

JUSTICE IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY

Strategies for Home, Community, and World

Pamela K. Brubaker

Rebecca Todd Peters

Laura A. Stivers

Editors

Westminster John Knox Press
LOUISVILLE • LONDON

Contents

Contributors	vii
Introduction	1
Part One. Household Strategies	
1. Supporting Community Farming by Rebecca Todd Peters	17
2. Relating to Household Labor Justly by W. Anne Joh	29
3. Consuming Responsibly by Marcia Allen Owens	40
4. Eating Intentionally by Shannon Jung	50
Part Two. Community Strategies	
5. Holding Corporations Accountable by Laura Stivers	65
6. Engaging Environmental Justice by Carlton Waterhouse	78
7. Revitalizing Local Communities by Wylin Dassie	91
8. Creating the Commons by Larry L. Rasmussen	101
Part Three. Public Policy Strategies	
9. Promoting Solidarity with Migrants by Daisy L. Machado	115
10. Reforming Global Economic Policies by Pamela K. Brubaker	127
11. Ensuring Sustainability by John B. Cobb Jr.	140
12. Challenging Our Assumptions by Mary Elizabeth Hobgood	150
Index	161

Introduction

Pamela K. Brubaker, Rebecca Todd Peters, and Laura Stivers

Your well-paying computer job has been outsourced to India; you are unable to pay your health insurance premiums; you discover that 80 percent of the food you eat is genetically modified, that all of your elected politicians are millionaires, and that corporate advertising is inundating your kids' schools. As an American you might have experienced one or all of these negative effects of economic globalization. The situation is considerably worse for two-thirds of the people in the world, many of whom have been uprooted from their land to make way for agribusinesses only to suffer unemployment in overcrowded cities. Many people in our world lack basic necessities such as suitable housing, clean water, food, health care, and education. Although poverty is an age-old problem, in many places economic globalization has exacerbated, not alleviated, it.

Most of us would agree that these negative effects of economic globalization do not coincide with our visions of a healthy society. We have a sense of dis-ease, but we often feel overwhelmed by the seeming inevitability of economic globalization and rising corporate power. We wonder what we as individuals or even as communities can do. In addition, we sometimes have ambivalence about globalization. Despite its drawbacks, many Americans experience some benefit

from an economic system that rewards those who have disposable income. We have access to any type of food we want, any time of year; we can communicate instantaneously with people around the globe and readily travel to any destination we desire; we can buy electronics and clothes and many other consumer goods quite cheaply. What we have not quite gotten around to examining are the ethics that underlie decisions we make about how we spend our money, where we work, how we invest, what we do with our “free” time, and many other aspects of daily life.

We, the editors of this volume, are three white women who are active in Christian churches and social justice movements that seek to challenge and problematize preconceived ideas about the inevitability and beneficence of economic globalization. We are all professors of social ethics who are passionately committed to teaching and activism that promote God’s vision of *ekklesia* or a community of equals. We believe that those of us “at the top,” who do benefit in some ways from economic globalization, bear some responsibility for the negative implications of our lifestyles on those “at the bottom.” In compiling this volume we invited a diverse group of contributors to help us reflect on these responsibilities.

This desire to question our behavior and complicity in the increasing destitution of the majority of the world’s people is not intended to elicit guilt among our readers—indeed, quite the contrary. Guilt is often accompanied by social paralysis. To avoid feeling guilty, many of us simply avoid situations that might prompt guilt. In other words, if we feel guilty when we think about the ways in which our lifestyles are bought at the price of the sacrifice of others, the easiest solution is simply not to think about our actions at all. Life is much simpler this way. After all, most of us have enough trouble getting dinner on the table for our families without trying to figure out how far the food traveled to get there or how much the workers who harvested the crops were paid.

Unfortunately, sticking our heads in the sand does not absolve us of our responsibility to our neighbor. As Jesus taught in the parable of the Good Samaritan, we are responsible to care for our neighbors—even when we do not know them. We cannot allow our guilt to paralyze us into inaction. Guilt has no place in Christian community. Christ did not come to make us feel guilty, but to teach us a new way to live. Christ’s vision of a better world includes a profound message of forgiveness that allows us to continue to function in the world. Many of us buy clothes made in sweatshops, drive SUVs, or eat food grown in unsustainable ways. This is often a result of how unreflective Americans are about our consumer behaviors. Most of us are ignorant of many of the ethical problems associated with our consumer behaviors. Perhaps others of us feel powerless to live our lives in alternative ways that challenge the status quo. Either way, we end up contributing to the problems of economic injustice and environmental degradation in our world.

While Christ teaches us that forgiveness is indeed a free gift from God, it is

not intended to be a free pass for living an unreflective life. In a world of social injustice and ecological destruction, it is not enough to live our lives simply being nice to others, refraining from lying, cheating, and stealing, and basking in God's love and blessing. We are called to reflect on the blessings in our lives and to examine how our lives are interconnected with millions of people around the world *whom we will never know*. Where have our blessings come from? Are there structures and powers that exist in the world that have contributed to our affluence, our well-being, what we might call our "blessedness"? We are called to respond to God's desire for the well-being of the whole creation by taking responsibility for our lives and the ways in which we help and hurt others—intentionally or unintentionally.

We are indeed freed by God's forgiveness, but we are freed for a new life in Christ that requires us to live differently, a new life that asks us to participate in building God's vision of a new heaven and a new earth. Each of us is called to follow Christ in working to build God's kin-dom¹ here on earth, and Jesus' actions and ministry offer us a guide to follow. Just as he ministered to the sick, the poor, the outcast, and the needy, we are called to look into the faces of our neighbors and respond. Jesus lived his life in opposition to the dominant powers of his world in an effort to help others and to transform the world around him. Following Jesus' call, we seek a society in which preventable social problems like hunger, illiteracy, abuse, and child labor become a historical memory rather than a present reality.

Our hope for this book is that it will motivate people to make changes in their own lifestyles and to organize with others to change institutions and policies so that all inhabitants of the earth as well as the earth itself can, as theologian Sallie McFague says, "live abundantly." The abundant life will be based "not on material goods, but on those things that really make people happy: the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their children; medical care and educational opportunities; loving relationships; meaningful work; an enriching imaginative and spiritual life; and time spent with friends and in the natural world."²

Many books analyze what globalization is and how it affects us, but not very many offer concrete suggestions for how to respond to it.³ In this book we start from the assumption that economic globalization, in its present form, is causing more harm than good. Although this is a contested assumption, the goal of this book is not to convince readers that economic globalization is causing harm. We write to those who are already aware of its negative effects, either directly or indirectly, and want to know what they can do to make our economic systems more socially and environmentally just. We think this book is unique for two reasons. One, we offer strategies for resisting the current model of economic globalization and for rethinking how we can promote just and sustainable communities. Two, we do our rethinking from within a Christian ethical framework for those who connect such resistance to faith and spirituality.

UNDERSTANDING THE CURRENT PROBLEM

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the virtual disappearance of state-sponsored communism, capitalism has risen to the fore as the reigning economic model. There are few places in the world where nation-states are experimenting with economic models other than the capitalist model. While China has certainly retained a strong state-centered political economy, it has eagerly embraced capitalism and economic growth as the Chinese seek to become more respected participants in the global economy. It is true that capitalist countries have evidenced stronger support for the democratic freedoms and values that most of us in North America cherish and desire. Nevertheless, an uncritical valorization of capitalism as synonymous with democracy and freedom can allow us to overlook some of the deep ethical problems that are also associated with the model of capitalism that marks our current era.⁴

New strategies for promoting free-market capitalism and economic integration focus on three primary public policy strategies—privatization, deregulation, and liberalization of trade and finance. Privatization is the move to place assets and services that have traditionally been owned and managed by the government into the hands of private business. Transportation, education, prison systems, and the postal service are examples of services that have historically been managed by state and federal governments in the United States. It has traditionally been part of our philosophy that certain tasks and services are so important for the common good of the community, especially those to which all citizens should have access, that they should be managed by the government. When goods are in the private sector, we have less say about who will have access to them. “Deregulation” refers to the attempt to get rid of governmental regulations that affect the business community. Proponents argue that regulations hamper the efficiency of the market and get in the way of a “free market.” Since the 1980s, numerous regulations intended to protect consumer safety, the environment, and worker safety have been struck down as impediments to the market. Finally, reigning economic theory is oriented toward increasing the volume of international trade. This is often accomplished through “free” trade agreements that remove or reduce tariffs or quotas on goods and services and restrictions on foreign investment. Although in principle this may seem reasonable, in a world with huge imbalances of power, wealth, and capacity, the results are mixed. For example, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has led to job losses in both the United States and Mexico. The net loss of U.S. manufacturing jobs is roughly 1 million while the agricultural sector in Mexico is estimated to have lost 1.3 million jobs.⁵

We are certainly not rejecting all international trade or market economies. Our strategies focus on resisting the current model of economic globalization known as “neoliberalism.” This model promotes the free market as the best

route to ensuring economic development and political, economic, moral, and cultural liberty. More specifically, it aims for freer international trade and investment, less social and environmental regulations for corporations, the privatization of state-owned enterprises, and a decrease in social spending. Proponents believe that a market free of government regulation and intervention will promote the most economic growth, which will in turn benefit the most people. We argue that the neoliberal economic model has been detrimental to most people and to the environment. We will highlight just a few of the problems associated with the current economic model.

Global financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have acquired such power and status in our global economy that they are able to pressure countries into implementing neoliberal economic policies as prerequisites for participation in the global marketplace. Countries needing loans to pay off debt must agree to structural adjustment programs, in effect restructuring their economies to fit the neoliberal policy agenda. Even recent concessions of debt forgiveness orchestrated by the G-8 (Group of 8: United States, Great Britain, Canada, Italy, France, Germany, Japan, and Russia) in Scotland were tied to neoliberal market reforms. Proponents of this economic model argue that handing over economic decision making from the state to the free market is an inevitable process that is the result of large historical factors. While they acknowledge that countries narrow their political and economic policy choices by adopting a free-market-oriented economic agenda, they argue that the increased economic growth and prosperity is worth it. One of the most dangerous side effects of current market reforms, however, is the emphasis on reducing social spending, which has made education and health care less accessible for many people in the world. The emphasis on privatization of state-owned enterprises has also led to the provision of fewer public goods and services. The private sector does not need to ensure accessibility to goods and often charges more than many people can pay. The privatization of water in Bolivia, where rates tripled or even quadrupled, is a good example.⁶

In light of the growing inequality between the rich and poor around the world in recent decades, we question the faith that has been placed in this “one model fits all” approach to economic activity and the promise of prosperity that underlies it. Indeed, the current model of economic globalization has led to greater inequality.⁷ Critics call it the “20:80 Society,” wherein the top 20 percent of the population participate in the life, earnings, and consumption of the system, while the other 80 percent are exploited or, even worse, marginalized by the system.⁸ By 2003 the compensation for CEOs in the United States was estimated to be 301 times the average worker’s pay, up from 42 times the average worker’s pay in 1980.⁹ According to United for a Fair Economy, changes in family income in the United States from 1947 to 1979 were roughly equal across the economic spectrum, with incomes in the bottom 20 percent

rising slightly faster than those in the top 20 percent. This shifted dramatically from 1979 to 2001, the period that coincides with the rise of neoliberal economic policies, when incomes in the bottom 20 percent of the population rose by only 3 percent, while the top 20 percent rose by 53 percent and the top 5 percent by 81 percent.¹⁰ Global inequalities also increased in this period. The United Nations' *Human Development Report 1999* reported that "the gap in per capita income (GNP) between the countries with the richest fifth of the world's people and those with the poorest fifth widened from 30 to 1 in 1960, to 60 to 1 in 1990, to 74 to 1 in 1995."¹¹ Statistics for inequality in the distribution of wealth rather than income would show even greater disparity both nationally and globally.

In addition to questions about the current model's ability to promote economic benefits for the most marginalized citizens of our world, there are also questions about this model's impact on our environment. The decrease in governmental regulations on environmental issues has led to increased environmental destruction.¹² Furthermore, the economic development strategies promoted by structural adjustment policies are not environmentally friendly. For example, many countries are forced to switch from small-scale sustainable agriculture to large-scale industrial export agriculture to bring in money for debt interest payments.

The current economic model also privileges an individualistic approach to decision making that assumes people make "rational" economic decisions that promote their own self-interest. This assumption that individuals are selfish and indifferent to how others fare leads to policies with thin notions of relationship or the common good. While economists have long claimed that economics is a value-neutral "science," this focus on individual well-being as a core element of the framework of free-market capitalism functions to hinder it from promoting economic activity that reflects just social relations.

Furthermore, there are values that serve to channel and direct current models of economic activity. Recent economic restructuring that lessens governmental involvement and seeks to promote maximum profit gives preference to the values of profit and efficiency over other values like sustainability and economic justice. This restructuring encourages corporations to maximize their profits. The argument is that corporate profit will lead to more jobs. Often the opposite occurs—workers are deemed "inefficient" and replaced by machines. Moreover, a large amount of profit being made in the global economy is not from productive investment, but from extractive investment in the form of financial speculation. This is nothing more than sophisticated gambling and does nothing to create jobs or wealth for communities. Simply put, when economies are structured primarily around profit, the interests of money will be more important than the interests of people or the environment.

The current model of economic globalization is not concerned about meaningful work that is geographically and environmentally sensitive to par-

ticular communities. Corporations prioritizing profit seek to shed labor and environmental standards and are not particularly concerned about creating enough work for all, let alone meaningful work. Indeed, given the internal logic of the system to keep wages low, it is in their best interest to have a pool of unemployed people seeking work. Economic globalization is displacing more and more people as well. These displaced people often become a cheap and flexible labor force in the globalized economy.

Proponents of neoliberal economic globalization argue that it encourages democracy because financial investors want to invest only in countries that are stable and have open and clear economic and political procedures. Critics argue that what is democracy in name is in truth “plutocracy” in which the monied interests of a few have inordinate power. Of the largest one hundred economies in the world today, fifty-one are corporations. Between corporate power, trade agreements such as NAFTA and CAFTA, and international financial institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, and the WTO (none of which is democratic), the power and autonomy of national, state, and local governments to govern their own economies has been restricted. The interests of international trade, which coincide with the interests of transnational corporations, take precedence. For example, international organizations have increasingly restricted governments from instituting environmental and social protections.

CREATING JUST HOUSEHOLDS, COMMUNITIES, AND ENVIRONMENTS

Because our goal is to be more constructive than critical, we offer a general vision of characteristics that we think just societies exhibit. We are not trying to offer a one-size-fits-all blueprint for how communities should be organized. In fact, we believe there are and should be a plurality of models for just and healthy community. Within this plurality, however, there are common elements. One is what we call narrow inequality. Just societies are not likely to have complete equality since there will always be differences in talent and motivation, but they will have public policies that sharply narrow the gap in wealth and income. For example, there might be safety nets put in place so that no one goes below a certain standard of living, and there might be a maximum wage law as well as progressive taxation.

Another common element of just societies is the commitment to sustainability. Justice requires that healthy households and communities will respect the earth and its living inhabitants and find ways to live within the limits of the earth’s carrying capacity, or what the earth is able to sustain. In today’s world, economic growth is valued over sustainability. Societies oriented toward justice will require a different economic system than unbridled capitalism.

Technology, industry, and agriculture would be modeled on sustainability, and the use of renewable resources would be the norm. Lastly, households would take seriously population control and sustainable consumption.

Just societies will also have a commitment to healthy relationships in and between communities. Just societies view individuals as social by nature, but are also aware of the oppressive ways that humans can relate. Such societies will have public policies that respect individual rights, yet also view individuals as part of larger families and groups. These policies would protect both individuals and groups from various oppressions (e.g., racism, sexism) as well as proactively resist oppression. In a just society, profit and efficiency would not take precedence over all other values. Resources would be invested in creating healthy communities and environments where caring relationships can develop. The end goal of any economic and political system would be the flourishing of God's creation. The interests of people and the environment would be given more priority than the interests of money.

Work and productivity are also necessary for a just society, but not simply as a means to profit. A healthy society will find ways to make more work fulfilling and will ensure that work environments are safe and support human dignity. A just society will also find ways to promote local development that provides meaningful jobs that pay a living wage for people in their geographical environment so that they can have roots in a place—a home. Local development will fit the needs of the community and be environmentally sensitive.

For communities to be able to address their particular social and environmental needs, the principle of subsidiarity will be important. That is, decisions will be made at the most local level possible. National policies will still be important to ensure standards of social and environmental justice and to regulate fairness between communities, but a majority of power would be decentralized so that people can participate in defining their own development. Most importantly, local and national politics will not be dominated by big-money interests. A just society will have a democracy where votes count and leaders get elected according to what policies they support, not according to how deep their pockets are.

Lastly, just societies will value good education and health care for all. Policies will ensure accessibility and not restrict such important goods to those who can pay. Public goods that are paid for by tax money will be given importance. Just societies will also be organized around patterns of work, family, and relaxation that allow for families and communities to care for one another. Active concern for the development and well-being of children will go far beyond providing quality education to all, but will also include quality day care, after school care, and elder care as well as programs that facilitate the development of relationships of mentoring and care for children at risk. Recognition of our common humanity and responsibility to care for one another as sisters and brothers will replace society's current overemphasis on individualism.

STRATEGIES FOR PROMOTING JUST AND HEALTHY SOCIETIES

Clearly there is much work to be done if we hope to transform globalization into a more just and healthy model for social interaction. In working, teaching, organizing, and talking with people across the United States, we repeatedly encounter a certain sense of hopelessness among students, laypeople, and concerned citizens alike. This hopelessness is rooted in a despairing sense of the massive scale of the problems that are associated with the current form of economic globalization and an inability to see how we might begin to work together to effect change in these global systems of oppression and domination. Many people agree that something is wrong, but they simply do not know what to do about it.

We have written this book to help individuals and their communities begin to see ways that they can facilitate the necessary transformation toward justice in which our faith calls us to participate. We have hope for a better future, hope for a world community that approximates justice, and hope for a healthier planet and human community. Some people call us and our vision naive; we prefer to think of ourselves as followers of Christ who are called to justice. We believe that our purpose in life is to work toward making the world more just. We are quite cognizant of the powers that be and how they are arrayed against our vision of hope and transformation. In the chapters that follow you will read critical assessments of the current political-economic structures that dominate our world, but with those assessments come examples of people and communities who are actively involved in making a new way. We hope that these chapters will encourage you to organize your household toward personal lifestyle changes and inspire your church or civic organization to take up community and public policy work to transform the status quo.

The book is divided into three parts—household, community, and public policy—because these are the three arenas where social change occurs. While many of the issues and problems raised in these chapters can (and should) be addressed on the individual, community, and public policy level, we have asked each author to focus on one particular level for ease of comprehension and activism. We believe that ultimately it is essential for change to take place on all three levels simultaneously in order for larger-scale transformation to take place.

If you are new to these issues and feel overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problems, we encourage you to start small, to set a goal to work toward for three to six months. As we hope you will see by the end of this book, much of the problem that we face is ideological—our ideas about what is possible have been shaped and formed by the prevailing economic logic of neoliberal capitalism in ways that often disallow alternative visions of how we might order our society and our economy. By making small steps in our personal lifestyles we can begin

to challenge the dominant ideology that sometimes shapes our vision of the future. As our habits and practices begin to change, our minds often become more open to new possibilities for the future.

It is often easiest to begin projects on a small scale, such as by joining a CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) farm, starting a compost pile, or renegotiating our relationship with people who work in our homes (e.g., housecleaning, child care, lawn service). Making changes in our own households is often the most manageable place to begin. Furthermore, it is hard to convince others of the need for change if we have not addressed our own complicity in undermining healthy societies. Taking one step at a time is key. That said, we do not have to have a spotless individual record (buy exclusively organic food, have all of our assets in socially responsible funds, etc.) before we can begin to work with others resisting the current form of economic globalization. Similarly, policies aimed at a healthy society will not be instituted at the national level unless there is enough household and community support for them.

We hope that this book can be a guide for thinking about the ethical and spiritual issues at stake as well as offering suggestions for how your church; PTA; women's group, men's group, or youth group; or Sunday school class might begin to organize around larger community and public policy strategies that will change the face of your town or local community as well as change the face of globalization on a larger scale. While you might want to try to follow some of the suggestions or examples illustrated in these chapters, they can also serve as a stimulus for creative thinking about what the most pressing problems are in your community and how you might work with others to develop strategies for addressing the problems. We have included discussion questions at the end of each chapter to prompt such thinking and strategizing.

Households are the focus of the first section of the book, with chapters that describe individual strategies and practices that we can do on an individual basis within our families. Rebecca Todd Peters looks at how households can support local economies and environmentally healthy food production through Community Supported Agriculture. She compares corporate agribusiness with biodynamic and organic farming, arguing that the latter promotes the long-term thriving of the earth and people. Furthermore, she argues that a relational connection to farmers and the earth can serve an important role in moral formation. Discussion questions highlight the relationship between eating and food production and prompt us to think about our own moral agency in relation to the food we eat.

Anne Joh examines how those of us who employ household labor can do so justly. She examines experiences of domestic laborers in the current global economic order—experiences that cause “bruised hearts.” While not ignoring power discrepancies, she proposes labor relationships based on reciprocity, interdependence, and mutuality, drawing on Christian and Korean traditions that speak to a “fullness of the heart.” Discussion questions prompt readers to

identify injustices in caregiving work and envision ways to revalue and relate to household labor justly.

Marcia Owens considers the excessive consumption patterns of Americans that have become a virus (affluenza), infecting individual households as well as churches. She argues that we need to come to a new awareness, giving priority to the norms of sustainability and sufficiency. To lead us to such an awareness, she offers questions that help assess our consumption, and examples of how churches have become more environmentally and socially responsible in their behaviors and practices. Discussion questions prompt awareness of our purchasing patterns and ways to be responsible consumers.

Shannon Jung concludes this section by analyzing the quality, safety, and availability of food in the current system of economic globalization and our spending and eating practices in the affluent world. He gives strategies for implementing a Christian vision of good eating based on honoring our bodies through delight and sharing, promoting more equitable distribution of the costs of food production and eating, and promoting more environmentally sustainable food production. Discussion questions prompt reflection on how cultural forces of global capitalism affect the way we eat and envision a spirituality of eating based on delight, sharing, and treating all bodies as temples.

Communities are the focus of the second section of the book, with chapters that describe what communities and congregations are doing to address problems resulting from economic globalization. Laura Stivers considers the community impact of job displacement caused by “footloose capital.” She looks to the community benefit agreement negotiated by a broad-based coalition of organizations in Los Angeles for lessons in how to hold corporations accountable to local communities. She argues for an alternative vision of economic globalization based on protection of the common good and rootedness to particular places. Discussion questions challenge communities and congregations to address issues of job quality and local corporate accountability standards as a way to promote the common good.

Carlton Waterhouse analyzes the connections between globalization and environmental injustice. He tells the inspiring story of ReGenesis, a South Carolina community organization that successfully transformed a distressed neighborhood. He argues that their success was due to communally negotiated and shared virtues that guided them in developing effective strategies and approaches to environmental injustices. These communal virtues sustained the community, allowed them to weather adversities, and inspired hope in other communities. Discussion questions promote awareness of environmental injustice and ways that communities and congregations can foster communal virtues in addressing problems posed by economic globalization.

Wylin Dassie examines how congregations, following the biblical mandate of concern for the poor and needy, have been reevaluating their public role in response to changes wrought by economic globalization. She illustrates different

ways that congregations have participated in community economic development strategies and addresses the difficulty of securing funding for such efforts. Discussion questions ask congregations to identify ministry projects that address local needs and challenge them to think theologically about community responsibility.

Larry Rasmussen argues that creation is a commons to which we all belong and gives five examples of communities that are re-creating the commons, from land trusts in the United States to African “Earthkeeping” Churches. All of these examples honor the land and the local community as the commons, a value that economic globalization does not take seriously. Discussion questions rekindle a sense of belonging to the land and encourage readers to envision ways that communities and congregations can create the commons.

Public policies, particularly those of the U.S. government, are the focus of the last section of the book, with articles that examine ways to respond to economic globalization on a policy level. Daisy Machado explores the impact of globalization on the borderlands of the United States and Mexico. She challenges us to overcome negative attitudes toward those who are different, including immigrants, and to act in solidarity to uphold human dignity by promoting policies that address global economic inequality and deplorable working conditions for those on the border and in other areas of the world. Discussion questions ask us to think about our perceptions of immigrants and immigration history and identify how we can be in solidarity with migrants and people in the borderlands by working to change policies.

Pamela Brubaker analyzes the neoliberal policies the U.S. government has imposed on global economic institutions, drawing on her participation in World Council of Churches–sponsored conversations with the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. She argues for an “economy of life” paradigm that calls for just, participatory, and sustainable communities and maintains that debt cancellation, regulation of global financial speculation, and fair trade policies will promote such a paradigm. Discussion questions raise the issue of our responsibility for changing unjust international policies and ask readers to envision ways to get involved on both a small and large scale.

John Cobb examines the negative environmental impacts of U.S. policies. He argues for a Christian “bottom-up” perspective that focuses on the most vulnerable human and nonhuman creatures, as well as the planet itself. He presents already existing and imaginative alternatives to oil-dependent modes of farming and city designs that would promote sustainability. Discussion questions ask how we can live more sustainably and what kinds of public policies would follow from a “bottom-up” perspective.

Mary Hobgood shows how the affluent also have a stake in the struggle for justice. She advocates an ethic of solidarity and accountability with all those who struggle for social justice, citing a specific need for critical economic liter-

acy and an alternative Christian vision to that of the religious right. Discussion questions promote critical class awareness and uplift class oppression and poverty as crucial moral issues for Christianity.

While the topics covered by this book are certainly not exhaustive, they represent interesting and important examples of how individuals, households, and local communities can begin to get involved in the process of working toward justice in our current global economy. The resources of civil society (local churches and community groups) stand poised to make an enormous difference in the fate of economic globalization in our world. Several chapters in this book document examples of how this is already happening. We invite you to listen to the voice of God in our midst calling us to justice. We hope you will join us in the struggle.

NOTES

1. This term was coined by Ada María Isasi-Díaz to replace the patriarchal and hierarchical notion of God's "kingdom" with the more egalitarian, familial term "kin-dom," which refers to a place where all our brothers and sisters (or "kin") are welcomed. See *Mujerista Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1996), 103 fn. 8.
2. Sallie McFague, *Life Abundant: Rethinking Theology and Economy for a Planet in Peril* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 209–10.
3. Rebecca Todd Peters, *In Search of the Good Life: The Ethics of Globalization* (New York: Continuum, 2004); Cynthia Moe-Lobeda, *Healing a Broken World: Globalization and God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002); Pamela K. Brubaker, *Globalization at What Price? Economic Change and Daily Life* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2001); Jerry Mander and Edward Goldsmith, eds., *The Case Against the Global Economy: And a Turn Toward the Local* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1997).
4. This model of capitalism as the "new world order" is not unrelated to the current "war on terror." This vision of capitalism as synonymous with democracy and freedom has been adopted by the Bush administration as it seeks to impose its vision of a democratic-capitalist political economy on other countries. Some charge that the Bush administration's attempts to keep the public overly fearful of terrorist attacks is a strategy to divert attention away from the economic difficulties many families face. While terrorism is certainly a serious concern, we must retain the capacity for critical ethical analysis of political and economic policies.
5. Robert E. Scott and David Ratner, "NAFTA's Cautionary Tale," Issue Brief #214, Economic Policy Institute, 20 July 2005, available online at www.epinet.org.
6. Protest erupted in this case. See [http://www.citizen.org/documents/Bolivia_\(PDF\).PDF](http://www.citizen.org/documents/Bolivia_(PDF).PDF).
7. See Globalization and Inequality Group, The Brookings Institution, www.brookings.edu.
8. Hans-Peter Martin and Harald Schumann, *The Global Trap: Globalization and the Assault on Prosperity and Democracy*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London: Zed, 1996), 3.
9. http://www.faireconomy.org/research/CEO_Pay_charts.html (accessed July 14, 2005).

10. http://www.faireconomy.org/research/income_charts.html (accessed July 14, 2005).
11. United Nations, *Human Development Report 1999* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 104–5.
12. See the Center for International Education's Online Internet Guide "Understanding the Face of Globalization" for organizations doing research on this issue: <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/CIE/Resources/globalization/globalenv.html>.

PART ONE
HOUSEHOLD STRATEGIES

Chapter 1

Supporting Community Farming

Rebecca Todd Peters

Dogwood Springs Farm in Burkesville, Kentucky, is a ninety-acre organic farm run by the Korrow family. Eight years ago, frustrated by both corporate competition that undercut prices for their organic garlic and the difficulties associated with local marketing, the Korrows joined a growing localized, grassroots movement known as Community Supported Agriculture (CSA). Now, rather than having to transport their crops to local farmers' markets, or arrange to sell them to local independent groceries (which are themselves rapidly disappearing), for twenty-five weeks of the year the Korrows provide a bushel of seasonal, organic fruits and vegetables to a group of thirty urban families in Nashville. Each family buys a seasonal share in the farm for \$600, which is paid up front. The money enables the Korrows to purchase seeds and cover their annual expenses and provides the farm with a stable consumer base. Consumers benefit by getting to know and develop relationships with the family who is growing their food and by having access to locally grown, fresh, organic products. This alternative market model challenges the dominant neoliberal economic wisdom about trade, profits, and agriculture in general. But more than serving as merely an alternative economic model, it also reveals an alternative ethical

paradigm reflecting a vision of the good life that contradicts the dominant attitudes of success and happiness promoted by capitalist media outlets and the business machines that run them. CSA is one example of a larger movement within the farming community that focuses on embracing and promoting an agrarian ethic of sustainability and biodiversity. This alternative ethic challenges the corporate model of agribusiness that has come to dominate global food production in the last quarter century. Let us examine each of these approaches to agriculture and their underlying value systems in turn.

CORPORATE AGRIBUSINESS AS A REFLECTION OF NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION

While various forms of farming implements have been engineered and used throughout history in agricultural societies, John Deere introduced his first “all steel, non-sticking, unstoppable moldboard plows” to the farming community in 1837.¹ These early steel plows began the transformation of traditional farming practices, ushering in a new era of invasive farming techniques. Plows, tractors, harvesters, and other high-tech farming equipment have eased the physical burden of farmers’ backbreaking work. They have also contributed to increased crop yield and efficiency in farming. Conventional American farmers embraced this new technology in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, and by the 1930s over a million tractors were working U.S. soil.²

The end of World War II saw a number of social and technological changes that contributed to the rise of a model of corporate-driven agriculture that has greatly transformed the production of food in our world. With the destruction of much of the European continent, the Marshall Plan’s commitment to help feed and rebuild Europe after the war increased the demand on American agricultural production. Additionally, pesticides like DDT that had been used in the war to control lice and malaria were subsequently marketed to farmers as a cheap and effective way to control crop-eating insects. A barrage of chemical herbicides promised equally beneficial results in controlling weeds. Technological equipment like mechanical foggers and aerial sprayers, also developed for use in the war, were soon adapted for agricultural use and marketed to farmers. The postwar boom and prosperity enticed many farmers to live like their urban counterparts, which often resulted in one of two things: an increased need for cash to purchase consumer goods or eschewing the family farm and moving to the city in search of something new.³ Some farmers moved to expand the size of their farmlands and try to increase profits, while others sold off land to neighbors or corporate farms and moved to the city. All of this contributed to the changing face of farming communities in the United States.

Since the 1950s farm policy and agricultural experts have greatly emphasized efficiency, which they define as increased crop yield. They argue that the best

way to achieve this efficiency is through a practice known as “monocropping.” Monocropping is a highly industrialized farming process that focuses on planting a single crop and often utilizes genetically enhanced “high-yield” seeds and intensive herbicides and pesticides. This type of large-scale farming also requires the use of large, fossil-fuel-driven farming equipment. As farms grow bigger and shift to more industrial models of agriculture, they often adopt the monocrop approach to agriculture in an attempt to ensure the highest yield. Theoretically this means that their land is producing at its highest potential value and the highest profits will result.

In the 1970s this industrial model of agriculture, formerly called “agribusiness,” was dubbed “the Green Revolution” and was heavily promoted by development theorists who urged farmers in the two-thirds world to produce crops for export rather than for local food consumption. Agribusiness was endorsed and promoted by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), who cooperated with corporations and local governments to provide initially low-cost, hybridized, “high-yielding” seeds to farmers. The Bank also financed many of the large water projects that were necessary for irrigating industrial-style farms. As the structural adjustment crisis of the 1980s squeezed many poorer countries, however, new policies by the Bank and the IMF eliminated government-supported national seed banks and low-interest loans for farmers.⁴ This style of farming is best suited for large, corporate style farms and for creating crops for sale on large markets. As a result, more and more farmers in the two-thirds world are growing industrial monocrops for export rather than food for local consumption.

The growing world population has also driven the development of agribusiness as conventional agronomists argue that the only way to feed the increasing world population is to increase the productivity of the land. As we have seen, the dominant perspective argues that this is best achieved through a highly industrialized form of agriculture that relies heavily on chemicals, machinery, and monocropping. All of the values promoted by this form of agriculture—increased efficiency, growth for trade, and increased economy of scale—are consistent with the values and ideals promoted by the neoliberal vision of economic development and increased global integration.

BIODYNAMIC AND ORGANIC FARMING AS AN ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL VISION

A growing and important movement in agriculture has taken various forms in recent years. It is known by different names—biodynamic, organic, or small-scale farming. In this movement, we find small-scale farmers who orient their attitudes about farming around the values of sustainability and integration. Biodynamic farming focuses on small farms that have a mutually enhancing balance

of animals and plants. The plants feed the animals, as well as the humans who tend the land, and the animals, in turn, provide manure for natural fertilization of the plants, as well as dairy products and meat. Every aspect of a biodynamic farm is integrated to reduce waste, maximize efficiency and production through natural processes, and create a space in which humans, animals, and the earth can live together in mutually sustaining ways. Organic farming is also oriented toward natural pest control, fertilization, and soil enhancement, and it uses natural rather than chemical or synthetic elements to achieve these results. Both biodynamic and organic farming are better suited to small-scale farming than to large corporate farms. In recent years, though, the advent of corporate-style “organic” farms has generated division and debate within the alternative agriculture movement.

In addition to these farming movements, a new consumer movement known as the “Slow Food” movement is gaining interest and support in many places around the world. Here consumers around the world who object to the standardization of food and the increased emphasis on “fast food” have joined together to promote a slowing down of our food practices and dietary habits. What they mean to do is promote consumer attention to the origins of our food and more careful attention to its preparation—neither of which happens in a “fast food” culture. This movement was initially born in 1986 when Carlo Petrini organized a protest of the opening of a McDonald’s near the Spanish Steps in Rome. He armed his protestors with bowls of homemade penne as a symbolic gesture embracing the local culture and cuisine in defiance of the values of generic, standardized fast food represented by the Golden Arches. The Slow Food movement now claims 80,000 members in 100 countries, including 140 local chapters (or *convivia*) in the United States. Proponents of slow food advocate for local farmers, promote regional food traditions, and work toward developing community appreciation and support for sustainable agriculture and the joy of growing, harvesting, and preparing food. Local education is often done through workshops, potlucks, and partnership programs with local schools to help engender appreciation in young people.

Small-scale farmers and many environmentalists are highly critical of the high-tech methods promoted by corporate agribusiness that were intended to increase efficiency and production but have had unexpected negative environmental and social side effects. Since 1960 we have lost half of the topsoil in this country, and we continue to lose it at a rate “17 times faster than nature can create it.”⁵ This is largely a result of the deeply invasive rupture of the soil caused by modern plowing techniques. Additionally, the overuse of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides combined with the high-tech equipment necessary for larger-scale production has increased the capital expenses of conventional farmers compared to small-scale organic and biodynamic farming techniques that are modeled on integration and sustainability.

The push toward a corporate model of farming and increased agricultural

exports is having detrimental effects on the viability of small-scale farmers. A major drive to increase U.S. grain exports in the 1970s contributed to an increase in farm size, which meant one-third fewer farmers between 1970 and 1992.⁶ Peter Rosset of the Institute for Food and Development Policy notes that “while U.S. farm exports jumped from less than \$10 billion to more than \$60 billion per year, average farm income dropped by almost one-half.”⁷ The upshot is that corporate agribusinesses now manufacture and market over 95 percent of the food in the United States and have seen markedly increased profits, while small-scale family farming has almost disappeared. Furthermore, the health and quality of farmland and local waterways are rapidly deteriorating, issues that are not reflected in the economic analysis of the “success” of corporate farming.⁸ The domination of the food industry by a handful of transnational corporations has contributed to the marginalization of small farmers as an integral part of the world’s food supply. Instead of individual farmers and their families reaping the benefits of their labor and reinvesting their earnings in their local communities, profits are now largely shared by corporations and their investors.

Despite corporations’ dominance in the market and their claims of increased crop yield, small-scale farmers have questioned the definition of efficiency used by the corporate farming community. As we have seen, corporate farmers define efficiency by focusing on crop yields, which they have been able to increase as a per-acre measurement through monocropping farming techniques. Small-scale farmers, in contrast, look more holistically at the total output of their farm rather than the productivity of crop acreage. From this vantage point, small-scale farmers argue that their farms have a higher total output per unit acre than conventional farms. In their calculations, small-scale farmers measure *all* their inputs and externalities, which might include such things as manure and compost generated on the farm for fertilizer rather than having to purchase fertilizer from an external source. Their calculations also offer a more accurate account of environmental effects like pollution and soil erosion, which corporate farmers do not include in their accounting. In addition to demonstrating a higher output for small farms than corporate farms, small-scale farmers argue that their method of calculating the “efficiency” of a farm is more accurate than crop yield per acre precisely because they do not externalize their environmental costs.

Yet another problem of industrial models of agriculture is their drive for standardization. The definition of quality in produce, for example, has been reduced to visual aesthetics. Farmers must focus on ensuring that every tomato, apple, and head of lettuce in the grocery store *looks* the same, often regardless of the taste. This standardization of crops has eliminated the natural biodiversity that farmers and nature cultivated over the centuries. While thousands of varieties of rice were once grown in the Philippines, 98 percent of the rice now comes from two varieties. Mexico has lost more than 80 percent of its maize varieties since 1930, and China has lost 90 percent of its wheat varieties in the last twenty years.⁹

It is not surprising that the perspectives of small-scale farmers and corporate agribusiness are so noticeably different, for these two groups of farmers see, understand, and experience the world differently. To large-scale farmers farming is a business enterprise and their concern is primarily economic profit. As we have seen, this profit is often bought at the cost of the health of the land and appreciation for and attention to the biodiversity of the environment. While large-scale farmers are certainly attuned to the tastes and desires of the market (as is any good businessperson), they often seem to be out of touch with what is best for the land, for our environment, and for the human community. To be fair, large-scale farmers claim to be concerned about the problem of hunger. From their perspective, the only way to feed the world is through large-scale farms and corporations managing the market. Archer Daniels Midland, one of the largest corporate agribusinesses, illustrates this view by calling itself “the supermarket to the world.”

Small-scale farmers, in contrast, are more concerned that their farming practices exist in harmony with their environment and that they promote thriving local communities. They have learned that what is best for the environment is, in the long run, also best for their livelihood as farmers. Agricultural economists define “real farmers” as those who make a living from farming.¹⁰ Many small-scale farmers live on their farms and produce food to feed themselves and sometimes others in their families and communities. They may supplement their farming with part-time or full-time work and thus do not by definition “qualify” as farmers. Farmer Gene Logsdon describes his life in the following way:

I come closer to making my living from farming in a literal sense than “real” farmers. Carol and I raise most of our food including our meat, and some for other family members, keep a garden almost an acre in size, produce half of our home heating fuel from our own wood, derive most of our recreation and satisfaction from our farm, grow corn, oats, hay, and pasture, keep a cow and a calf, two hogs, twenty ewes and their lambs, a flock of hens and broilers, and sell a few lambs and eggs. I’m sure I spend more time *living* on our farm than any industrial farmer in our county does. When they are not golfing in Florida or fishing in Canada, they spend a lot of time in the coffee shop or in my office telling me how farming is going down the drain.¹¹

Farmers like the Logsdons are often excluded from the dominant discourse about farming that drives the development of agricultural and trade policy in the United States and internationally. They simply do not have the same financial and political resources that corporate agribusiness does to shape the agricultural agenda of our world. Despite their relative lack of resources and clout, small-scale farmers are organizing around the world to promote more healthy farming practices and to support and encourage other small-scale farmers in their work.

COMMUNITY SUPPORTED AGRICULTURE

Let us return to the Korrow family. Christy and Chris and their two daughters, Kaysha and Gabrielle, live in a round two-room home that Chris built more than a decade ago. In the midst of an overindulgent consumer culture they have chosen a radically alternative life of simplicity that carries with it both burdens and blessings. Their commitment to caring for the earth, their family, and their community is reflected in their deep sense of calling to organic farming as a spiritual expression of their deeply held values. These values reflect an “earthist” approach to the world that focuses on honoring the interdependence of our world and celebrating the sacredness of life.

Theologian John Cobb coined the term “earthist” to refer to a way of thinking and living that honors the earth and promotes sustainable human interaction with the created world. Proponents of an earthist perspective seek to reorient globalization away from individual profit-driven values toward a different set of moral norms by which supposed scientific and technological advances might be judged. The moral norms that guide the behavior of farmers like the Korrows and other earthist adherents are rooted in a respect for the sacred quality of all creation. This respect engenders sustainable methods of agriculture and behavioral lifestyles that are more in keeping with small-scale agriculture than that of corporate agribusiness.

The Korrows’ recognition of this interdependence is witnessed in their own lived expression of biodynamic farming and the radical commitment they have made to living in relationship with the earth. For the Korrows, who have rejected institutionalized forms of religion, the deeply spiritual nature of their lives and their farming is evident in the way they care for their land, their crops, their animals, and one another. I first came to know the Korrows in 2000 when my family joined their CSA, Dogwood Springs Farm, which is located in rural Kentucky. During the two years that we belonged to their CSA, we visited their farm and talked with them on numerous occasions about farming, rural development, and the processes of globalization that affect our everyday lives. Like many small-scale alternative farmers, the Korrows are deeply involved in promoting sustainable agriculture and in facilitating rural and community development. The Korrows founded the Rural Center for Responsible Living in 1999, a nonprofit organization that focuses on education, outreach, and community service. They continue to work toward promoting organic and biodynamic farming in rural Kentucky and Tennessee and helping conventional farmers who are trying to switch over to more sustainable farming methods find the resources to do so.

The idea of Community Supported Agriculture first began in the United States in 1985 when farmer Robyn Van En and a core group of like-minded producers and consumers initiated the first CSA at her farm in South Egremont, Massachusetts.¹² Community Supported Agriculture is more than just a new

market niche catering to urban yuppies: it is a paradigm shift away from a market-oriented and consumer-driven approach to agriculture. Organic and biodynamic farming challenge the accepted wisdom that technological advances such as chemical fertilizers and pesticides, monocropping, and all labor-saving farm machinery are beneficial achievements. CSA farmers invariably farm smaller plots of land in a much more intensive way—much like farmers did decades ago and the Amish still do today. But it is more than a different farming method that sets these farmers apart from the majority of their colleagues. Many farmers who participate in CSAs share Robyn Van En's "commitment to agriculture, to the harmony of nature and community together, to providing for 'the best hope we know of for the health and long-term thriving of our earth and its people.'"¹³ Organic and biodynamic farmers embrace a different ethical vision of farming, one that is currently challenging the conventional wisdom within the farming community.

In much the same way, we as consumers must also reorient our relationship with food and the environment. American consumers are no longer used to eating with the seasons. Members of a CSA, however, receive a basket full of seasonal, local foods once a week. The lack of choice in what the week's menu will look like challenges the consumer belief that we have a right to eat whatever we want, whenever we want it, a supposed right supported by our local chain grocery store. Our absolute right to food choice and accessibility must be reassessed in light of its destructive consequences. On average U.S. food travels 1,300 miles before it lands on our table.¹⁴ Our increased appetite for beef has contributed to the destruction of rainforests in Latin America. Land in the two-thirds world that is currently being used to grow out-of-season crops for U.S. tables could be raising food for the workers who pick it who no longer have sustainable communities and farmlands of their own. Contrary to the view of agribusiness that the only way to solve the problem of hunger in our world is to increase crop yields and production, for years we have known that the problem of food supply in our world is not one of quantity but one of distribution. Bread for the World points out:

Virtually every country in the world has the potential of growing sufficient food on a sustainable basis. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has set the minimum requirement for caloric intake per person per day at 2350. Worldwide, there are 2720 calories available per person per day. Over 50 countries fall below that requirement; they do not produce enough food to feed their populations, nor are they able to afford to import the necessary commodities to make up the gap. Most of these countries are in sub-Saharan Africa.¹⁵

Industrial agriculture and corporate distribution of the world's food supply is not the only way to address the problem of hunger in our world, nor is it the best.

But let's get back to the consumers who participate in CSAs: the basket

shows up once a week and first-world consumers are challenged to eat with the seasons—to think about the weather and the land and the farmers who are growing our food. My six-year-old daughter is learning that food comes not from a grocery store, but from the land—and there are people who grow it for us. Every Saturday morning we go to the farmers' market and pick up our basket of vegetables. We talk to our current CSA farmers, Pat and Brian Bush, about what is happening on the farm, how the weather is affecting the growing season, what crops are just finishing up, and what we can expect in the next couple of weeks. In addition to visiting with the Bushes we pick up a gallon of milk from the local organic dairy, a loaf of bread from a local bakery, and often buy other local produce to supplement what we get from our CSA.

As an essentially urban child with two professional parents, my daughter's moral formation is taking place within the context of experiencing her interdependence with the land, with nature, and with other people. We have visited our CSA farms with her since she was a toddler and she is developing her own relationships with local farmers and producers in our community. As a feminist ethicist and a mother, I am deeply concerned about the moral formation of my daughter. Children do not learn simply by listening to what we say; their moral formation is shaped and formed by the actions in which we participate together as a family and as a community of people. It is not enough for me simply to explain to my daughter about social injustice and about environmental degradation. Volunteering as a family with a local homeless shelter for families opens up opportunities for us to talk about homelessness, poverty, and other social problems in ways that have meaning for a six-year-old. Likewise, visiting the farmers' market and the farms where our vegetables, eggs, and flowers come from and knowing the people who cultivate these products reinforces our own commitment to enjoying "slow food" as we cook together as a family and teach her the joys of growing, harvesting, and preparing food to share with others.

Food is essential for life, but it has more than instrumental value. Food can help us to stay in touch with God's good creation. It can serve to remind us of the bounty of the earth and the rich diversity of taste, texture, color, and smell that are available to us in different regions and areas of the world. While we must be careful not to reduce our appreciation for other cultures into simple culinary interest, food can be a window into the heart of a community and its people. Living in a culture of obesity and excess as we do in the United States, we ought to pay more attention to what and how we eat for a number of reasons. Watching our waistline is only the most self-interested of these. Attention to what we eat, where and how it is grown, and how it is prepared are central ethical questions for our moral community. Our capacity to respect the land as God's creation is directly related to our ability to experience our relationship to the environment and our interdependence as a species. Attending to our moral formation as members of local as well as global communities ought to be an intrinsic aspect of any model of globalization that we participate in creating.

Participation in a CSA can be challenging. The first year we belonged to a CSA, the farm had a bumper crop of bok choy. Before that summer I had bought bok choy only when a recipe called for it, and, yes, eight solid weeks of bok choy challenged our Western culinary repertoire and exhausted our cache of cookbooks. Yet eating with the seasons is a delightfully rewarding and spiritual experience. I have eaten broccoli rabe and Swiss chard for the first time in my life, and every summer I get two bushels of tomatoes that I put up as tomato sauce and canned tomatoes—food that feeds my family through the winter. A remarkable sense of pride and satisfaction has accompanied my participation in a CSA, feelings that were nurtured by the relationship that my daughter and I developed with the Korrows and the Bushes (and their animals) as we visited their farms and became friends. Eating with the seasons forces consumers to think about what we are eating, but it also provides a much fresher, more natural, and ultimately healthier diet than that of most Americans.

CONCLUSIONS

Community Supported Agriculture is based on a vision of a different future for globalization. That vision holds that if we keep the earth as the center of our attention, then our social, economic, and political policies will reflect a respect for our interdependence with all of creation. Ultimately, earthist proponents call for a future rooted in smaller economies of scale that prioritize a turn toward the local. The freedom and creativity that often accompany the work of resistance have allowed for a space in which earthist thinkers have been able to generate a wide variety of public policy strategies that challenge the self-centered and greed-oriented model of capitalism that currently dominates society. The existence of CSAs illustrates one expression of what these smaller economies of scale might look like.

This earthist paradigm calls for an ardent need to shift away from a model of globalization as export-oriented trade and mass-produced products and toward a model of localization and “slow food.” A return to local food production for local consumption could greatly increase poor people’s access to food. Studies on subsistence agriculture have shown that it is efficient and sustainable and that it adequately provides for the food needs of its local producers.¹⁶ Edward Goldsmith has pointed out:

Even the World Bank, which has spearheaded the modernization of agriculture in the Third World, admitted in one of its more notorious reports that “smallholders in Africa are outstanding managers of their own resources—their land and capital, fertilizer and water” (World Bank 1981). Why then modernize agriculture and push the smallholders into the slums? The answer, as the report fully admits, is that subsistence farming is incompatible with the development of the market.¹⁷

Although subsistence farming might not be the best way of “developing the market,” it is best for the environment, for the community, and for the earth. Joining a CSA, supporting your local farmers’ market and other locally owned businesses, planting an organic garden, seeking out or creating a local slow food *conviva*—these are only a few ways that you and your household can begin to get involved in supporting your local economy and contributing to a more sustainable way of life for all God’s creatures. Slow down, listen to the earth around you, and taste the difference it will make.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Describe a typical week in your kitchen or at your dinner table. Where does your food come from? Who prepares the meals? Who eats them? What do you like most about mealtime? What do you like least? What ways can you imagine changing your weekly patterns to incorporate more locally grown produce?
2. Can you imagine yourself (or a group of people you know) joining a CSA? Why or why not? What are some of the impediments that you might face? How might you overcome these?
3. Peters describes how consumer spending and consumption patterns are issues of moral formation. How do you think about your own moral agency in relation to the food that you purchase and the food that you eat? How is the way that our food is grown, prepared, and consumed a moral issue?

RESOURCES

Books and Articles

- Groh, Trauger, and Steven McFadden. *Farms of Tomorrow Revisited: Community Supported Farms—Farm Supported Communities*. Kimberton, PA: Biodynamic Farming and Gardening Association, 2000.
- Kimbrell, Andrew, ed. *The Fatal Harvest Reader: The Tragedy of Industrial Agriculture*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2002.
- Logsdon, Gene. *Living at Nature’s Pace: Farming and the American Dream*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2000.
- Petrini, Carlo, ed., with Ben Watson and Slow Food Editore. *Slow Food: Collected Thoughts on Taste, Tradition, and the Honest Pleasures of Food*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2001.
- Shuman, Michael H. *Going Local: Creating Self-Reliant Communities in a Global Age*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Vitek, William, and Wes Jackson. *Rooted in the Land: Essays on Community and Place*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.

Organizations and Web Sites

Alternative Farming Systems Information Center. www.nal.usda.gov/afsic.
 Robyn Van En Center for CSA Resources. www.nal.usda.gov/afsic.
 Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education. www.sare.org/csa.
 Green People. www.greenpeople.org/csa.htm.
 Slow Food USA. www.slowfoodusa.org.
 Agricultural Policy Analysis Center. www.agpolicy.org.

NOTES

1. Peter Warshall, "Tilth and Technology: The Industrial Redesign of Our Nation's Soils," in *The Fatal Harvest Reader: The Tragedy of Industrial Agriculture*, ed. Andrew Kimbrell (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2002), 169.
2. Ibid.
3. Gene Logsdon, *Living at Nature's Pace: Farming and the American Dream* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2000), 5.
4. Debi Barker, "Globalization and Industrial Agriculture," in *Fatal Harvest Reader*, 254.
5. Andrew Kimbrell, "Seven Deadly Myths of Industrial Agriculture," in *Fatal Harvest Reader*, 16.
6. Peter Rosset, "A New Food Movement Comes of Age in Seattle," in *Globalize This! The Battle against the World Trade Organization and Corporate Rule* (Monroe, ME: Common Press, 2000), 140.
7. Ibid.
8. Karen Lehman and Al Krebs, "Control of the World's Food Supply," in *The Case Against the Global Economy: And For a Turn Toward the Local*, ed. Jerry Mander and Edward Goldsmith (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1996), 123.
9. Barker, "Globalization," 253.
10. Logsdon, *Living*, 211.
11. Ibid.
12. Stephanie Reph, *Robyn Van En Center for CSA Resources*. Fulton Center for Sustainable Living, Wilson College. <http://www.csacenter.org/robynbio.html> (accessed June 16, 2003).
13. Ibid.
14. Kathryn Casa, "Community Agriculture Puts Farmers' Face on Food," *National Catholic Reporter* 35, no. 28 (1999): 3–4.
15. David Beckman, *Bread for the World Institute*. <http://www.bread.org/hungerbasics/international.html> (accessed June 16, 2003).
16. Edward Goldsmith, "The Last Word: Family, Community, Democracy," in *Case Against the Global Economy*, 509.
17. Ibid.