Harvest Festival for public input. This festival's attendees tend to primarily include members of Detroit's black community—especially those involved in food and/or justice work who consider their pertinent knowledge to be largely identity and place-based. It was therefore this portion of the public that had the chance to learn in detail about the proposed policy and provide verbal and written comments on it before an official vote. Gloria Rivera (8/19/2013), whose organization co-sponsored the festival, emphasized that privileging embedded experts and expertise in this way was purposeful: “we want[ed] the people most affected to have access to the conversation and the decision-making... to transform the government [by] transforming whose heart and mind [formed policy].” Much of this public's comments were then incorporated into a revised Food Security Policy, which was presented to City Council shortly after. Officials “enthusiastically” supported expanding experiential expertise into food governance, and they lauded the “groundbreaking” legislation when adopting it into law (Watson 2008).

The Food Security Policy's approval not only helped legitimize embedded experts and expertise's role in municipal food governance, but it also helped further expand this authority by mandating the creation of the Detroit Food Policy Council (DFPC). The DFPC is a decision-making body comprised of local government officials and community members who together guide food policy and a number of broader food systems initiatives. Much as occurred with the Food Security Policy, officials tasked embedded experts with creating the DFPC. Malik Yakini (1/22/2014), who helped lead this process, explained that these experts' goal throughout was to again further embedded experts and expertise, ensuring that “the grassroots continues to have a large voice” over other—especially professionalized—knowledge-ways. The DFPC by-laws therefore include a number of geographic and identity-based requirements, including mandating members to include six at-large community representatives and an overall membership balance that “will represent the ethnic/cultural, economic, generational, and gender diversity of the city's residents.” The by-laws also require councilmembers to be local residents or representatives of Detroit-based institutions who vow to “conduct the Council's business in ways that embodies a commitment to anti-racist, anti-sexist, and anti-elitist processes and outcomes” (Detroit Food Policy Council 2011). With such stipulations, since its conception in 2009 the DFPC has

subsequently furthered embedded experts and expertise's authority over professionalized ones throughout municipal food policy and beyond.

### ***(3) Protection of Autonomy: Fighting Embedded Experts and Expertise's Exploitation***

As embedded experts and expertise gained power throughout Detroit's food system, rivals began to exploit this authority in ways embedded experts felt threatened their and their expertise's position. Consider, for example, the case of John Hantz, who proposed launching a large-scale urban farm to revive Detroit's economy. Hantz himself grew up in Detroit and remains a resident of its Indian Village neighborhood. He argued that it was this—his locally-rooted experience—which motivated the project: "I'd drive through blighted neighborhoods in the city...[and realize] that large scale farming could begin to take land out of circulation in a positive way" (in Kavanaugh 2010). Despite his residency, though, Hantz, a white millionaire, generally defied the boundaries Detroit's mostly African-American, lower-income residents were constructing around who and what counts as an embedded expert in Detroit's food system. Consequently, embedded experts quickly identified Hantz as an inauthentic embedded expert exploiting their authority.

To fight the perceived exploitation of their authority, embedded experts positioned actors such as Hantz as invalid embedded experts the public should neither trust nor support. For instance, they publicly questioned the relevance of Hantz's experience to Detroit's food system and framed him as manipulating embedded knowledge for self-benefit. Some of this rhetoric was informal, including ad-hoc discussions among DBCFSN members as occurred initially in the abovementioned expulsion and expansion efforts. Yet frequently these efforts included more formal efforts—such as hosting public forums, publishing targeted pieces in local media, and releasing official statements—to spread the discourse that Hantz threatened the local food system with his inauthentic and "demonstrated lack of knowledge of urban culture" (Reddit Detroit 2012). They suggested aspects of Hantz's identity, including his net-worth, precluded him from the necessary experience to qualify as an embedded expert and argued he should thus not achieve power, affirming that area "policies and processes [...must] reflect the will and priorities of the community [...and] not give undue favor to the wealthy" (Detroit Food Policy Council 2012).

In addition, embedded experts worked to shape and accelerate into law a Detroit Urban Agriculture Ordinance that would protect their and their expertise's authority, including in the face of attempted exploitation. They aimed for the ordinance to, for example, require public input on any proposed farm over one acre (such as Hantz's). Such a provision promised embedded experts the opportunity to have their knowledge and perspectives weighed ahead of decision-making. The Planning Commission was receptive to this idea—in part because of the prior boundary-work embedded experts had achieved—and moved forward in drafting the ordinance through a largely citizen-driven process that again valued embedded experts and expertise. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), the official spearheading the ordinance drafting process, explained, “it was actually once the big folks got in the room, [like] Hantz...that I drew a line in the sand. It was like no, [the embedded experts] in Detroit will decide what happens here and how it happens...It was very intentional, the kind of deep community engagement and involvement that we did [when drafting the Urban Agriculture Ordinance].” Based in the knowledge-ways informing it, in 2013 City Council approved the ordinance to offer further protections for embedded experts and expertise's influence.

#### ***(4) Accommodation: Transforming Professionalized Rivals into Experiential Allies***

At times the expulsion, expansion, and protection of autonomy efforts Detroit's embedded experts engaged in threatened these experts' own credibility in the public eye—and thus, too, their boundaries in-the-making. While many Detroiters respected embedded experts' position that professionalized experts were “outsiders” who should not dominate the food system, often residents also recognized that professionalized experts nonetheless could play a beneficial role in this system, as well. These experts frequently brought know-how useful for developing food enterprises, attracted funding to support local food, and presented a willingness to work with embedded experts to benefit as many as possible. Ridding professionalized experts from influence altogether thus at times raised public concern about the intentions and legitimacy of embedded experts, themselves.

To maintain their credibility and their authority, embedded experts subsequently engaged in boundary-work that strategically facilitated professionalized experts crossing embedded professional demarcations to play a (constrained) role in Detroit's food system. Consider, for example, the DFPC, described above. While embedded experts drove the DFPC to reflect and

augment their own standing and expertise, they also strategically made space for professionalized experts to be part of decision-making provided they abide by certain conditions. For example, the DFPC's by-laws allow members to be non-Detroit residents if they are affiliated with a Detroit-based institution (thus approximating the place-based aspects of embedded expertise) and vow to resist behaving in ways that "reflects and perpetuates the social inequalities present in the broader society" (to align with the identity-driven aspects of embedded expertise) (Detroit Food Policy Council 2011). With these provisions, embedded experts therefore allowed professionalized experts constricted access to their side of the boundary while protecting embedded experts and expertise's overall power. I term this type of strategic inclusion "*accommodation.*"

Accommodation occurred in Detroit in myriad ways, including in the much more explicit and far-reaching boundary-work embedded experts engaged in through the Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice organization. This initiative began after embedded experts met at a conference panel in Detroit emphasizing race and place-based discourses in the context of food. Panel attendees realized they shared an interest in increasing similar dialogues across the city's food system. They believed such discussions could empower embedded experts *and* engage professionalized experts with concepts of privilege and oppression so they could align with—rather than rival—elements central to embedded expertise. They thus founded Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice to promote "a deeper analysis in the community of how white supremacy impacts the food system and how food systems actors can work collectively to mitigate that impact" through public discussions, intensive trainings, and a variety of workshops and panels (Detroit Black Community Food Security Network 2015). Some embedded experts have been actively recruited to participate in these activities, with the organization hoping to help "people with lived experience build capacity" (Cabbil 9/5/2013). Meanwhile professionalized experts tend to seek out Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice to validate their role in the food system. For example, many Detroiters questioned Earthworks Urban Farm, a prominent local non-profit, staffs' legitimacy comprised predominantly of professionalized experts; several staff therefore engaged with Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice to better home their own race and place-based knowledge and gain credibility. Earthworks' website (2016) explains some of this:

*Our Program Manager is a white male who didn't grow up in the community, and our leadership within the larger organization of the Capuchin Soup Kitchen is also largely white men. Our volunteer base is also largely made up of white volunteers from outside*

*of Detroit...While all of this could be considered to be problematic, we also see opportunity in this...We work closely with the organization Uprooting Racism, [Planting Justice]... as a working study in both social justice and in knowing.*

Still others have been exposed to the initiative by accident, coming across workshop and panels at events held throughout the city. For instance, attendees at the annual Detroit Food Summit in 2014 were encouraged to “explore ideas of exploitation, extraction of local resources, race, and class as it relates to... primarily white academic institution[s] and well-meaning and well-funded initiative[s]” through a conference session Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice helped host (Detroit Food Policy Council 2014).

Through Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice, many embedded and professionalized experts have been accommodated inside the embedded | professionalized boundary. While this meant conceding some power, embedded experts facilitated such accommodation to ensure their legitimacy and maintain embedded experience’s overall authority. Shane Bernardo (7/18/2013), who is involved in both Earthworks Urban Farm and Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice, explained some of this in an interview:

*One of the questions we [embedded experts] were asking ourselves is, ‘how much do we dedicate towards pushing back [against professionalized experts] and how much of our resources and time and people power do we (re)dedicate to building the vision [together] for what we want to see going forward?’ ... We’ve found that through some sort of anti-oppression training [where] the white caucus focuses on internalized privilege, internalized white supremacy, internalized white privilege, and the people of color caucus might focus on internalized racism or colonialism, and we each bring that greater awareness to our work...then this can be a healing way of doing [food systems work] that honors our previous traditions and [embedded expertise].*

Meanwhile, professionalized experts participated in this accommodation despite it requiring them to adjust, as well, because they believed doing so would allow them to best (re)attain some meaningful food systems influence. Jess Daniel (6/6/2013), who moved to Detroit in the late 2000s to help launch a now prominent food non-profit, explained some of this in an interview:

*I didn’t really grow up with a critical race lens at all. But I think being dropped into Detroit and particularly Detroit food’s scene, so much of [the expertise is rooted in] race, it is, like, the purpose of it. The purpose is empowerment for certain populations. The purpose is self-determination... And that’s one of the reasons why I [made race-based knowledge a focus of my work]... Now [embedded experts] are an ally.*



Though it required adaptation amongst competing expert authorities, through accommodation both rivals thus achieved some feelings of success and the boundaries around embedded experience in Detroit's food system were generally preserved.

## **Conclusion**

This analysis sheds light on how boundary-work plays out in the context of experience. In Detroit's food system, embedded experts engaged in four specific boundary activities—expulsion, expansion, protection of autonomy, and accommodation—to establish the authority of themselves and their embedded expertise. Specifically, they constructed boundaries that favored knowledge-ways based in specific experiences with race and place while simultaneously “othering” know-how rooted in more formal work experience. Through this strategic boundary-work, the often less resourced embedded experts of Detroit were thus able to achieve unprecedented power over professionalized experts and (re)define whose and what experience counts when shaping social and political change in the city's food system.

Additionally, this study underscores the concept of *accommodation*, an important element of boundary-work underdeveloped in the scholarly literature. Accommodation occurs when an expert authority allows rivals to cross existing epistemological delineations based on certain conditions. This requires modification amongst competing experts, but both agree to participate to better their legitimacy and influence. Moreover, through accommodation, the general boundaries around an epistemological area (in this case, embedded experience) remain in tact and are further insulated from rival challenges. Moving forward, there is significant room for further research into this element of boundary-work. Indeed, the above discussion examines accommodation in the context of one epistemological area and solely in the case of Detroit's food system. Further attention to the dynamics around and comprising accommodation will better our understanding of knowledge construction in a range of instances.

## **Notes**

1. “Experience” includes a range of lived events, conditions, history, and culture. When people convert, consciously or not, their experiences to make sense of the social world, this constitutes “experiential knowledge”. Through the shared contesting, negotiating,

- and (re)constructing of this knowledge, a communal “expert” understanding— “experiential expertise”—emerges (e.g. Caron-Flinterman, Broerse, and Bunders 2005).
2. Typically, these conferences bring ten to fifteen citizens together to evaluate a technology with input from select experts and materials. After, citizens deliberate and develop conclusions on the technology for technical elites, policymakers, and the public to consider (e.g. Anderson and Jaeger 1999).
  3. In fact, in some cases publics participating in consensus conferences are so “aware of the existing power distribution...instead of confronting it, they deliberately conform to the role expected by the authorities” (Nishizawa 2005, p486).

### **Works Cited**

- Allen, Barbara L. (2003) *Uneasy Alchemy: Citizens and Experts in Louisiana’s Chemical Corridor Disputes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Allen, Barbara L. (2004) “Shifting boundary work: Issues and tensions in environmental health science in the case of Grand Bois, Louisiana.” *Science as Culture*. 13(4): 429-48.
- Anderson, Ida-Elisabeth and Birgit Jaeger. (1999). “Scenario workshops and consensus conferences: towards more democratic decision-making.” *Science and Public Policy*. 26(5): 331–40.
- Bernardo, Shane. (7/18/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Blok, Anders. (2007) “Experts on public trial: on democratizing expertise through a Danish consensus conference.” *Public Understanding of Science*. 16(2): 163–82.
- Bockmeyer, Janice. (2000) “A Culture of Distrust: The Impact of Local Political Culture on Participation in the Detroit EZ.” *Urban Studies*. 37(13): 2417– 40.
- Brown, Phil, Stephen Zavestoski, Sabrina McCormick, Brian Mayer, Rachel Morello-Frosch and Rebecca Gasior Altman. (2004) “Embodied health movements: new approaches to social movements in health.” *Sociology of Health and Illness*. 26(1): 50–80.
- Cabbil, Lila. (9/5/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Cabbil, Lila. (2014). “About.” Interview for SHINE. Accessed March 15 at: <http://www.whiteprivilegeconference.com/shine.html>.
- Corburn, Jason. (2005) *Street Science: Community Knowledge and Environmental Health Justice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Daniel, Jess. (6/6/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Detroit Black Community Food Security Network. (2015) “About Us.” Organizational Website. Accessed October 15 at: <http://detroitblackfoodsecurity.org/about.html>.
- Detroit City Council. (2008) “Food Security Policy.” Accessed March 15, 2016 at: <http://detroitblackfoodsecurity.org/policy.html>.
- Detroit Food Policy Council. (2011) “By-Laws.” Available at: <http://detroitfoodpolicycouncil.net>.
- Detroit Food Policy Council. (2012) “Public Land Sale Process in Detroit: A Community Perspective.” Report. Available by Request.
- Detroit Food Policy Council. (2014) “Detroit Food 2014: Race to Good Food.” Conference Program. Available by Request.
- Goodman, David, E. Melanie DuPuis, and Michael K. Goodman. (2005) *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice, and Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Earthworks. (2016) “About Us.” Organizational Website. Accessed March 15: [http://www.cskdetroit.org/earthworks/about\\_us](http://www.cskdetroit.org/earthworks/about_us).

- Edwards, Bob, and John D. McCarthy. (2004) "Resources and Social Movement Mobilization." Pp 116-153 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Einsiedel, E.F., Jelsoe, E. and Breck, T. (2001) "Publics at the Technology Table: The Consensus Conference in Denmark, Canada, and Australia." *Public Understanding of Science*. 10(1): 83-98.
- Epstein, Steven. (1996) *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ferretti, Maria Paola and Vincenzo Pavone. (2009) "What do Civil Society Organizations Expect from Participation in Science? Lessons from Germany and Spain on the issue of GMOs." *Science and Public Policy*. 36(4): 287-99.
- Caron-Flinterman, J. Francisca, Jacqueline E.W. Broerse, and Joske F.G. Bunders. (2005) "The experiential knowledge of patients: a new resource for biomedical research?" *Social Science and Medicine*. 60: 2575-84.
- Frickel, Scott. (2011) "Who are the Expert Activists of Environmental Health Justice?" Pp 21-39 in *Engineers, Scientists, and Environmental Justice: Transforming Expert Cultures through Grassroots Engagement*, eds. Benjamin Cohen and Gwen Ottinger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gieryn, Thomas. (1983) "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review*. 48(6): 781-95.
- Guston, David H. (2000) *Between Politics and Science: Assuring the Integrity and Productivity Of Research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Guston, David H. (1999). "Stabilizing the boundary between US politics and science: The role of the Office of Technology Transfer as a boundary organization." *Social Studies of Science*. 29 (1): 87-112.
- Guston, David H. (2001) "Boundary Organizations in Environmental Policy and Science: An Introduction." *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. 26(4): 399-408.
- Hebron, Jerry. (8/28/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Hilgartner, Stephen. (2000) *Science on Stage: Expert Advice as Public Drama*. Stanford University Press.
- Hinrichs, Claire C. (2003) "The practice and politics of food system localization." *Journal of Rural Studies*. 19: 33-45.
- Jackman, Michael. (2013) "Detroit Black Community Food Security Network's Growing Determination." *Detroit Metro Times*. October 2.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. (1990) *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. (2005) *Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, Phil. (2016) "I, too, \_\_\_\_ America..." Blog Post. Detroit Slow Food Central City. March 30. Accessed April 1 at: <https://slowfooddetroitcentralcity.wordpress.com>.
- Kavanaugh, Kelli B. (2010) "John Hantz: The man has a plan, but does Detroit have a farming future?" Feature Article. Model D. October 24.
- Lamont, Michele and Virag Molnar. (2002) "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28:167-95
- Lyson, Thomas A. (2004) *Civic Agriculture: Reconnecting Farm, Food and Community*. Boston,

- MA: Tufts University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. (1996) "Political Opportunities: Conceptual Origins, Current Problems, and Future Directions." Pp 23-40 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movement: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, David S., and Debra C. Minkoff. (2004) "Conceptualizing Political Opportunity." *Social Forces*. 82(4): 1457-92.
- Moore, Kelly. (1996) "Organizing Integrity: American Science and the Creation of Public Interest Organizations, 1955-1975." *American Journal of Sociology*. 101(6): 1592-1627.
- Morrell, Erica. (2015) "Unpacking Frame Resonance: Professional and Experiential Expertise in Intellectual Property Rights Contention." *Mobilization*. 20(3): 361-78.
- Nishizawa, Mariko. (2005) "Citizen deliberations on science and technology and their social environments: case study on the Japanese consensus conference on GM crops." *Science and Public Policy*. 32(6): 479-89.
- Ordakowski, Stacy. (5/24/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Ottinger, Gwen and Benjamin Cohen. (2011) *Technoscience and Environmental Justice: Expert Cultures in a Grassroots Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Owens, Michele. (2008) "Gardening to Save Detroit". *Oprah Magazine*. April Issue.
- Parthasarathy, Shobita. (2010) "Breaking the Expertise Barrier: Understanding Activist Strategies in Science and Technology Policy Domains." *Science and Public Policy*. 37(5): 355-67.
- Reddit Detroit. (2012) "Let's Talk About Hantz Farms." Online Dialogue. Accessed April 1, 2016 at: [https://www.reddit.com/r/Detroit/comments/14228y/lets\\_talk\\_about\\_hantz\\_farms/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Detroit/comments/14228y/lets_talk_about_hantz_farms/).
- Rivera, Gloria. (8/19/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Ryzik, Melena. (2010) "Detroit's Renewal, Slow-Cooked." *The New York Times*. October 19.
- Sage, Jovan. (12/5/2013) Personal Interview. New York City, New York.
- Sauer, Andrea. (2012) "Food Policy Councils." Community Food Security Coalition. Website No Longer Available.
- Score, Mike. (6/18/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Smiley, Tavis. (2015) "Detroit Town Hall." PBS Television Programming. Accessed April 1, 2016 at: <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/tavissmiley>.
- T.R. (7/10/2013) Personal Interview. Telephone Communication. (Anonymity Requested)
- Underwood, Kathryn. (9/20/2013) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- United States Department of Agriculture. (2012) "National Count of Farmers Market Directory Listings." Agriculture Marketing Service.
- Uprooting Racism, Planting Justice. (2016) Organizational Website. Visited March 15 at: <http://www.uprootingracismdetroit.org>.
- Watson, JoAnn. (2008) Testimony in Transcript of the March Meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Service Standing Committee. Detroit Municipal Archives. Available by Appointment.
- Yakini, Malik. (1/22/2014) Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.

## Chapter 3

### Direct and Indirect Policy Feedback Effects and the Transformation of Local Food Movement Participants in Two American Cities

#### **Abstract**

Across hundreds of cities, local food movement participants are working to (re)localize food by moving its control, production, and distribution to the municipal level. But while their efforts may be similar, their intentions often are not. Indeed, these participants variously seek to (re)localize food for environmental, economic, and social reasons, resulting in a generally decentralized movement with a high level of independent action. Nonetheless, by the mid-2010s local food movement participants in the cities of Cleveland and Detroit, U.S.A., unexpectedly came to unify their goals. Through a comparative, qualitative analysis, this article demonstrates that local food policy played a significant role in bringing about these outcomes. Specifically, two categories of policy feedback effects—direct and indirect—are shown to have critically shaped Cleveland and Detroit’s local food movement participants’ goals. *Direct policy feedback effects* occur when government influences certain social actors (in this case, local food movement participants) head-on. *Indirect policy feedback effects*, meanwhile, take place as policymaking shapes these same social actors secondarily by first influencing the wider public. Considering both types of effects in policy studies promise to better highlight citizens as active agents, themselves, and help clarify governance | society relations, in turn. Additionally, this article demonstrates and makes a case for further analyzing rising local food policy’s consequential implications.

#### **Keywords**

Policy feedback effects, Local, Food, Movements, Policy, Mass Publics

## **Introduction**

Across the United States and much of the globe, grassroots, non-profit, business, and governmental actors are variously attempting to (re)localize food by moving its control, production, and distribution to the municipal level. Their efforts are often captured under the term “local food movement,” which connotes a level of local food systems co-promotion amongst diverse actors. Yet participants in this movement rarely agree about everything (1). Some of the movement’s actors desire to (re)localize food because of goals associated with the environment, others the economy, and still others social justice, for example, and they often have disparate approaches to achieving these outcomes (e.g. Cockrall-King 2012; Hinrichs 2003; Hinrichs and Lyson 2007). There thus tends to be a high level of independent action and lack of centralization within much of the local food movement (e.g. Starr 2010).

Participants in the local food movement of two American cities, Cleveland and Detroit, at first epitomized the wider movement’s trend toward autonomy. Starting around 2000, these actors variously launched urban farms, farmers’ markets, educational and job-training non-profits, and food businesses, for example, in an effort to (re)localize food in Cleveland and Detroit for varied economic, health, equity, and ecological purposes. Yet by the mid-2010s, these movement participants took on a generally unified aim in each place. In Cleveland, the majority of local food movement participants explicitly committed to the goal of sustainable economic growth. This perspective holds that the dominant problems in the local food system are issues such as environmental degradation and unemployment and the chief solutions worthy of focus consequently concern ecological and economic development. In contrast, in Detroit, most movement members came to express aims unequivocally tied to advancing social justice. Here, the dominant problems in the food system are considered to be issues such as racial exclusion and disparities in community involvement and benefit; hand-in-hand, the solutions worthy of pursuit center on addressing the food system’s structural inequities.

The unification of goals among Cleveland and Detroit’s food movement participants along sustainable economic growth and social justice, respectfully, is surprising in light of the local food movement’s wider tendency to lack centralization and because it required many movement members—including well-resourced ones—to commit to consequential and at times risky changes to their very missions and associated activities. Moreover, Cleveland and Detroit are quite alike geographically, economically, demographically, socially, and historically (2); that

local food movement participants between each place arrived at altogether different collective goals for (re)localization is thus even more puzzling. Why, then, did local food movement participants in Cleveland unify around the goal of sustainable economic growth and those in Detroit around social justice?

Through a comparative, qualitative analysis of food (re)localization in the two cities, I find that Cleveland's food movement participants unified their goals around sustainable economic growth and Detroit's around social justice due largely to the nature of food policy that emerged in each place (3). As the local food movement has gained momentum, hundreds of cities, including both Cleveland and Detroit, have seen a corresponding rise in local food policy. This includes legislation around issues such as urban agriculture, the establishment of formal local food decision-making bodies, and even the funneling of municipal resources to support area food systems activities. In Cleveland, this food policy has generally been concerned with managing food to achieve economic and environmental objectives; in contrast, in Detroit food policy tends to be centered more on bringing about more equitable relations through food systems regulation. "Policy feedback" captures the potential for such types of food policy, once created, to (re)shape society through distinct effects (e.g. Skocpol 1992). These effects included influencing social problem construction and the solutions societies seek, in turn. It is due largely to these very effects that I argue food movement participants in Cleveland and Detroit variously (re)framed their goals in alignment with sustainable economic growth and social justice, respectfully.

In analyzing policy feedback effects in Cleveland and Detroit, I locate and argue that there are two specific types of feedback by which food policy shaped local food movement participants: what I term "direct" and "indirect" policy feedback effects. *Direct policy feedback effects* refer to instances where government influences certain social actors (in this case, local food movement participants) head-on. For example, in Cleveland the city's Re-Imagining a More Sustainable Cleveland program provided concrete resources—including land and funding—provided recipients committing to work towards sustainability and economic development; in so doing, this political program directly influenced the rhetoric of food movement participants, who (re)framed their goals in pursuit of these resources. *Indirect policy feedback effects*, meanwhile, connotes the potential for policymaking to shape these same social actors secondarily by first influencing mass publics. Also in Cleveland, for instance, the city's Year of Local Food worked

to mobilize the public to embrace and participate in food (re)localization efforts aimed at achieving positive economic and environmental change, in particular. This call encouraged many Cleveland residents to contribute to local food initiatives whose objectives explicitly focused on sustainable economic development. To attract such inspired members of the public, many local food initiatives consequently (re)framed their goals accordingly. Indirectly, then, food policy continued to influence local food movement participants through first shaping the mass public's attitudes and behavior.

While food studies scholars have begun to examine municipal food governance, scarce attention has been paid to food policy's impact on the very movement participants who helped bring it about. This study offers a step toward addressing this gap. Additionally, this research contributes to the policy feedback and associated literatures, which tend to under-address indirect policy feedback effects and the power mass publics wield through them.

### **Lessons from Food and Policy Studies**

Over the last two decades, food studies literature has increasingly focused on municipal food policymaking itself. Substantial research now identifies local governments as key actors in food (re)localization. Wekerle's (2004) analysis based in Toronto shows that the city's government provided critical leadership, staffing, and policy support to the city's local food security movement. In analyzing London's Food Board and Food Strategy, Reynolds (2009) too finds that coordinated government approaches to urban food issues have been central to the development of local food systems. Several analyses of municipal food policymaking also address why certain food systems issues get on city officials' agendas in the first place, how local governments negotiate their responses, and the challenges and opportunities to implementing the legislation that results (e.g. Lang, Barling, and Caraher 2009; Mansfield and Mendes 2013; Mendes 2007).

In general, however, food studies scholarship has yet to analyze municipal food policy's impacts on future governance and/or social organization, itself. Nonetheless, there is evidence to support that examining such "policy feedback effects" is both needed—empirically, to capture realities on the ground—and useful—theoretically, to understand alternative food movements and food systems more generally (4). In studying Vancouver, for example, Mendes (2008) suggests that local food policymaking may be fostering new networks, ideas and practices which



can alter urban trajectories altogether. Wekerle (2004) and Roberts (2010) too indicate that municipal food decision-making may have ongoing implications, including (re)shaping local lawmakers' behavior and social activism even beyond a given city's boundaries.

Research on policy feedback effects is itself somewhat nascent, yet there is a strong tradition of study which forms its foundation and can effectively help guide its application to food policy. As early as 1935, for example, Schattschneider suggested that new policies create new politics. In the 1960s, scholars began to adapt Schattschneider's assertion into three main streams of inquiry regarding how policies shape: (1) future governance (e.g. Lowi 1964); (2) meanings of democracy and citizenship (e.g. Marshall 1965); and (3) the public's beliefs, attitudes, and action (e.g. Edelman 1971). In the early 1990s, these three streams were drawn together under the term policy feedback and related research has since grown considerably (e.g. Beland 2010).

In 2004, Mettler and Soss drew on the proliferating policy feedback scholarship to develop a single framework for understanding how political decision-making might affect specific policy targets and mass opinion and behavior. This framework focuses on five particular empirical relationships, one of which includes the framing of social issues. "Framing" is an active, meaning-making process by which actors strategically diagnose a problem, propose solutions, and motivate others to rise up and join in pursuing particular change (e.g. Benford and Snow 2000). How social issues are framed matters because this shapes what is to be done, and how, more widely. Mettler and Soss (2004) emphasize the importance of policy on how others view issue areas, arguing that by acknowledging and addressing particular problems through equally specific legislative solutions, governance conveys formative messages to society about the nature of various social matters (see, also, e.g. Mettler 2002; Pierson 1993; Schneider and Ingram 1997; Soss and Schram 2007). Rather than policy targets' and mass publics' beliefs and behaviors flowing from some underlying element of individual or group psychology, then, such notions instead stem largely from the diagnostic and prognostic framing central in a given political context (e.g. Nelson and Kinder 1996; Zaller 1992). Consider policymaking and the public's perception of drug abuse, for example: drug education and treatment programs tend to foster mass understandings of drug abuse as public health problem with users viewed as victims in need of help, whereas law enforcement based approaches frequently promote notions of drug abuse as a matter of personal responsibility with users widely viewed as social deviants (e.g.

Sharp 1994). Common patterns of thinking in a given society—whether among specific movement participants or the mass public—can thus be viewed, in part, as a politically constructed outcome.

Social movements scholarship corroborates much of the policy feedback approach to viewing public understandings as politically constrained and enabled (e.g. McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996). This literature examines policy impacts especially on the very types of social movement actors with which the following study of Cleveland and Detroit is concerned (e.g. Anheier, Neidhardt, and Vortkamp 1998; Evans 1997; Mooney and Hunt 1996). Flam (1996), for example, shows that repressive political conditions in Poland directly affected the Workers' Defense Committee in creating broad symbolic-moral frames uncharacteristic in Western democracies. And in their analysis of agrarian mobilization, Mooney and Hunt (1996) similarly find that broader political conditions can affect a frame's resonance and motivate movement actors to reframe issues in response.

Based on much of the abovementioned scholarship, when I began examining framing in the context of Cleveland and Detroit's food systems, I expected that my analysis would chiefly reveal what I term *direct policy feedback effects*: instances whereby policy impacts targets—in my case, the food movement participants whose unified goals I sought to better understand—immediately, without any significant mediating effects (5).

*Direct policy feedback effect:*  
government → targeted actor

Yet as I engaged in this analysis, I found that mass publics at times serve as intermediaries in this relationship, first interpreting and leveraging food policy in distinct ways and then placing corresponding pressure on food movement participants to shape these latter actors, in turn. In other words, I discovered that policy affects particular actors (in this case, local food movement participants) via, what I term, *indirect policy feedback effects*: occasions in which policymaking influences targeted actors secondarily by first shaping mass publics.

*Indirect policy feedback effect:*  
government → mass publics → targeted actor

A few other studies highlight such effects. In analyzing U.S. peace movements, Marullo, Pagnucco, and Smith (1996) show, for example, that federal changes concerning arms control under President Reagan's administration *directly* "allowed for, and necessitated, a change in [movement] framing to accommodate the new reality" (p22). Additionally, these authors articulate that official moves such as the signing of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces agreement also *indirectly* shaped the peace movement's framing strategies by first leading "to the withdrawal of public concern over nuclear weapons issues" (p22). Indeed, it was the public's response to policy which compelled the movement to further shift its rhetoric away from nuclear weapons, in particular, to other aspects of the peace movements' concern.

With some exceptions, at present most scholarship analyzes in-depth direct policy feedback effects alone, with scarce attention paid to the role mass publics may play as powerful intermediary agents in policy | society relations. Nonetheless, scholars agree that policy is subject to public debate and interpretation; it is thus essential to take seriously that how something like food policy might constrain or enable any given movement participant's objectives is thus partially contingent on the mass publics' own construal (e.g. Gamson and Meyer 1996; Goodwin and Jasper 1999; Koopmans and Duyvendak 1995). Indeed, the particular outcomes I analyze in Cleveland and Detroit would be inexplicable without regarding both direct and indirect policy feedback effects combined, as likely would those in Marullo, Pagnucco, and Smith's (1996) abovementioned case, along with numerous others. Paying greater attention to indirect policy feedback effects is also beneficial because it can help scholars better evaluate citizens as active agents who themselves wield power by uniquely translating political structures and cultures to (re)make socio-political order, in turn. Many policy feedback scholars have called for such an increase in citizen-centered considerations (e.g. Mettler and Sorelle 2014; Mettler and Soss 2004; Soss and Schram 2007).

In the following section, I briefly review the methods and data for this study. I then provide a birds-eye examination of Cleveland and Detroit's food system. This discussion offers a general outline of the history and nature of food (re)localization between the two cities and delivers a broad foundation of evidence concerning policy's affects on local food movement participants and their goals. I proceed with an in-depth investigation of two particularly illuminating cases drawn from each city: Chateau Hough, in Cleveland, and Whole Foods

Market, in Detroit (6). Chateau Hough is an urban agriculture initiative that started out with specific racial justice goals. Yet within a few years of conception, its founder radically moved to a mission focused on environmental sustainability and economic development. Meanwhile, Whole Foods Market is a national grocery chain with stated profit, food quality, and environmental goals. Yet just a few years after proposing its Detroit location, the Market's leadership dramatically altered the store's aims to addressing food systems inequities. As I examine each case, I underscore how rising food policy—via direct and indirect policy feedback effects—helped to bring about these shifts in both Chateau Hough and Whole Foods Market. The paper concludes with a review of this analysis' chief contributions and a consideration of future directions for research.

### **Data and Methods**

This study is comparative—focusing on Cleveland and Detroit—and qualitative—with data derived from numerous primary source documents, over forty-eight hours of observation, and over seventy in-depth interviews. Comparative inquiry helps avoid particularized insights to allow for potentially generalizable trends to be identified, and qualitative methods are important to capturing the personal experiences individuals and groups have with public policy. Documents analyzed include archival records from the official bodies involved in regulating municipal food (including from Cleveland and Detroit's City Council, the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition, and the Detroit Food Policy Council), along with pertinent area websites, popular articles, and non-governmental paraphernalia. Additionally, observation and corresponding note taking was completed in Cleveland and Detroit at municipal hearings, food policy coalition/council meetings, and local food events (such as conferences and educational initiatives). Finally, semi-structured interviews lasting between thirty minutes and two hours were recorded and later transcribed with actors from structured food systems' categories in both Cleveland and Detroit, including representatives from food systems non-profits, health and educational institutions, grassroots community groups, food businesses, and municipal agencies. All data was coded and analyzed using a grounded theory approach.

### **Changes in Policy, Changes in Goals: Cleveland and Detroit's Food Systems**

#### ***The Birds-Eye View***

Around the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century a number of people in Cleveland began expanding local food systems efforts to achieve varied goals. In early 2000, for example, area academics, farmers, emergency food providers, and government officials came together to mobilize a comprehensive plan towards achieving greater economic growth for Northeast Ohio's food system. Around the same time, faculty at Ohio State University and Oberlin College along with local development corporations started to focus on increasing food access and food justice in Cleveland's underserved neighborhoods, in part through the creation of mobile markets and specialized food assistance programs. Through strategic partnerships between municipal agencies and local NGOs, these efforts soon expanded to explicitly address food-related health disparities, such as obesity, malnutrition, and diabetes. Additionally, many grassroots organizations got involved in (re)localizing food at this time, including through expanding community gardens to variously enhance area aesthetics, leisure, environmental quality, and education. Local restaurants and food businesses too increased, often featuring area-grown produce and cottage foods in an effort to highlight Cleveland as a destination for enjoying food as an experience in and of itself.

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Detroit—much as Cleveland—too saw a variety of new local food initiatives taking off. A number of grassroots and non-profit environmental initiatives were involved in this trend, including ones focused on “greening” the city and reconnecting citizens with nature through community gardening and urban agriculture-based education. Several locally-driven restaurants and other food businesses also launched in hopes of reviving both the local economy and peoples' experiences with food; and soon after, Eastern Market, the oldest publicly-owned market in the U.S., privatized towards better achieving these aims, as well. Additionally, by the mid-2000s, area development corporations, local universities, municipal officials, and entrepreneurs had begun to address inadequate food access and often-coupled health disparities in Detroit through the creation of mobile markets, facilitating of enhanced food options in corner stores, and extending of food assistance programs. It was around this same time that a number of grassroots efforts also coalesced, especially among Detroit's African-American population, aiming to foster greater racial equity in the local food system.

In both Cleveland and Detroit, the growth of these loosely coupled yet diverse local food movement initiatives challenged officials to create novel municipal arenas of policy concerned solely with food. Neither city had standing policies on urban agriculture, for example. In fact,

urban farming was technically illegal in both places. In light of the above events, new legislation seemed necessary. Additionally, under national momentum around local food, policymakers in Cleveland and Detroit were often offered access to private and supra-local funding so long as they channeled this support to pertinent area initiatives. Accessing this money, however, required both municipalities to adopt more coordinated food policy approaches. In the mid to late 2000s, officials in both Cleveland and Detroit consequently began creating altogether new local food policies, programs, and decision-making structures and cultures.

In Cleveland, rising food policy quickly came to center around advancing sustainable economic growth. Cleveland's mayor sponsored a "Year of Local Food" in 2012, for instance, which provided "a focus on local food [as] essential for a sustainable economy" through targeted events, programming, and other opportunities (Sustainable Cleveland 2011). Officials aimed for this Year to spread awareness across government entities, local food movement participants, and especially the mass public about the opportunities and benefits to linking local food with development aims. Indeed, the Year expressly aimed to serve as "a vehicle for collective action and engagement...accessible to all members of the community...to address the most basic conditions for sustainability...and growth" (Sustainable Cleveland 2011). Additionally, the city established its first food policy, the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance, overtly to facilitate local foods' environmental and economic potential; a number of similarly-focused legislation—including around direct to consumer sales, food trucks, and bid incentives—then followed. City officials also launched the Gardening for Greenbacks and Re-Imagining a More Sustainable Cleveland programs, which provide funding and land to residents for uses that "create sustainable solutions...[and] complement the City of Cleveland's long-term development objectives" (City of Cleveland 2013). And to further guide "a food systems development agenda for the city of Cleveland", the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition (CCFPC) formed among over fifty area policymakers, academics, non-profits, and businesses; today the CCFPC remains chief local food decision-making body for the city (Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition 2016).

In contrast to Cleveland, in Detroit food policy quickly became organized in the context of fostering social justice rather than sustainable economic growth. For example, the city's first food policy, its Food Security Policy, explicitly aims to "identify and eliminate barriers to African-American participation and ownership in all aspects of the food system" (City of Detroit

2008) and sets out a broad agenda to guide political and social change towards achieving this goal. The Urban Agriculture Ordinance, which passed into law several years later, too works to ensure food systems equity, including mandating direct opportunities for the public to inform land-use decision-making. And in 2008, the city established the Detroit Food Policy Council (DFPC) that, similarly to the CCFPC in Cleveland, provides broad cultural and structural support to guide local food policy. Yet unlike the CCFPC, in guiding food policy the DFPC focuses on “actively work[ing] for racial equity and healing”, achieving such social justice oriented goals in part by mandating its twenty-one members to “conduct the Council’s business in ways that embodies a commitment to anti-racist, anti-sexist, and anti-elitist processes and outcomes” (Detroit Food Policy Council 2011). Furthermore, the DFPC fosters social justice not only in guiding government but also in influencing local food movement participants and the mass public through its annual summit, which underscores food systems disparities associated with race and place, and its yearly Golden Beet Awards, that honors the work of area individuals, organization, and businesses expressly involved in building a more just and equitable local food system.

Cleveland and Detroit’s distinct arenas of food policy—as focused on sustainable economic growth and social justice, respectfully—matter in part because they seem to have motivated the unification of local food movement participants’ goals in similarly distinct ways. In surveying Cleveland’s food system, Councilman Joe Cimperman (5/28/2014) touched on this policymaking’s feedback effects: “since the initial Urban Garden [District ordinance passed]...something is permeating people’s minds. It just feels like more people culturally get it now, the economic benefits and how we can actually create healthier environments [through local food].” Indeed, many food movement participants across Cleveland have adjusted in pursuit sustainable economic growth goals regardless of their original mission, often accrediting rising local food policy as a motivation for this change. Those organizing the city’s annual Race, Food, and Justice conference, for example, moved from a stated aim of encouraging a broad social justice discourse around “race and racism” to dialogues more narrowly centered on development, including discussing “how the history of farming, culture and race factor into economics [and] land use” (Williams 2013). Kim Foreman (8/5/2013), this conference’s co-organizer, explained that the government’s involvement in food policy helped (further) marginalize social (and particularly, racial) justice discourses vis-à-vis food and

normalize/promote other frames among the public, which compelled the conference's to adjust its focus towards attracting more attendees:

*Race and racism are hard issues for a lot of people to discuss...Everybody [in government] was talking about the Urban Garden Zoning District ordinance, and no one was talking about [social justice]...So [we conference organizers] talked more about the environmental health and economic dimensions of a lot of different social justice issues [because] if you come up with the right concept and approach people will show up.*

As food policy gained momentum in Cleveland, the Cuyahoga County Board of Developmental Disabilities too shifted some of its goals. Indeed, the Board got involved in urban agriculture to provide training and employment opportunities to adults with developmental disabilities—a narrower focus than its original mission of supporting and empowering developmentally disabled populations, more generally. In an interview, Dan Nolan (6/14/2013), the Board's Regional Employment Manager, linked this move to changes in government:

*There was some pushback initially from some members of the Board...but because local food was gaining momentum in Cleveland government and [the Board] is a government agency, they decided, 'there is a wave, why not ride it?' With the economic downturn and [officials] thinking more about sustainable ways to find jobs...[our farm thus launched and became] all about jobs—creating jobs for people with developmental disabilities.*

And the rise of food policy also appears to have further empowered those already working to address sustainable economic development in the food system to expand their missions. For example, Great Lakes Brewing Company, which focuses expressly on profit, people, and the environment, had long wanted to pursue this commitment by turning a vacant lot within Cleveland's Ward 3 into an urban farm. For years, however, the Company lacked the official support necessary to move forward with this project. Yet with rising local food policy, this changed. Richard Bassich (5/22/2013), Great Lakes' local food liaison, explained:

*I've been here 12 years...and as long as I can remember, we wanted that piece of land...And [then municipal government] noticed that the local food movement was getting kind of big around Cleveland and [officials] wanted it to be sustainable...so then we got some grants and the go ahead through the City [to start the farm].*

In light of rising local food policy, the Company thus obtained officials' moral support and concrete resources to (further) pursue its sustainable economic growth objectives specifically.

As in Cleveland, Detroit's local food movement participants' aims too seemed to be unifying along the dimensions favored in that city's policy, which, in this case, spanned social



(and, often, racial) justice. Jess Daniel (6/6/2013), who founded the Detroit non-profit FoodLab, offered an overview of these distinct dynamics in an interview:

*Detroit's food scene, so much of it comes from a social justice [objective] and race is, like, the purpose of it. The purpose [of (re)localizing food] is empowerment for certain populations. The purpose is self-determination. And a lot of it has to do with... [government entities such as] the Food Policy Council; it has made a huge impact.*

Acknowledging that she “didn’t really have a critical race lens growing up”, after being “dropped into Detroit’s food scene” and experiencing the rise of local food policy and associated shifts in public attitudes there Daniel too shifted FoodLab’s mission. Indeed, she went from focusing the organization on advancing the economic success of food start-ups to fostering equity by engaging “a diverse community” to “make good food a sustainable reality for all Detroiters” (FoodLab 2016). The Detroit chapter of the prominent non-profit initiative Slow Food too shifted its mission and radically restructured following pressure tied to the city’s emerging food policy. Detroit Planning Commission official Kathryn Underwood and DFPC member Phil Jones themselves leveraged their official status and emerging policy norms to help compel the chapter to move away from its “core mission of enjoying food” (Ordakowski 5/24/2013) to addressing food in an overt social justice context, “as far as race is concerned and ethnicity” (Jovan Sage 12/5/2013). Additionally, Detroit’s food policy helped empower those already working expressly on social justice issues. In fact, the Food Security Policy itself states that “the City of Detroit should support the efforts of the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network,” a grassroots organization whose goal is to build self-reliance, food security, and justice in Detroit’s African-American community (City of Detroit 2008). Following the policy’s adoption, Detroit City Council and the City’s Planning, General Services, and Recreation Departments subsequently provided direct help to the Network in acquiring the land needed to expand its D-town Farm, and, with it, the organizations’ mission as framed in terms of racial justice.

This brief overview of Cleveland and Detroit provides evidence to suggest that each city’s local food movement participants aligned and/or expanded their goals around sustainable economic growth and social justice, respectfully, due in part to rising local food policy. But how, exactly, did policy wield such effects? To better understand these dynamics, the following section provides an in-depth examination of policy feedback effects and food (re)localization in the context of Chateau Hough, in Cleveland, and Whole Foods Market, in Detroit.

## *The In-Depth Investigation*

### *The Story of Chateau Hough, Cleveland*

Mansfield Frazier identifies as an African-American, formerly incarcerated man, who grew up in Cleveland; he is also the founder of Chateau Hough, an urban agriculture non-profit in that city. Growing up, Frazier (5/21/2013) felt that “Uncle Sam is sick. I love him, but he’s got racism.” He was passed up for promotions at work—told that his co-workers were not ready for a black boss—and soon became an outlaw defying the rules of a system that seemed unfair to him, anyway. But life behind bars only heightened to Frazier the injustices disproportionately plaguing African-American communities, and, after finishing his sentence, Frazier committed to combatting the racist system he disdained by playing by its rules rather than defying them. After leaving prison, Frazier thus built a reputation as an author on prison culture, criminal life, and the black experience and as one of Cleveland’s most effective re-entry counselors. He then decided to expand on these efforts by launching Chateau Hough in 2010.

Perhaps not surprisingly given Frazier’s background, racial justice was originally, explicitly, at the heart of his framing of the area problems Chateau Hough would address. Indeed, through Chateau Hough Frazier expressly aimed to provide opportunities to typically excluded, formerly incarcerated, African-American men and the predominantly black, disenfranchised Hough community they frequently returned to. Frazier (5/21/2013) spoke to some of these dynamics in an interview:

*Uncle Sam is racist. A sick old coo! I’m just trying to make him well, keep him alive, you know?...Nobody [involves the black, formerly incarcerated] population I [work with], just like the poverty programs in the ‘60s, where there were no poor people actually at the table... I’m trying to involve the people others are trying to help...That’s the goal. And the goal is wealth-building in inner city communities... my home in Hough, this is my community. If nobody else is gonna step up [and help improve this neighborhood], then I am going to.*

To Frazier, urban agriculture seemed the ideal means for achieving these goals. He felt urban agriculture could beautify and raise-up the blighted Hough neighborhood; and he believed that physical, outdoor work was a well-suited means to channel many former prisoners’ abilities into employable skills. Additionally, nationally recognized environmental justice activist Majora Carter’s work exposing relations between land use and racial (in)equity motivated Frazier: “if I don’t do something with the land in my neighborhood,” Frazier (5/21/2013) realized, “somebody

who doesn't look like me is going to come and do it. And I don't want that." Finally, he settled on growing grapes because they guaranteed the high dollar per acre value he believed was necessary to make the project financially viable in the long-term.

With racial justice at the heart of his vision, Frazier began looking for the land and funding necessary to launch the vineyards at Chateau Hough. Often this brought him into contact with emerging local food policy, since the City of Cleveland owned substantial acreage in its land bank and increasingly served as a bridge connecting non-profit organizations involved in food production to this land as well as other resources. Yet as he approached area lawmakers, Frazier quickly began experiencing hurdles associated with Chateau Hough's racial justice framing. For example, Frazier aimed to secure funding and land through the municipal Re-Imagining a More Sustainable Cleveland program, which provides grants to projects reusing vacant land in ways that enhances ecosystems function and economic development. Because the program requires eligible recipients to be overtly committed to these aims, Frazier recognized he would have to shift Chateau Hough's mission away from racial justice to discussing the initiative's economic development, community building, and environmental objectives in order to obtain support. Frazier acted accordingly, and stressing the development dimensions of Chateau Hough appeared effective: officials awarded Frazier's initiative one of Re-Imagining's largest single grants and a gratis piece of land bank property.

After this initial success, Frazier generally continued to (re)frame Chateau Hough's goals away from racial justice towards sustainable economic growth in an effort to garner further official support. At the time there were (and, as of this writing, currently remain) no municipal food policies or programs that expressly support racial justice-based initiatives, yet much food policy allocates resources to those explicitly committed to economic and environmental goals. Frazier thus expressed Chateau Hough's aims in continued alignment with these latter objectives rather than the former despite his original desires for the project. This (re)framing continued to prove efficacious for Chateau Hough, helpful not only in meeting the terms of the Re-Imagining grant, for instance, but also in securing additional political support in the form of a Cleveland Climate Action Fund grant, which supports projects taking active steps to mitigate climate change. Like the Re-Imagining program, initiatives eligible for this grant are evaluated for their potential to "reduce carbon," have "economic impact," and present "a potential for scale and

sustainability” (Cleveland Climate Action Fund 2015). It was only through demonstrating a commitment to such issues that Chateau Hough was thus able to receive support from the Fund.

It is also important to note that Frazier (re)framed Chateau Hough away from racial justice aims towards sustainable economic growth not only because of the overt terms of food policies and programs and in Cleveland but also because of what Frazier felt were often implicit yet very real official biases against African-Americans and projects centered around their empowerment. Frazier (5/21/2013) expressed some of this in an interview:

*I don't want to bash public officials...but at first they didn't want to fund [Chateau Hough], they said, 'well [Frazier] doesn't know about grapes'...There's kinda a notion among white [policymakers] about black people that we can't do it...and especially the [formerly incarcerated] population I [represent and] serve; politicians say, 'I don't wanna hear from them' and they certainly don't wanna give them money.*

In order to get officials' backing, Frazier was thus further encouraged to drop the racial justice tenor of the initiative. He continued on in the interview, explaining: “so what do I have to do, being a formerly incarcerated [black] person, never any college, how do I get [officials] to respect me [and Chateau Hough]?...I'm deeply involved in [racial] politics, but I'm moving back from it some.” Whether Frazier's interpretation of political dynamics in Cleveland were real or perceived, through them food policy thus continued to (re)make Chateau Hough's objectives.

In addition to appealing directly to local policy structures and cultures, Frazier also shifted Chateau Hough's mission towards sustainable economic growth in an effort to attract the broader public's backing. Indeed, Frazier saw public support as central to Chateau Hough's long-term success; in a media interview, he emphasized: “there needs to be a firm commitment from the community to keep the project sustainable, viable, and income producing well into the future” (Carr 2013). Yet Frazier initially faced similar resistance from the public as he did from officials, including from philanthropic “funders [who] tend to view our vineyards in a negative light” (Carr 2013). Frazier believed Chateau Hough was turning-off the public in such ways particularly because of its overt racial justice connotations and aims; a media exchange at the time captured some of this tension (Public Broadcasting Service 2011):

*Business correspondent Paul Solman comments, “Chateau Hough?”*

*Frazier replies, “Cleveland: Yes. Why not?”*

*“When I think of Hough,” Solman responds, “I think the [race] riots of the early and middle '60s.”*

*Frazier laments, commenting back, “if I were to say Chateau Hunting Valley or Chateau Westlake [or another largely white, well-off area that does not connote the racial*

*inequities synonymous with Hough] nobody would raise an eyebrow. You say Chateau Hough, and people do a double-take.”*  
*Solmon concedes, skeptically, “Ok, one vacant lot vineyard doesn’t a winery make...”*

Jenita McGowan (7/24/2013), chief at the city’s Office of Sustainability, confirmed in an interview that initially much of the worried feedback she received from citizens about the growth of local food in the city was related to Frazier’s initiative under its original racial justice focus: “there has been some public concern,” she explained, “mostly over land redistribution [in Hough] and [the] re-entry programs [associated] with it.” While McGowan did not state that such concerns were tied to racial dimensions directly, this seemed clear from the context of our conversation.

The lack of citizen support for Chateau Hough’s racial justice premise was not inherent; in fact, in several other U.S. cities racial justice has been a publicly accepted and lauded goal for urban agriculture (including in Detroit, as discussed in this paper; see, also, more generally, Alkon and Agyeman 2011). Rather, political conditions in Cleveland seemed to foster citizens’ inattention to, and in some cases even overt weariness of, this goal while simultaneously fostering support for local food efforts expressly promoting sustainable economic growth. Morgan Taggart (7/24/2013), co-convener of the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition, confirmed that in framing food along economic and ecological dimensions (without mention of social or racial justice), the government encouraged this same focus across the public:

*The success of certain legislation really mobilizes people [in distinct directions]. It really builds confidence in a specific model...and I think because of [local food policies and programs] like Re-Imagining Cleveland, people were really excited, there was a lot of community enthusiasm, a lot of people rallying around this issue [of local food and urban agriculture] as a space for economic development and community development and... supporting the environment over other [objectives].*

Kim Foreman (8/5/2013), executive director at the Cleveland non-profit Environmental Health Watch, corroborated this as well:

*Some people in the neighborhoods are doing stuff around food justice...but they have been marginalized...they don’t have the right access, the right resources, they haven’t been invited to the right tables...so the community has come to think more about economic development [vis-à-vis food] and not race and racism.*

Indeed, local food policy’s impact on public attitudes in this way was often intentional, as Jenita McGowan (7/24/2013), chief at the city’s Office of Sustainability, emphasized when discussing

the city's Year of Local Food:

*The government has a role to play in the food system, of course, but it is not our job nor is it possible to lead the food system [in every dimension]. Everyone has a role to play...So we encourage the grassroots. Our purpose is to spur [public] action along key drivers: sustainability and job creation.*

In an anonymous survey the Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition conducted, residents in fact recognized food policy's particular focus on sustainable economic growth and inattention to a "more racially diverse representation" of local food matters; many respondents then went on to express that this political trend was fostering a "lack of diversity and inclusion" in the public's response to food systems issues (Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition 2013). Many residents thus appear to recognize and be affected by if and how issues were taken up in area food policy or not, just as Frazier was in his own interpretations. Moreover, this appear to have, in turn, fostered a greater mass awareness and acceptance of food systems discourse centered on sustainable economic growth above other matters.

Attune to both the political and social perceptions emerging in part because of the city's developing local food policy, Frazier therefore continued to reframe Chateau Hough's mission away from racial justice towards economic and environmental enhancement. The project's Internet website now welcomes visitors with a stated mission explicit about its potential contributions to sustainable economic growth but void of racial justice aims: "welcome to the Vineyards and BioCellar of Chateau Hough," it states, "creating greener, healthier and wealthier places to live, work, and raise families" (Chateau Hough 2016). With such downplaying of racial justice and emphasis on economic and environmental issues, many citizens have now come to enthusiastically support Chateau Hough. Frazier (5/21/2013) corroborated this in an interview: "now people want to, so many people, they swear they helped build [Chateau Hough]. Some of them stood on a shovel for an hour and they go back to the University and, 'oh I helped build it!'" This wider support is also recognizable in the many prominent community initiatives that began to laud Chateau Hough after it shifted focus to sustainable economic growth, such the GardenWalk Cleveland—a citizen-initiated effort that provides self-guided tours highlighting specific gardens across the city—which began promoting Chateau Hough only in the years after it received the Re-Imagining a More Sustainable Cleveland grant.

That Chateau Hough (re)framed its objectives along sustainable economic growth matters in part because coupled with this shift have been concrete changes to the project's very

operations on-the-ground. For example, while Frazier still engages formerly incarcerated black people in the initiative, he now also encourages many others to contribute to the vineyards, regardless of race, income, or need. He (5/21/2013) explained in an interview, “I’ll use anybody. Black, white, young, old.” Frazier also partnered with a group of biology and architectural experts from area universities and private institutions (who happen to be white, well-educated, non-Hough residents); these actors were attracted to Chateau Hough’s environmental dimensions and, together with Frazier, conceived of and launched the project’s new BioCellar—which continues Chateau Hough’s (new) focus on being “a sustainable solution”, in part by turning an abandoned home into an 800-square-foot passive solar greenhouse with a below-grade level growing facility (Herrick 2015).

Chateau Hough has thus shifted its goals from racial justice to sustainable economic growth with symbolic and concrete implications for the initiative and the surrounding community; furthermore, it appears these consequential changes are in many ways a result of direct and indirect policy feedback effects combined. In a personal interview, Randall McShepard (7/24/2013), an African-American Clevelander involved in another prominent urban agriculture initiative and a policy think tank there, spoke to these effects:

*Minority farmers are more about social justice issues [like racial equity] from the start, but this may not be the case [after they seek support from] the City and community... there tends to be insider/outsider dynamics in Cleveland, where you get more support if you...are working on health, job creation, and sustainability.*

Indeed, in the case of Chateau Hough, direct interactions with municipal policymakers, policies, and programs shaped Frazier’s understanding of the food systems problems and solutions he should aim to pursue. For example, that the City only offered grants to urban agriculture initiatives with expressed economic and/or environmental aims motivated Frazier to align Chateau Hough with these objectives. Additionally, local food policymaking indirectly affected Chateau Hough by first influencing the public’s reception of local food and the nature of its coupled support. Indeed, food policy in Cleveland helped fostered a wider perception that the chief issues facing local food systems and their most laudable solutions revolved around sustainable economic growth over other objectives. Citizens, in turn, placed these assumptions on Chateau Hough when determining whether to support the initiative or not, which further encouraged the organization to change in response.

### *The Story of Whole Foods Market, Detroit*

In 2009, Whole Foods Market, a national grocery chain, began considering launching a store location in Detroit. Walter Robb, the chain's co-CEO, spearheaded this move. At the time, his personal friend Tom Vilsack, then U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, met with a group of black ministers in Detroit seeking help addressing grocery store (in)access in their city. Soon after, Vilsack approached Robb to discuss the potential for Whole Foods Market to help these Detroiters. Vilsack then put Robb in touch with the city's officials, and, not much later, Robb arrived in Detroit to discuss with area lawmakers the potential for a Whole Foods Market launch there (e.g. McMillan 2014).

Perhaps not surprisingly given Whole Foods Market position as a large, publicly traded, for-profit corporation, social equity was not at the heart of the Market's mission when it first considered opening in Detroit. Robb did view the Detroit store as potentially helping to bridge the gap in food access between rich and poor, but, more so, as with all of Whole Foods Markets' stores up to that point, Robb and the Market's other leadership centered on turning a profit. Moreover, the city planners Robb met with initially shared and supported the store's economic focus. At the time, Detroiters were spending an estimated \$200 million on groceries outside of the city; keeping that within the urban center could be a financial "game-changer" for Detroit, lawmakers felt (McMillan 2014). Additionally, municipal officials hoped the store's opening would attract others to further develop retail locations and higher-end housing; Olga Stella, with the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation, a development nonprofit that works with the city, explained this perception in an interview, stating, "[Whole Foods] has such an ability to attract national attention not just from other retailers but other developers. It's in a category all its own" (in Bussey 2012). With economic goals in mind, both Whole Foods Market and the City of Detroit consequently decided to move forward with a store launch there.

As talks concerning the Detroit Whole Foods Market's location continued, however, area lawmakers started to shift their understanding of the store as not only a potential solution to economic issues in Detroit but also as a significant actor in the city's food system. Officials had recently adopted their first contemporary food policy, the Food Security Policy, and the DFPC was starting to come together. Both initiatives had significant social justice bases, and there was thus a growing sensitivity among officials to food systems (in)equities. Consequently, officials began to evaluate the store as much for its development potential as its ability to impact food



access and food systems employment, for instance. Kathryn Underwood (9/20/2013), a senior planner with the Detroit Planning Commission, touched on this in an interview:

*It was once the big folks (7) got in the room, such as [Whole Foods Market], that city government said, ‘oh, maybe we should take a look at [what role they play in the food system]...and it was then that [our interest in Whole Foods] as a social and very political issue in control and sovereignty was heightened.*

Lawmakers thus began to (re)frame the problems Whole Foods Market might address and how, often applying the particular social justice perspective guiding local food policy to the store, itself. This included focusing not only on the potential for the store to attract additional development, then, but also how many local residents the Market might employ, the possibility for area farms and cottage food businesses to be supported through the store’s local product sourcing, and how the corporation could adjust its offerings and pricing to help address disparities in local food access. The City Planning Commission even approached Whole Foods Market’s leadership specifically to recommend that they reach out to the local Black Farmers Association towards ensuring the Market would tackle the food equity concerns prominent especially among Detroit’s African-American community (e.g. City of Detroit 2012).

With municipal officials now considering a Detroit Whole Foods Market not only through an economic lens but also a through that of food system’s justice, the Market’s leadership recognized that, to be successful, they too needed to adjust their considerations accordingly. Robb corroborated this in a media interview, explaining that Detroit’s political environment “changed the way [we at Whole Foods] viewed business” (AlHajal 2015). Indeed, to gain favor with local officials—and, specifically, to earn land and municipal tax incentives—the store shifted its stated aims to more explicitly align with social justice principles rather than economic development ones, including addressing issues such as inadequate food access disproportionately impacting minority and lower-income communities: “that is a moral dilemma. That is a moral challenge. That is a moral problem that [the Whole Foods Detroit location will] do something about,” Robb affirmed (AlHajal 2015). The store confirmed their new focus to officials directly and promised that with their shift in stated commitment the company would adhere to social justice objectives as it engaged in hiring (committing at least half of the Market’s jobs to city residents) and pricing (including reducing item costs to be more accessible to lower-income residents), for example (see, for instance, Councilmember Spivey’s report to City Council and updates on the Market’s zoning in City of Detroit 2012).

In addition to its interactions with area officials, the public also played a significant role in motivating Whole Foods Market Detroit to alter its mission; in fact, it was citizen pressure that compelled the store to move explicitly to address not only social justice, in general, but often racial justice and community engagement, in particular. This began largely in 2011, about two years after talks initiated for the store's launch, when a coalition of community members—some expressly involved in the local food movement and others not—approached Robb to discuss the store's impact on the community and racial (in)justices particularly. Robb agreed to meet for several reasons, not least of which was that the community would be the store's customers and it was thus essential to have their support and loyalty. In talking with Robb, these residents then stayed "true to a vision of justice" and demanded the store focus on meeting the needs of Detroit's 85% African-American population and provide ongoing opportunities for local residents to meaningfully engage with the Market—including guiding its development as well as being favored for employment opportunities in everything from the construction of the store to its staffing once launched. Under continued public pressure, Robb then reached out and met with Malik Yakini, a black Detroiter known as a leader in the city's food justice movement (and then-chair of the DFPC). Yakini (1/22/2014) explained that racial justice was at the center of their subsequent conversation:

*[Robb] wanted to meet with me and he wanted me to help him as a white guy "get it." That was the way he framed it. And so we had a real, a really open discussion about race and gentrification and power and Midtown [the area where the store would be built] and how Whole Foods might play into that.*

Building on what community groups and individuals like Yakini expressed, the Market ultimately agreed to "really overhauling our core value as a company," Robb confirmed, and moved to a mission more deeply centered on social justice, including addressing issues such as racial (in)equity and citizen engagement head-on (AlHajal 2015). Indeed, the store's leadership now openly states "we're going after racism" (McMillan 2014), which represents an "unprecedented move" for the chain that Robb credits to "really respecting the community and listening to where they were and what they were doing" (AlHajal 2015). And unlike most prior Whole Foods Markets' news and advertising efforts (which tend to laud the Market's commitment to the environment, customers, and food quality), the Market's online blog emphasizes the unique, community-centered focus of its Detroit store, stating: "the new Whole Foods Market store in Detroit is like no other! Our team members immersed themselves in the

community and asked people what they wanted... The store is meant to be an extension of the community” (Garcia 2013). Moreover, with this (re)framing, the chain’s very operations shifted, as well. For instance, the store continued to meet with community members in formal bi-monthly sessions for over a year ahead of opening along with making available a community office for residents to come to with inquiries, ideas, and concerns on a rolling basis (e.g. City of Detroit 2012). The store then upped to 70% its original promise to hire 50% of its staff from the local population; adjusted its offerings to reflect the community’s make-up (e.g. selling fresh okra and stocking beauty products designed specifically for African-Americans); and employed a culturally-relevant nutrition coordinator, Akua Woolbright, who began hosting community health classes even prior to the store’s launch; among several other changes. The store’s website (Whole Foods Detroit 2016) widely advertises its shifted mission and these particular efforts, stating, for example:

*[This store is] Detroit Built: Made with wood from Reclaimed Detroit, plus recycled signs and tabletops made from old cars and trucks. It’s Detroit Powered: We’ve hired 70% of our team from the city. It’s Detroit Local: Featuring products by vendors like Avalon International Breads and Great Lakes Coffee. It’s Detroit Proud. Giving back to the community through partnerships with Gleaner’s Food Bank, the Coalition on Temporary Shelter, and Sisters Acquiring Financial Equality.*

Citizen pressure undoubtedly had an impact on Whole Foods Market—but why did community members come to pressure the store, in the first place? Initially, the community generally did not fully feel they had a say in the Market, in fact. But two years into talks for the store’s launch, local food policy, and its social justice-centered structures and cultures, had become fairly established in the city. It was then, through the help of this policy, that citizens began to feel they had a say in the store. Indeed, residents expressed that local food policy helped influence their understandings of area issues and emboldened them to approach Whole Foods Market with distinct social (and often racial) justice demands. Gloria Rivera (8/19/2013), one of the members involved in the community coalition that contacted Robb, explained this in an interview:

*We were [empowered] by the neighborhood level and also the policy level...The Detroit Food Policy Council had already been [operating] since 2008, 2009....And to their credit the City Council passed the Food Security Policy...[This policy is] empowering the community, well, I don’t like the word empowering, helping communities to realize that we do have a say. So we decided, ‘we’re going to take on Whole Foods’.*

Indeed, the Detroit the Food Security Policy itself stated that area lawmakers and the public must “hold those accountable within the food system that profit from Detroiters” including encouraging such actors to “eliminate barriers to African-American participation and ownership in all aspects of the food system” (City of Detroit 2008). In an interview, T.R., an African-American Detroiters who now works in a variety of food systems positions there, stressed the importance of such policy statements—and local food policy, more generally—to citizens’ subsequent assuredness and actions:

*I would say, more importantly than for an organization, [policy is] really important for the folks on the ground; policies really affect them...I think [citizens] being able to have these open conversations with [each other, officials, and organizational leaders] about the things that need to be changed, you know, structural racism...I don't know if I would've felt this comfortable doing that, say, five or six years ago [before local food policy], I don't think I would've had the words and the confidence...but with things like the Detroit Food Policy Council and [the Council's] workgroups, this [discourse] has become really accessible. [Government] has been able to influence some things happening in the city.*

Because of area policy itself, then, it appears citizens came to identify certain food system issues as problems meriting solutions over others and develop the capacity to pressure local food movement participants, such as Whole Foods Market, to respond, accordingly. Furthermore, this motivation only increased as it was announced that the Market would receive municipal tax incentives. Rivera (8/19/2013) continued on about this in an interview:

*Because it is public money, that really gets people, you know? “Oh, it’s our money?” “Yeah, it is your money” ... People believe, and this is true of any corporation that comes here [to Detroit], that any business that gets tax credits, that that money is public money. That is our taxes. So, we want to say something about that. And that’s how the narrative of Whole Foods became...we were involved in, as much as we could, asking questions of the corporation.*

Food policy—including the legislation, decision-making bodies, and resource allocations associated with it— thus (re)shaped citizens understandings of themselves and their active role vis-à-vis Whole Foods Market, which consequently created pressure on the store to further (re)shape its objectives towards meeting popular expectations.

As with Chateau Hough in Cleveland, Whole Foods Market thus too dramatically shifted its stated goals and on-the-ground operations in connection with rising local food policy; and two particular mechanisms appear to account especially for this: direct and indirect policy feedback

effects. Directly, for example, interactions with municipal policymakers shaped co-CEO Walter Robb and Whole Foods Market's understanding of the social problems facing Detroit and the store's capacity to address them. This helped Whole Foods Market adjust from solely recognizing the city's economic ills to also considering the social (in)equities plaguing its food system. Furthermore, citizen pressure, as also policy motivated, encouraged the Market to further (re)frame its mission towards more explicitly addressing racial justice and community engagement. Indirectly, by first impacting citizens, local food policy in Detroit therefore continued to shape Whole Foods Market.

## **Conclusion**

Why did local food movement participants in Cleveland unify around the goal of sustainable economic development and those in Detroit around racial justice? The above birds-eye and in-depth analyses together provide evidence that rising local food policy shaped Cleveland and Detroit's local food movement participants' very goals for and within the food system. Moreover, the in-depth component of this examination offers a new way of thinking about policy, targets, and mass public relations: directly and indirectly. Direct policy feedback effects include instances where government influences specific social actors' understandings and/or behaviors head-on, while indirect policy feedback effects refer to points at which policymaking shapes these same social actors secondarily by first influencing mass publics.

Considering direct and indirect policy feedback effects has important consequences for scholarship going forward. Indeed, policy feedback and associated literatures have yet to adequately focus on indirect effects, whether alone or in conjunction with direct ones. This paper makes a case against this trend, demonstrating that only through taking seriously indirect policy feedback effects can we fully understand the particular food systems outcomes that came about in Cleveland and Detroit—and likely many other cases. Moreover, further research into indirect policy feedback effects will help enhance consideration of citizens as central agents of change in the study of policy | society relations. Research that can contribute specific strategies for evaluating indirect policy feedback effects will be particularly useful going forward, especially since these effects can at times be messy to analyze due to their roundabout and ancillary nature. Finally, in regards to food studies scholarship, in particular, literature on alternative food systems tends to emphasize how citizens *circumvent* government to bring about distinct food systems

outcomes; the analysis in this paper suggests it may be especially illuminating to investigate more deeply if and how communities may, in fact, be *leveraging* policy to influence food systems change (whether deliberately or not). Further food studies research on direct and indirect policy feedback effects can also help clarify if these effects are encouraging the types of changes certain actors (e.g. governments, practitioners, and/or grassroots movement members) aim to achieve through (re)localizing food policy or if these effects are, in a sense, co-opting these efforts to bring about different transformations than may have been originally intended.

### Notes

1. A social movement “participant” generally includes individuals, groups, and organizations that have at least a minimal sense of themselves as connected, sharing a common purpose, and trying and affect change for that purpose (e.g. Paul and van Seeters 2014; Zald 2000).
2. For example, Cleveland and Detroit are Rustbelt cities located just two hours away from one another. They both have majority African-American citizenries and similar population densities, median household incomes, and educational attainment. The two also have parallel histories of racial tension, white flight, crime, corruption, and major changes in manufacturing. In part because of this, Cleveland and Detroit have both lost around 45% of their population since 1960, and they today face economic decline, rising food desert and obesity trends, and substantial land vacancy (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Moreover, (re)localizing food has recently become a tool actors in both places are using to help address these ills and remake their cities, more generally.
3. By local food policy, I refer to municipal decision-making cultures and structures combined, which have emerged around food in cities like Cleveland and Detroit. This includes distinct legislation (e.g. urban agriculture ordinances), official programs (e.g. city funding initiatives), and decision-making bodies (e.g. local food policy coalitions), together. “Food policy” thus connotes a combination of political phenomena akin to how a term like “welfare policy” is often used.
4. “Alternative” connotes non-conventional food systems efforts of late, including movements concerned with local, slow, deep, organic, sovereign, just, and fair food.
5. There are certain mediating factors—such as culture, itself—which are, in a sense, constant across direct and indirect policy feedback effects as they occur within a bounded social and political context; such factors must be acknowledged for the important roles they play, but they do not alter the nature of the direct/indirect framework put forth here.
6. I consider both Chateau Hough and Whole Foods Detroit to be local food movement participants because they are organizations which feel generally connected to others in the movement, have a common purpose (food (re)localization), and try and affect change for that purpose. Some may be particularly skeptical of Whole Foods Detroit as representing a local food movement participant because of its national, corporate connection; nonetheless, there is growing scholarship acknowledging the nature and importance of business mobilization as a component of social movements (e.g. Hess 2005; Walker 2009) and, perhaps more importantly, Whole Foods Detroit itself and many

related actors identified the organization as such an actor.

7. Along with Whole Foods Market, at the time Hantz Farm (a large, private urban farm), RecoveryPark (another large urban farm), a Meijer Grocery store, among other so-called “major players” began considering Detroit locations.

### **Works Cited**

- AlHajal, Khalil. 2015. “How Detroit changed the way Whole Foods Market views business.” *MLive News*. May 28.
- Alkon, Alison Hope and Julian Agyeman. 2011. *Cultivating Food Justice: Race, Class, and Sustainability*. MIT Press.
- Bassich, Richard. 5/22/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Beland, Daniel. 2010. “Reconsidering Policy Feedback: How Policies Affect Politics.” *Administration and Society*. 1-23.
- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. “Framing Process and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26: 611-39.
- Bussey, John. 2012. “Whole Foods' Detroit Gamble.” *Wall Street Journal*. March 8. Available online at: <http://www.wsj.com>.
- Carr, Kathy. 2013. “Mansfield Frazier keeps tending to his Vineyards of Château Hough.” *Crains Cleveland*. September 3. Available online at: <http://www.crainsclevelandbusiness.com>
- Château Hough. 2016. “Home.” Organizational Website. Accessed May 15 at: <http://chateauhough.org>.
- Cimperman, Joe. 5/28/2014. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- City of Detroit. 2008. “Food Security Policy.” Available at: <http://detroitblackfoodsecurity.org/policy.html>.
- City of Detroit. 2012. *Journal of the City Council*. January 10.
- City of Cleveland. 2013. “Gardening for Greenbacks Program 2013 Report.” Available at: [http://www.city.cleveland.oh.us/sites/default/files/forms\\_publications/CoBankReport2013.pdf?id=3402](http://www.city.cleveland.oh.us/sites/default/files/forms_publications/CoBankReport2013.pdf?id=3402).
- Cleveland Climate Action Fund. 2015. “Cleveland Climate Action Fund 2015 Micro Grant Program Guidelines and Application Form.” Available by request.
- Cleveland Cuyahoga County Food Policy Coalition. 2013. “FPC Stakeholder Interviews.” Report/Data Summary. Available by Request.
- Cleveland Cuyahoga Food Policy Coalition. 2016. “About Us.” Organizational Website. Accessed May 15 at: <http://cccfoodpolicy.org>
- Cockrall-King, Jennifer. 2012. *Food and the City: Urban Agriculture and the New Food Revolution*. Prometheus Books.
- Daniel, Jess. 6/6/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Detroit Food Policy Council. 2011. “By-Laws.” Available at: [http://detroitfoodpolicycouncil.net/sites/default/files/pdfs/DFPC\\_Bylaws\\_Final.pdf](http://detroitfoodpolicycouncil.net/sites/default/files/pdfs/DFPC_Bylaws_Final.pdf).
- Edelman, Murray J. 1971. *Politics as Symbolic Action: Mass Arousal and Quiescence*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- FoodLab. 2016. Organizational Website. Accessed April 15: <https://foodlabdetroit.com>.
- Foreman, Kim. 8/5/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Frazier, Mansfield. 5/21/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Garcia, Stefanie. 2013. “Our Local Forager in the New Detroit Food Scene.” Whole Foods Blog.

- Available online at: <http://www.wholefoodsmarket.com/blog/>.
- Gilbert, Neil. 2002. *Transformation of the Welfare State: The Silent Surrender of Public Responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Herrick, Christina. 2015. "From Riots To Vineyard: A Story of Urban Revival." *Growing Produce*. March 25. Available at <http://www.growingproduce.com>.
- Hess, David J. 2005. "Technology and Product-Oriented Movements: Approximating Social Movement Studies and Science and Technology Studies." *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. 30(4): 515-35.
- Hinrichs, C. Clare. 2003. "The practice and politics of food system localization." *Journal of Rural Studies*. 19: 33-45.
- Hinrichs, C. Clare and Thomas A. Lyson. 2007. *Remaking the North American Food System: Strategies for Sustainability*. University of Nebraska Press.
- James, Paul and Paul van Seeters. 2014. *Globalization and Politics, Vol. 2: Global Social Movements and Global Civil Society*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lang, Tim, David Barling, and Martin Caraher. 2009. *Food Policy: Integrating Health, Environment, and Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1964. "American business, public policy, case-studies, and political theory." *World Politics*. 16(4): 677-715.
- Mansfield, Brent and Wendy Mendes. 2013. "Municipal Food Strategies and Integrated Approaches to Urban Agriculture: Exploring Three Cases from the Global North." *International Planning Studies*. 18(1): 37-60.
- Marshall, T. H. 1965. *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development: Essays*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Publishers.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McGowan, Jenita. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- McMillan, Tracie. 2014. "Can Whole Foods Change the Way Poor People Eat?" Food and Environment Reporting Network. November 19.
- McShepard, Randall. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Mead, Lawrence M. 1998. "Telling the poor what to do." *The Public Interest*. 132: 97-112.
- Mendes, Wendy. 2007. Negotiating a Place for 'Sustainability' Policies in Municipal Planning and Governance: The Role of Scalar Discourses and Practices." *Space and Polity*. 11(1): 95-119.
- Mendes, Wendy. 2008. "Implementing Social and Environmental Policies in Cities: The Case of Food Policy in Vancouver, Canada." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 2002. "Bringing the State Back in to Civic Engagement: Policy Feedback Effects of the G.I. Bill for World War II Veterans." *The American Political Science Review*. 96(2): 351-65.
- Mettler, Suzanne and Mallory Sorelle. 2014. "Policy Feedback." Pp 151-182 in Eds. Paul Sabatier and Chris Weible, *Theories of the Policy Process*. 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mettler, Suzanne and Joe Soss. 2004. "The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship: Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics." *Perspectives on Politics*. 2(1): 55-73.



- Mooney Patrick H and Scott A. Hunt. 1996. A repertoire of interpretations: master frames and Ideological continuity in U.S. agrarian mobilization. *Sociology Quarterly*. 37: 177-97.
- Musilli, Amanda. 8/27/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Nelson, Thomas E. and Donald R. Kinder. 1996. "Issue frames and group-centrism in American public opinion." *Journal of Politics*. 58(4): 1,055-78.
- Nolan, Dan. 6/14/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Ordakowski, Stacy. 5/24/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Pierson, Paul. 1993. "When effect becomes cause: Policy feedback and political change." *World Politics*. 45(4): 595-628.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1983. "The American road to democratic socialism." *Democracy*. 3(3): 58-69.
- Public Broadcasting Service. 2011. "Raze the Roof: Cleveland Levels Vacant Homes to Revive Neighborhoods." Newshour. July 5. Available at: <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/>.
- Quadagno, Jill. 1994. *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, B. 2009. "Feeding a World City: The London Food Strategy." *International Planning Studies*. 14(4): 417-24.
- Rivera, Gloria. 8/19/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Roberts, Wayne. 2010. "Food Policy Encounters of a Third Kind: How the Toronto Food Policy Council socializes for Sustainability." Pp 173-200 in *Imagining Sustainable Food Systems*.
- Sage, Jovan. 12/5/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1935. *Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff: A Study of Free Private Enterprise in Pressure Politics, as Shown in the 1929-1930 Revision of the Tariff*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy*. University Press of Kansas.
- Schram, Sanford E. 2000. *After Welfare: The Culture of Postindustrial Social Policy*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sharp, Elaine B. 1994. Paradoxes of national antidrug policymaking. Pp 96-116 in *The Politics of Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda*. Rochefort and Cobb, eds. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting soldiers and mothers: The political origins of social policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Soss, Joe. 2005. "Making Clients and Citizens: Welfare policy as a Source of Status, Belief, and Action." Pp. 291-328 in *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, Schneider and Ingram, eds. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Soss, Joe, and Lael R. Keiser. 2008. "The Political Roots of Disability Claims: How State Environments and Policies Shape Citizen Demands." *Political Research Quarterly*. 59(1): 133-48.
- Soss, Joe and Sanford F. Schram. 2007. "A Public Transformed? Welfare Reform as Policy Feedback." *The American Political Science Review*. 101(1): 111-27.
- Starr, Amory. 2010. "Local Food: A Social Movement?" *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*.
- Sustainable Cleveland. 2011. "Sustainability Summit Briefing Document." Report. Available At: <http://www.sustainablecleveland.org>

- Taggart, Morgan. 7/24/2013. Personal Interview. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Tighe, Lavinia. 2013. "Race, Food and Justice Conference Evaluation Survey Report." Confidential Report. Available Only by Request.
- T.R. 7/10/2013. Personal Interview. Telephone Communication.
- Underwood, Kathryn. 9/20/2013. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. "QuickFacts." For Cleveland and Detroit. Available at: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/>.
- Walker, Edward T. 2009. "Privatizing Participation: Civic Change and the Organizational Dynamics of Grassroots Lobbying Firms." *American Sociological Review*. 74(1): 83-105.
- Wekerle, Gerda R. 2004. "Food Justice Movements: Policy, Planning, and Networks." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 23:378-86.
- Whole Foods Detroit. 2016. "Store Opening: Detroit!" Accessed May 15 at: <http://www.wholefoodsmarket.com/service/store-opening-detroit>
- Williams, Rhonda. 2013. "Free Conference on Race, Food & Justice." Interview with M. LaVora Perry. Available at: <http://www.neighborhoodgrants.org/free-conference-on-race-food-justice/>.
- Yakini, Malik. 1/22/2014. Personal Interview. Detroit, Michigan.
- Zald, Mayer N. 2000. "Ideologically Structured Action: An Enlarged Agenda for Social Movement Research." *Mobilization*. 5(1): 1-16.

## **Conclusion**

At its core, this dissertation reveals that municipal debates about food and food policy are, in fact, struggles over knowledge and power, more deeply. Actors from diverse backgrounds engage in efforts to (re)localize food, with different interests, values, and forms of knowledge and expertise motivating them. At times, diverse individuals and groups' motivations overlap and work together, but at other times they clash and conflict. Out of this collaboration and competition, ultimately only certain perspectives shape what food and food policy is and should be. I show that the knowledge and knowledge-holders who win out in these efforts do so in light of structural and cultural conditions unique to their locality as well as their own strategic ability to effectively identify, deploy, and advocate for themselves and their particular forms of expertise. Moreover, I suggest that taking seriously these battles and their outcomes matters because, once established, dynamics of knowledge and power in the food system can (re)structure society, more broadly.

This dissertation research offers direct contributions to scholarship concerned with knowledge politics by further illuminating how certain types of experts and expertise often marginalized in conventional systems (specifically, those around the regulation, management, production, and distribution of food) gain power (or not). Additionally, my dissertation speaks to academic studies concerned with policy, itself, which have yet to robustly regard local level decision-making dynamics that are on the rise. Finally, this comparative dissertation speaks directly to the growing scholarship on food systems and alternative food efforts, which generally consists of single case studies or broad movement analyses that fail to capture the nuanced co-production of policy and society my dissertation suggests food (re)localization often holds.

In addition to the academic merits of my study, this dissertation contributes practical understandings of the local food trends that are sweeping popular and political life. Throughout the dissertation I shed light on the nature of participation and inclusion (or lack thereof) in food (re)localization. This can help practitioners identify and promote best practices while also pinpointing and ameliorating new or replicated disparities in food systems power. Ultimately,

then, the practical merit and intended broader significance of this dissertation is to help expand the range of actors, values, and forms of knowledge and expertise achieving fruitful expression in food (re)localization towards fostering more equitable, legitimate, and broadly-owned future policies and programs.

## **Chapter Contributions**

### ***Chapter 1: What does local food policy look like?***

In Chapter 1 of this dissertation, I clarify exactly what knowledge counts in Cleveland and Detroit’s food policy, how this knowledge is evaluated, and why this matters, more broadly. In Cleveland, for example, I show that both community members and officials tend to trust applied professionals as politically relevant experts based largely in their work skills and standing. Often, these experts collaborate in somewhat informal decision-making processes that occur largely out of the public eye, where they ad-hoc introduce and evaluate various applied professionals’ perspectives and social science research to substantiate food policy. In contrast, in Detroit both the government and policy advocates have placed trust in grassroots residents, particularly those who represent and comprise the city’s dominant African-American population, to guide food policymaking. These residents tend to leverage their experiential, cultural, and historical knowledge to substantiate political determinations via decision-making processes that are highly transparent, publicly inclusive, and often driven by citizens, themselves. Essential features of policymaking thus differ between the two cities and also the national level where scientific elites tend to guide decision-making via moderately transparent, given-and-take decision-making that favors quantitative data as the basis of decision-making. Taken together, I suggest these varied dynamics present a compelling basis with which to establish that civic epistemologies differ between and within various levels of governance, and I demonstrate that this has implications for both government and society—including if and how social actors organize and achieve political influence locally, or not.

### ***Chapter 2: Why and how is local food policy emerging?***

In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, I focus on Detroit to explore how the unique knowledge dynamics characterizing distinct cities’ local food systems and food policy come to be. I argue that through four specific boundary activities, distinct actors in Detroit—who I term “embedded

experiential experts”—were able to effectively assert their and their know-how’s authority in the city’s food system over the “professionalized experts” who originally dominated. This analysis includes a consideration of the dominant intellectual activities that comprise boundary-work—expulsion, expansion, and protection of autonomy (which prior scholarship has already identified)—along with introducing what I term “accommodation” (on these three former activities, see Gieryn 1983, which first identified them; for a review of additional pertinent research, see Lamont and Molnar 2002). Accommodation captures instances where an expert authority facilitates rivals in crossing existing intellectual delineations based on certain conditions. This fourth boundary-activity complements the three identified by scholars prior by showing that intellectual authorities can develop their power and that of an overall epistemological arena not only by getting rid of/discrediting rivals but also through strategically incorporating them. Especially in pluralistic contexts such as the U.S., accommodation helps make sense of how varied actors, interests, and forms of knowledge can seemingly collaborate in guiding social and political change while singular and distinct epistemological dynamics nonetheless characterize their overall actions. Accommodation, I thus argue, is an important concept for making sense of arrangements of knowledge and power not only in the context of Detroit and its food system but in many other locations and around numerous additional issue areas.

### ***Chapter 3: What are the implications of rising local food policy?***

Finally, in chapter 3, I compare how rising food policy in Cleveland and Detroit has impacted local food movement participants’ very objectives and actions vis-à-vis the food system in each place. I show that, over time, these participants moved from disparate food systems efforts to a generally unified approach centered on sustainable economic growth in Cleveland and social justice in Detroit. I explain these outcomes as the result of what I term “direct” and “indirect” policy feedback effects. Direct policy feedback effects occur when government influences certain social actors (in my case, local food movement participants) head-on. Indirect policy feedback effects, meanwhile, take place as policymaking shapes these same social actors secondarily by first influencing mass publics. Indirect policy feedback effects offer an improved recognition of citizens’ own agency—not only the state’s, as has been a traditional focus of scholarship—in policy | society relations.

### **Future Avenues for Research**

This dissertation provides evidence that there are deeply-rooted, disparate, and widely impactful battles over knowledge and influence taking place at the local level. As (re)localization continues to rise around not only food but also climate change, energy extraction, and several social issues (e.g. individual and family rights vis-à-vis abortion and adoption, wages, bathroom use, and gun ownership), further examining these contests and their effects is critical both for scholars of socio-political change and for concerned practitioners. In addition, this dissertation suggests that struggles to shape food (re)localization may be influencing the materiality of food, itself, including the very ways in which food is produced, distributed, and consumed. Future research can more fully explore this potential through additional empirical analysis and engagement with theories around co-production, the societal-environment dialect, and the social construction of technology and the environment, for example. Such work will offer scholars and practitioners an even better sense of what is at stake for both food and democracy in the social and political battles this dissertation illuminates.

### **Works Cited**

- Gieryn, Thomas. (1983) "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review*. 48(6): 781-95.
- Lamont, Michele and Virag Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28:167-95.