UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

THE RECIPROCAL INFLUENCE OF THE FOOD JUSTICE MOVEMENT AND THE MEXICAN IMMIGRANT RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

THESIS

PRESENTED

AS PARTIAL REQUIREMENT OF

MASTERS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

BY

SARA WATROUS

MARCH 2012

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

L'INFLUENCE RÉCIPROQUE DES MOUVEMENTS POUR LA JUSTICE ALIMENTAIRE ET POUR LES DROITS DES SANS-PAPIERS MEXICAINS AUX ÉTATS-UNIS

MÉMOIRE

PRÉSENTÉ

COMME EXIGENCE PARTIELLE

DE LA MAÎTRISE EN SCIENCE POLITIQUE

PAR

SARA WATROUS

MARS 2012

REMERCIEMENTS

Je tiens à remercier dans un premier temps mon directeur de mémoire, Professeur Francis Depuis-Déri, pour sa patience, sa disponibilité et ses conseils utiles. Je voudrais également remercier le Département des Sciences Politiques de l'UQÀM qui m'a accordé la possibilité de fréquenter cette université et qui m'a beaucoup aidée en tant qu'étudiante internationale.

Je remercie mes amis, mes parents et les proches de mon entourage qui m'ont soutenue, sans quoi la rédaction de ce mémoire n'aurait pas été possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RÉSUMÉ

La présence massive de sans-papiers d'origine mexicaine aux Etats-Unis est un sujet qui divise le pays. Dans la crise économique actuelle, les sans-papiers sont utilisés comme boucs-émissaires pour détourner l'attention sur les vrais problèmes du système capitaliste. Dans les coulisses, par contre, il est évident que les travailleurs sans-papiers sont essentiels à l'économie des Etats-Unis telle qu'elle est structurée actuellement.

Ce mémoire va traiter du lien entre les sans-papiers d'origine mexicaine et la grande industrie agroalimentaire américaine et, plus spécifiquement, sur le fait que le mode alimentaire dominant dépend d'un système d'immigration en faillite qui permet l'exploitation d'une proportion de plus en plus importante de la population. Du fait de la longue liste d'externalités négatives qui permet à la grande industrie agroalimentaire de produire de la nourriture rapide et bon marché, un nombre croissant de communautés dans le pays commencent à reprendre contrôle de leur système alimentaire au moyen de réseaux décentralisés et divers faisant partie du mouvement communautaire sur l'alimentation. Ces réseaux, par contre, ne saisissent pas souvent l'opportunité qui se présente pour critiquer le maltraitement des travailleurs de l'industrie agroalimentaire. Ce mémoire va argumenter que l'établissement d'un lien entre ces mouvements—surtout le mouvement pour la justice alimentaire—et le mouvement pour la justice des sans-papiers est vital pour le succès des deux ainsi que pour la réforme de l'immigration aux Etats-Unis.

Le lien entre les sans-papiers et la grande industrie agroalimentaire est souvent ignoré. Ce mémoire est un aperçu, qui examine les aspects variés de cette intersection. Une analyse de la situation actuelle de l'immigration aux Etats-Unis, utilisant la théorie de colonisation interne, présentera une perspective radicalement différente de celle trouvée dans le discours dominant des médias. Comprendre les liens historiques entre le Mexique et les Etats-Unis et le rôle de la mondialisation dans les migrations construira la base de l'argument contre le sentiment anti-immigration qui balaie les Etats-Unis. Ce mémoire est un appel à plus de recherche sur le lien entre la justice alimentaire et la justice pour les sans-papiers.

Mots-clés : sans-papiers, immigration mexicaine, justice alimentaire, altermondialisation

SUMMARY

Undocumented Mexican immigration is an issue that divides the United States. In the current economic crisis, undocumented individuals are often scapegoated, so as to divert attention from the other crises of the capitalist system. Behind the scenes, however, it is evident that undocumented workers are an essential component of the U.S. economy, as currently structured.

This dissertation will look at the link between undocumented Mexican immigration and the U.S. corporate food industry and, more specifically, how the dominant food system is dependent on the country's broken immigration system that marks an increasing proportion of the U.S. population as exploitable. Because of the long list of hidden negative externalities that allow corporations to produce the cheap and convenient American diet, communities across the country are trying to regain control of their food system via a diverse and decentralized network of food movements. These movements, however, often do not use this opportunity to critique the maltreatment of undocumented food industry workers. This dissertation will argue that linking the many food movements—especially the more targeted food justice movement—to the Mexican migrant justice movement is vital to the success of both, and in pushing for just immigration reform in the U.S. The recent book, *Food Justice*, explains: "food justice seeks to ensure that the benefits and risks of where, what, and how food is grown, produced, transported, distributed, accessed and eaten are shared fairly."[1]

The link between undocumented Mexican immigration and the corporate food industry is often ignored. This dissertation is an overview, examining various aspects of this intersection. A re-thinking of the current immigration situation, using internal colonization theory, will present a radically different perspective than is often found in mainstream discussions on the issue. Understanding the historical ties between Mexico and the U.S. and the role of corporate globalization in migration, will form the basis for the argument against the current anti-immigration sentiment that has swept the U.S. This dissertation is a call for further research on the connection between food justice and migrant justice.

Key words: Undocumented immigration, Mexican, food justice, food industry, corporate globalization

---

[1] Oran Hesterman, *Fair Food: Growing a Healthy, Sustainable Food System for All*, New York: PublicAffairs, May 2011, p. 76.

INTRODUCTION

As the immigration debate remains center stage on the U.S. political scene, very much linked to the economic crisis in which the country currently finds itself, a diverse and decentralized network of food movements[2] is spreading across the nation. Individuals and communities are attempting to take back control of their food system(s), in protest to the corporate take-over of food, as well as American over-consumption, that has done significant harm to the well-being of the environment and society[3]. Yet, it is rare to hear of immigration reform or immigrant rights being linked to this movement, at least in the mainstream media.

The immigrant rights movement and the many food movements—in the context of this dissertation, specifically the food justice segment of it—are connected, and it will be argued that the link is vital to strengthening both and supporting just immigration reform in the U.S. Not only do these movements share common values, principles and goals, but also similar factors or realities have made them necessary in the fight for social justice. More importantly, yet rarely discussed, is that these movements are dependent on one another and very much linked by the simple fact that a significant number of those involved in U.S. food production are undocumented immigrants. According to the National Agricultural Workers' Survey of 2000: 52 percent of respondents identified themselves as undocumented, and approximately a half of the documented workers as foreign-born. This does not include H-2A guest workers—a temporary or seasonal agricultural workers program for non-immigrant foreigners ideally used when employers anticipate a shortage of domestic workers—that are also predominately Mexican. In the past decade the number of undocumented immigrants has also been on the rise. Not to mention, as the undocumented

---

[2] See G. Feenstra, "Creating Space for Sustainable Food Systems: Lessons from the Field," *Agriculture and Human Values*, vol. 19, no 2 (2002), 99-106 p.

[3] Eric Holt-Gimenez, "Food Sovereignty," Alternative Radio, Seattle, W.A., November 30, 2009.

population, which is currently estimated (February 2011) at 11.2 million, or 3.7 percent of the U.S. population[4] grows, they will represent an important group of food producers, consumers and activists.

Immigration is an issue that divides the country. Neither major political party is unified in its position on how open U.S. borders should be. This divisiveness has led to political inaction and, although there seems to be a general consensus on the need for serious reform, the prospect remains unlikely[5]. This inaction benefits some. The elite, tangled in the web of the corporate-political complex, profit from this broken immigration system that marginalizes an increasing proportion of the U.S. population and marks it as exploitable. This dissertation will examine how this is true of the dominant food system, in large part controlled by corporate America.

Much of the discourse by political leaders and the mainstream media is focused on the supposed societal burden—mostly economic—of undocumented immigration, for the white euro-American majority, as justifying the political opposition to immigration[6]. This dissertation will adopt an alternative perspective and examine certain socio-cultural/political factors that influence or have been influenced by these more commonly thought of economic factors. An examination of the historical ties between Mexico and the U.S., especially with a look at various forms of oppression, and the application of internal colonization theory will act as the foundation of this dissertation's perspective.

The United States has a two-track immigration system, which makes it relatively easy for wealthy, professional, Europeans to gain entry, while those from more disadvantaged backgrounds are met with hurdles that, too often, make it

---

[4] D'Vera Cohn and Jeffrey Passel, "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends," Pew Hispanic Center, February 2011, p. 1. See <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/133.pdf>.

[5] Gordan Hanson, "Why Does Immigration Divide America?" p. 1 <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/022/8793.pdf>.

[6] See Lou Dobbs, Patrick Buchanan, Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR), the militmen, etc.

impossible to migrate freely (and legally)[7]. When legal migration is not possible, individuals who experience the need to move do so without regards to borders or the legal and physical risks to themselves[8]. This is reflected in the current U.S. undocumented population. Three-quarters (76%) of these 11.2 million individuals are Hispanic; the majority (59%) are from Mexico[9]. Certain areas of the U.S., especially the Southwest, have seen the settlement of much higher proportions of these individuals[10]. Such figures have been used as the foundation for what the mainstream media refer to as the U.S. "immigration crisis"[11]. There is often a two-level explanation for this. The main premise is that there are too many "illegals"—the popularly used term for the undocumented—in the United States. The second premise, or the consequence of the first, is that this "excess" brings several problems to the country: drug abuse, criminality, poverty, violence, and a host of related burdens, especially financial, to American society.

The true immigration crisis, though, is not one of numbers but of the current political climate that criminalizes an increasing proportion of the U.S. population, pushing it into marginality and marking it as exploitable and disposable. This, of course, makes undocumented individuals prime bait for an industry—the food industry—that looks to maximize profit at any cost. The pipeline that appears to lead many undocumented individuals into jobs in this industry is no coincidence.

---

[7] Mary Bauer and Mónica Ramírez, "Injustice on Our Plates: Immigrant Women in the U.S. Food Industry," Southern Poverty Law Center, November 2010, p. 8. <http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/publication/Injustice_on_Our_Plates.pdf>. See <http://images.forbes.com/media/2010/06/09/0609_how-long-citizen-chart.jpg>

[8] Ibid., p. 12.

[9] Cohn, op. cit., p. 2. Although some estimate it to be higher, between 12-14 million: See Alfonso Gonzales, "Introduction: Power, Justice, and Survival: Latino Politics Today," *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 16.

[10] Ibid., p. 2-3.

[11] Individuals such as Bill O'Reilly, Lou Dobbs, Rush Limbaugh are the most prominent U.S. media hosts who engage in such discourse. See Samuel Huntington, *Who We Are? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004, p. 221-228.

This "immigration crisis" is very much linked to the current overarching economic crisis. The reality is that what Americans once took for granted is slowly disappearing; and as in previous periods of economic hardship, anti-immigrant movements have grown in force to deflect attention away from the true crises of the U.S. capitalist system[12]. The economy is hurting, unemployment is high, more and more people find themselves without sufficient health coverage (if any at all), cuts to public education and other services continue to be made. At the same time, the U.S. undocumented population has grown in visibility, making it an easy group to scapegoat[13]. Many Americans perceive this influx as further exacerbating the growing burden on already scarce public resources[14]. Yet, most economists disagree, concluding that the overall effect of undocumented individuals is positive, although the costs and benefits are not necessarily evenly distributed amongst the population[15].

So why is there such a discrepancy between the perception of the effect of undocumented immigrants on the economy and the reality of the situation? Job insecurity, tightened state budgets and xenophobia can help explain this, says Hanson[16]. The anti-immigration movement has been spearheaded by a wealthy elite, backed by a mostly conservative following—often members of the privileged, white class[17]. Similar to the issue of anthropogenic climate change, these same actors have

---

[12] Epifanio San Juan, *Beyond Postcolonial Theory*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998, p. 114.

[13] The author is not making reference to the Canadian citizen who overstays their visa, but the term "undocumented" and, more so, "illegal," which labels a specific class of individuals, often with certain racial and class characteristics. This paper will focus on those from Mexico who currently are at the bottom of the undocumented hierarchy.

[14] Arian Campo-Flores, "Why Americans Think (Wrongly) That Illegal Immigrants Hurt the Economy," *Newsweek*, May 14, 2010. In a April-May 2010 New York Times/CBS News poll, 74 percent of respondents said illegal immigrants weakened the economy, compared to only 17 percent who said they strengthened it

[15] Campo-Flores, op. cit., p. 1.

[16] Hanson, op. cit., p. 3.

[17] "Intelligence Report: Anti-Immigration Leader at Heart of White Nationalist Scene for Decades," *Southern Poverty Law Center*, December 2008 <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/news/intelligence-report-anti-immigration-leader-at-heart-of-white-nationalist-scene-fo>.

funded a smear campaign that has confused the public, discredited just solutions, and prevented hope of necessary systemic changes[18]. Yet again, attention is being deflected away from the true threats to American democracy: the rise of unchecked corporate power and the public manipulation by a powerful elite that is looking to safeguard their privileges at the expense of the U.S.'s well-being (often the two are linked). Although the United States claims to be a nation of immigrants, this elite makes it clear that it remains a country where the quintessential American is still viewed as someone of white, Anglo-Saxon privilege—even as this picture becomes increasingly outdated, ignoring the demographic shift well underway in the country.

It is largely unknown and kept hidden from the American citizen and consumer, that the abundant and convenient American diet is dependent upon undocumented laborers—in particular those from Mexico. These migrant laborers make up the backbone of the dominant U.S. food system. This is an orchestrated reality. In the midst of the current restrictive immigration climate, their illegal border crossing is sometimes directly facilitated by some of the largest corporations that dominate the food industry today[19]. When this is not the case, the historical ties between the U.S. and Mexico and corporate globalization' role in their migration can often help explain their presence in the U.S. Understanding these factors is necessary in order to see the hypocrisy of American policy and the ambiguous nature of immigration in the U.S.

In highlighting the link between undocumented immigration and the corporate take-over of the U.S. food system, this dissertation will attempt to lift the veil on this secretive industry and specifically the significant role undocumented workers play

---

Also, see: <http://liberationfrequency.tumblr.com/post/6793120789/fascists-are-the-tools-of-the-state-peter-gelderloos>

[18] Talk by Noam Chomsky at Nottingham High School in Syracuse, NY on May 11, 2011.

[19] Tyson Food Inc. indicted in 2001 on 36 counts of recruiting and smuggling undocumented workers into the U.S. See "Tyson Foods Indicted in Plan to Smuggle Illegal Workers" <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/20/us/tyson-foods-indicted-in-plan-to-smuggle-illegal-workers.html>

within it. This dissertation will examine some of the country's dark roots—its legacy of colonialism and imperialism—and the persisting racism and growing but unchecked corporate power that has come to characterize the dominant U.S. system.

I. The Economic and Regional Context: The Impacts of Neo-Liberalism

The current immigration situation is characterized by contradiction. U.S. immigration policy has become increasingly restrictive, yet the business sector needs and encourages these undocumented workers to fuel the U.S. economy. Globalization is only increasing these contradictions. The unequal effects of corporate globalization have increased the push-pull factors encouraging transnational migrations. This is most evident between the U.S.-Mexico border. It is one of the largest land borders—spanning 2,000 miles—between a "First-World" country and a "Third-World" country[20]. The economic difference and income gap is one of the largest between two neighboring countries[21]. A clear contradiction that is rarely discussed in the U.S. is the growing militarization of the border separating the U.S. from Mexico, a country that poses no strategic threat to it and is, in fact, an ally and major trading partner.[22] Because of the nature of this trading—"free trade"—and the other neo-liberal policies that dominate their interactions, the conditions for migration have only increased. For example, various neo-liberal policies affecting agriculture have displaced millions of Mexican farmers giving them few options other than migrating north into the U.S. Part II of this dissertation will discuss in more detail the role of corporate globalization, and specifically free trade, in this migration.

---

[20] Samuel P. Huntington, *Who We Are? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004, p. 222. Also see, "Reconsidering Immigration: Is Mexico a Special Case?" *Center for Immigration Studies*, November 2000, p. 1.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Patricia Fernandez-Kelly and Douglas S. Massey, "Borders for Whom? The Role of NAFTA in Mexico-U.S. Migration," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2007, p. 109.

The notions of Global North and Global South were produced in reference to critiques of the global, corporate food system[23]. According to historian Mike Davis, at the beginning of the 19th century, different regions of the world had roughly similar levels of economic production but by the end of the century, there was what is referred to as "the making of the Third World" by the "Global Era of Liberal Capitalism"[24]. This new system of course was forged through violence, colonialism and conquest, the details of this reality, for the most part, left out of the history textbooks. The history of this will be developed in further detail later on in this dissertation.

The corporate food industry, which dominates the U.S. food system, is a multi-billion dollar industry. It functions so as to maximize short-term profit, doing so at the expense of a host of related issues, including labor and other human rights, food quality and safety, treatment of animals, and the health of local economies and the environment. Although some of these concerns, especially those relating to consumer health and environmental impact receive occasional mainstream attention; the role and treatment of food industry workers, especially the undocumented ones, is often left out of discussions on the industry or immigration.

Neo-liberal policies, including free trade agreements, have helped support this industry that is now characterized by a small number of mega-corporations dominating it. For example, "Just four companies control more than: 84% of U.S. beef, 66% of pork, and 58% of chicken. While only one company—Monsanto—controls the genetics of 93% of the soybean and 80% of the corn grown in the U.S. And Dean Foods controls 40% of our fluid milk"[25]. The unchecked consolidation of corporate

---

[23] Raj Patel, "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food Systems," Conference at UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://www.foodmovementsunite.org/FMU-video.html>. (Patel makes reference to the work of historian Mike Davis and his book *Late Victorian Holocaust: : El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World*)

[24] Ibid.

[25] See "About the Campaign," The Fight Big Food Campaign, <http://www.fightbigfood.org/about/>.

power, dominated by U.S. companies, in this sector is not only harming U.S. trade partners (the case of Mexico will be discussed in Part II), but domestically this evolution from small, family-owned farms to a large-scale, industrialized food system is harming American small farmers, local economies, consumer health, and the environment to name a few. To sum up how food activists presently feel about this situation, the summary to a recently published (2010) book, *Food Justice*, explains, "The present corporate food regime dominating the planet's food systems is environmentally destructive, financially volatile and socially unjust"[26]. Yet, in the midst of the global food crisis experienced in 2007/8, the solutions that were continually being encouraged by U.S., as well as global institutions, supported only more of the same solutions that brought on the crisis in the first place. Solutions rarely included more than technological fixes, focusing on using global markets or deregulating the agricultural sector (also known as opening the door to corporate actors). In the midst of this, a network of diverse but decentralized food movements has begun to grow in power.

II. The Food Movements in the United States

The U.S. food movements are not new. Food riots and fighting for access to food has always been a part of history. Yet, the food sovereignty framework took shape during the peasant movements of the 1990s (with the 1996 declaration by La Via Campesina), looking for an alternative to neo-liberal policies and industrial agriculture[27]. The food justice movement can find roots in the Black Panther Party of the 1960s, as well as the farm workers movement led by Cesar Chavez during that

---

[26] See "Background," on the upcoming book, *Food Movements Unite* <http://www.foodmovementsunite.org/FMU-background.html>. To be published in Fall/Winter 2011/2.

[27] Sadie Beauregard, "Food Policy for People: Incorporating Food Sovereignty Principles into State Governance: Case Study of Venezuela, Mali, Ecuador and Bolivia." Thesis for Urban and Environmental Policy (Director: Robert Gottlieb), April 2009, p. 9.

same period. Part II will present an overview of these movements' long histories. Today, "organic," "local," and "sustainable" are all popular, mainstream terms. The concept of "fair" or "just" food remains new and somewhat of a fringe concept to most Americans.

It is clear that the food movement(s) is a movement of movements that is "widespread, highly diverse, refreshingly creative—politically amorphous"[28]. Oran Hesterman explains, "There are many models of food systems change that we can adopt, from focusing on equitable access to healthy food, good jobs, healthy working conditions, land, and water to reinstating a fading food culture"[29]. The specifics differ based on different local concerns but they share many similarities and are rooted in the same fight for basic human rights—notably, the right to food. The concept of food justice is increasingly being used by groups across the country, organizing around food. Although, the local food movement, for example, in the U.S. rarely addresses the broader global issues of neo-liberal trade and agriculture policies, it does present an alternative way in which communities can organize themselves to provide food without the long list of negative externalities. Many continue to argue that this is not enough. A question that some have asked, for example, is: Does organic and local matter, if it was produced by slave labor? This has moved many to organize around the concept of food justice, which also addresses the concerns surrounding the treatment of those who produce the food Americans eat. Food justice also forces the movement to go beyond its comfort zone—organizing in affluent, predominantly white communities.

The U.S. food justice movement is also seen in inner-city, low-income neighborhoods, where many live in what are referred to as "food desserts," due to the

---

[28] See "Background," on the upcoming book, *Food Movements Unite* <http://www.foodmovementsunite.org/FMU-background.html>. To be published in Fall/Winter 2011/2.

[29] Oran Hesterman, *Fair Food: Growing a Healthy, Sustainable Food System for All*, New York: PublicAffairs, May 2011, p. 75.

fact that individuals often must travel miles to find fresh produce or healthy foods. Ironically, food desserts are also found in rural America, in areas that were once "breadbaskets." Food justice focuses on access to healthy food as a human right, by looking to "de-commodify" it. This perspective also presents a powerful critique of the "whiteness" of the increasingly mainstream local food movement. This is nicely summed up by Anim Steel: "What does Fast Food have in common with Jim Crow? The political disenfranchisement addressed by the Civil Rights Movement, and the cheap, unhealthy food plaguing our underserved communities both reflect structural inequities that marginalize people of color"[30]. The recent book, *Food Justice*, explains: "food justice seeks to ensure that the benefits and risks of where, what, and how food is grown, produced, transported, distributed, accessed and eaten are shared fairly." Food justice looks to eliminate disparities and inequities. Food justice is about equity on all levels and thus leave room to support a lot of complementary work being done, which in turn can build a stronger movement[31]. This reflects much of the same feeling as Eric Holt-Gimenez, executive director of Food First, regarding the need for a strategy to support a transformation in the food system. Food advocates may work on several different issue areas, but share the common goal of challenging the injustices that exist in the current food system. In doing so, the food justice movement is linked to and supports allied movements such as those related to the environment, land use, health, immigration, worker rights, transportation, economic and community development, and social justice[32].

This dissertation will focus on the relationship between the food and immigration movements. The food movement will be evaluated not primarily as a

---

[30] Anim Steel, "Youth and Food Justice: Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement," *Food First*, vol. 16, no 3 (Fall 2010), <http://www.foodfirst.org/sites/www.foodfirst.org/files/pdf/Food_Justice__Civil_Rights_Fall_Backgrounder_2010.pdf> .

[31] Hesterman, op. cit., p. 76.

[32] Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi, *Food Justice*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010, p. 233.

viable alternative to the current food system, as is often the case, but instead as part of a solution to the current undocumented immigration situation. The inability of the food justice movement to fully address the plight of undocumented food industry workers is a major shortcoming that threatens the movement's success and authenticity. Its shortcomings, as well as its potential, will be examined. The concepts of food justice, food democracy, and food sovereignty are tools to accomplish this and will be discussed in Part III. Anti-oppression theory and internal colonization theories will again be used to look at the dynamics racism and classism within this movement so as to assess whether food justice within this movement is possible.

III. Methodology

Linguist and political activist Noam Chomsky often makes reference to the supposed "noble intent" that drives U.S. foreign policy. This dissertation, in studying the intersection between migrant justice and food justice, will dispel this myth and shine light on the true policy motive of the U.S.—power. Internal colonization theory will be used to frame the analysis of the treatment of racial minorities in the U.S. More specifically, how systemic racism plays a significant role in the interplay between immigration policy and food politics in the U.S. will be addressed.

In order to accomplish these goals, relevant government documents will be surveyed. These include government reports/studies, congressional hearing recordings/minutes, census data, as well as immigration and food related policies. The publications of various think tanks, such as the Pew Research Center will be examined. The Pew Hispanic Center has published important reports, such as "A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States." Materials from nonprofits (NGOs) and public interests groups, such as FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform), will be examined. FAIR is one of the country's most established anti-immigration groups. Reports from organizations that hold a more inclusive view will

be of particular value in this dissertation. For example, the Southern Poverty Law Center is one such group. Publications from political figures, such as Patrick Buchanan, with his book, *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* and Geraldo Rivera, author of *His Panic: Why Americans Fear Hispanics in the U.S.* will be key to understanding the opposing sides in the immigration debate. The political scientist, Samuel Huntington, has been extremely influential, notably with his last book, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. Public figures are powerful actors and tend to have large followings and thus impact over the issue, which is important in this dissertation.

Journalists and various activists and advocacy groups have published a lot on the issue of immigration as well. They are a vital source due to the fact that the mainstream media often stays clear of some of these controversial issues. This is the case when bringing to light various issues within the dominant food system. Very little has been written about the food movements, especially the food justice movement. It was only in 2010, that *Food Justice* was written by Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi. In 2011, *Fair Food* by Oran Hesterman was published. The book *Food Movements Unite!* came out at the end of November 2011. It is the sequel to *Food Rebellions: Crisis and the Hunger for Justice* (2009) by Eric Holt-Giménez, Raj Patel and Annie Shattuck. This has been happening fairly fast and academia has yet to catch up.

A few academics have addressed the issue of "food justice" in an indirect manner. Steve Striffler, for example, in *Chicken: The Dangerous Transformation of America's Favorite Food* looks at the evolutions in the poultry sector. Rachel Slocum, in "Whiteness, Space and Alternative Food Practice," addresses the issue of systemic racism in the food movements. Gerda Wekerle wrote an important piece, "Food Justice Movements: Policy, Planning, and Networks" in the *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, in 2004, giving an overview of the movements. It is a rare academic gem on the subject. Heather Mair in "A Mouthful of Change: Eating and Acting for

Food Democracy" discusses the potential of the food movement as well. There remains very little written on the subject. The potential in linking the food justice movement and migrant justice movement has not yet made it into this realm.

Various organizations that deal with food justice issues will be used, such as the Food and Water Watch, Seattle's Food Justice Project, the Institute for Food and Development Policy (Food First), and the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW). CIW is unique in that it is a coalition of immigrants—often undocumented—fighting for their own rights. It will provide firsthand experience of how individuals and groups are responding to the situation. This is where a lot of the publications relating to food justice in particular originate.

IV. Outline

Part I will present an overview of the current undocumented immigration situation in the U.S. and the discourse surrounding it. Studying the historical ties between the U.S. and Mexico, especially as they relate to cross border migration, will help inform the reader as to how the dynamics of oppression in American society have evolved to place Mexican farmworkers at the bottom of the racial/class hierarchy. Anti-Immigration sentiment and general racism in the U.S. will be examined with the lens internal colonization and anti-oppression theory. Internal colonization theory will also help explain how and why these undocumented individuals have found their way to the U.S. The important role these individuals play in the U.S. economy will be contrasted with the growing anti-immigration feeling in which the U.S. currently finds itself.

Part II will begin with discussing, more broadly, the root causes of migration, with a focus on corporate globalization, especially free trade. This will then lead to an in depth look at the U.S. corporate food industry and how it has favored profit at the expense of a host of related issues. Special attention will be paid to issues that are

pertinent to the country's future as well as its integrity, including: labor and other human rights, food quality and safety, treatment of animals, and the health of local economies. This chapter will explore how focusing on something as essential as food can inform public debate and shed new light on this issue of immigration.

Part III will study an alternative to the dominant food system that has been promoted by the various food movements—specifically the food justice movement. This section will introduce the concepts but also critique how the movement has been unsuccessful in addressing the plight of undocumented food industry workers. This will include a discussion on how the existence of systemic racism plays out within the movement. It will then examine ways in which the movement can go forward in a manner that is true to its values. This chapter will also look at how a more just food system can indirectly but effectively support more just and equitable immigration policies and practices (and vice versa). Linking the immigrant rights movement to the food justice movement will support both, while upholding some of the key American values (such as justice, equality, upward mobility or the American Dream, and individualism) and working for a more just and sustainable society.

PART ONE

UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRATION

CHAPTER I

RETHINKING UNDOCUMENTED MEXICAN IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States is in crisis. The U.S. economy is hurting - far from having recovered after the 2008/9 U.S./world economic crisis. The impacts continue to affect the quality of life of many Americans. This is the context of the current immigration situation in the U.S. and can help explain why many Americans perceive the influx of undocumented individuals as further exacerbating a growing burden on already scarce public resources[33]. This is not new, and as in previous periods of economic recession, immigrants are often one of the first groups to be scapegoated. Once again, anti-immigrant movements have grown in force to deflect anger away from the recurring crises in the U.S. social system[34]. It is the most recent manifestations of a reoccurring pattern in U.S. history.

The current undocumented immigration situation is significant; but not because "illegals" have overrun the country, like some public figures, such as former 1996 and 2000 presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan, warn[35]. Instead, it is the criminalization of an increasing proportion—undocumented individuals make up 3.6 percent[36]—of the U.S. population and the fact that the motives and methods of doing so are rarely

---

[33] See Demetrios G. Papademetriou and Aaron Terrazas, "Immigration and the Current Economic Crisis," Migration Policy Institute, January 2009 <www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/lmi_recessionJan09.pdf>.

[34] San Juan, op. cit., p. 114.

[35] Buchanan has written extensively on the issue. See Patrick Buchanan, *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America,* New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2006.

[36] Cohn, op. cit., p. 2.

questioned. The migrant justice movement's perspective will be introduced to counterbalance the current anti-immigrant/immigration sentiment that has been propelled by the mainstream medias.

Undocumented immigration is an issue that divides the United States. Neither major political party is unified in its position as to how open U.S. borders should be. Among Republicans, the business lobby advocates for access to pools of foreign labor, emphasizing the economic benefits of immigration[37]. On the other hand, many other conservative groups oppose immigration because of "the perception that it expands the welfare state, dilutes American culture, and threatens national security"[38]. Democrats are no more unified and have been ineffective in pushing reform even though most Latinos identify as Democrats. Although the current divisiveness has resulted in political inaction, there appears to be agreement across the political spectrum that the country's immigration policy needs repair. Yet the prospect of this is unlikely[39]. This can be partially explained by the fact that an American elite benefits from the status quo. Corporate America and the government are linked in the web of the corporate-political complex. The business community, although publicly in favor of some form of legal immigration to access foreign workers, profits from and, therefore, much prefers undocumented workers. This is one of the many reasons the current immigration situation is marked by such contradiction.

Section 1.1 will focus on the identity crisis behind the current immigration situation in the U.S. Section 1.2 will provide a historic overview of the relations between the U.S. and Mexico so as to better understand context the U.S. finds itself in today.

---

[37] The view of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), for example, is that, "Foreign nationals have made enormous contributions to U.S. companies, our economy and society as a whole. To continue our economic and technological preeminence we need to ensure that we have access to the talent we need to lead and compete."

[38] Hanson, p. 1.

[39] Ibid., p. 6.

1.1. Undocumented Immigration and the American Identity Crisis

What is thought to be an "illegal" immigration crisis is, in fact, an American identity crisis. It is not white, middle-class, Europeans who are migrating without papers in mass to the U.S. but predominately the poor of the Global South—a concern that is central to Samuel Huntington's arguments in *Who We Are? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. 76 percent of the 11.2 million U.S. undocumented are Hispanic and a majority (59 percent) are from Mexico.[40] It is estimated that the combined Hispanic groups, legal and other, will represent about a quarter of the entire U.S. population by 2040—one in four people living in the U.S. will be Hispanic by 2040[41]. Geraldo Rivera has even gone so far as to state that, if current trends continue, in less than a century, Anglos will switch places with Hispanics[42]. This demographic shift means that the "face of America" is changing, or "browning" as some accentuate.

The demographic shift is more visible in certain parts of the country, with eight states housing over two-thirds of these individuals (68%)[43]. Yet, what was once a very pronounced difference between regions is slowly balancing-out. In recent years, the growth of California's undocumented population has slowed and a group of "fast-growing, new-destination" states have attracted many immigrant newcomers[44]. A significant amount of variation exists between states, as well as within states. In one area residents may not see these demographic changes taking place, while others can clearly observe the rapid influx of these immigrants. In fact, recent research shows that the economic crisis has slowed migration from Mexico[45]. Nonetheless, spending

---

[40] Cohn, op. cit., p. 2.

[41] Geraldo Rivera, *His Panic: Why Americans Fear Hispanics in the U.S.* London: Celebra, 2008, p. 20.

[42] Ibid, p. 36.

[43] Cohn, p. 2-3.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Damien Cave, "Better Lives for Mexicans Cut Allure of Going North," *New York Times*, July 6, 2011 <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/07/06/world/americas/immigration.html?hp>.

on enforcement and border security keeps rising, as does undocumented immigration as a hot topic in political debate. Yet, as history has shown, migratory patterns and the political response to them tend to be cyclical. So one may ask, "What does this have to do with American identity"?

Although, the so-called face of America is changing, many like to think that American identity is not based around race or ethnicity. The U.S. Citizenship Test, for example, has no explicit racial or ethnic requirements; it simply requires a basic knowledge of English and of various aspects of U.S. history and its institutions[46]. Legally speaking, it would be discriminatory and thus illegal, to restrict citizenship for these reasons. American identity instead has been formed around the idea that the U.S. is an ethnically diverse melting pot, a homeland for generations of immigrants originating from around the world.

Samuel Huntington argues that in order to justify the way in which the United States was founded, early Americans had to differentiate between settlers and immigrants. These settlers established America as a "proposition country": a country whose identity was to be defined by its commitment to a particular set of values and ideals, expressed in the writings of the founding fathers, most notably in the *Declaration of Independence* and the *Constitution*—collectively known as the "American Creed," by some[47]. Yet, this creedal concept of American identity does not capture the fact that American identity is also defined in racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural terms. In this case, the American Creed has helped hide a great number of injustices that have taken place in the past, and continue today. After the U.S. was settled, the immigrants that followed would either be welcomed when needed or expelled when not and reasons were found to legitimize such actions. This is the other side to the coin, and although, the U.S. is often thought of as a country of immigrants,

---

[46] Aviva Chomsky, *"They Take Our Jobs!": and 20 Other Myths about Immigration*, Boston: Beacon Press, 2007, p. 78.

[47] Huntington, *Who We Are?*, op. cit., p. 66.

it is just as much a nation of nativists, as is evident in the current anti-immigrant climate[48]. There is a long history in the U.S. of restricting citizenship and/or other basic human rights to certain groups of people. Most notably, for example, in 1790, the first federal citizenship law restricted naturalization to "free white persons" who had lived in the U.S. for more than two years[49]. Gradually, citizenship law became more inclusive, as African Americans and women were allowed (*de jure*) full citizenship rights. But although in law, all are equal, in fact, the reality is far from this.

With today's immigration climate, many around the world are left to wonder: What happened to the: "Give us your poor, your tired, your huddled masses longing to be free..." still inscribed at the base of the Statue of Liberty?[50] U.S. immigration policy no longer reflects this, but one could argue that it never truly did—or at least, never for long. The Statue of Liberty was inaugurated in 1886 but in 1882 the U.S. passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, the first major piece of legislation restricting immigration law. The U.S. has never opened its arms to all immigrants at all times—only certain types—those it deemed worthy—at certain times. American history is full of contradictions with respect to immigration. Kenneth Davis writes, "Disdain for what is foreign is, sad to say, as American as apple pie, slavery and lynching"[51].

Still today, "sources from textbooks to popular culture promote the idea that the real essence of the country is white"[52]. Even with "inclusive" American citizenship, there exists the restrictive notion of the "real" American. In order to be a real Americans, Rinku Sen argues, one must be born in the U.S. and share a certain

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] Kenneth Davis, "The Founding Immigrants," *New York Times*, July 3, 2007 <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/03/opinion/03davis.html>.

[50] The pedestal contains an inscription of a poem titled "The New Colossus," which was written by Emma Lazarus in 1883. Its most famous line is: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free." Lazarus wrote the poem in an effort to raise money for completion of the pedestal.

[51] Davis, op. cit., p. 1.

[52] Chomsky, op. cit., p. 76.

number of traits: be white, Christian, and of European descent[53]. Yet, the rapidly changing demographics and shifting colorline within the U.S., challenge this notion, leaving some of these "real" Americans to feel a collective sense of endangerment. For a growing segment of the population to be left out of these privileges, makes it important to question the basis for what it means to be a "real" American. Because this conception of the "real" American has long been outdated, not reflecting the actual make-up of the U.S. population, it is more representative of the current economic and political climate, where societal anxieties and racial tensions are more easily exploited.

Those who see the ethnic, racial and religious constitution of the U.S. as essential to American identity, well-being and longevity, see this change as a sign of the country's inevitable demise. Patrick Buchanan is one of the better known proponents of this point of view. Mainstream right-wing commentators, such as Lou Dobbs, Bill O'Reilly, or Rush Limbaugh, make it quite clear that the U.S. is under attack by these "illegals." Patrick Buchanan, former presidential candidate, in his book *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America,* continuously uses the language of "invasion" alongside the term "illegal." In his book, Buchanan attempts to draw a parallel between the American Empire and the Roman Empire, warning that the fall of the American Empire has already begun and will continue if like the Romans the U.S. does not defend itself against the "barbarian" invaders[54]. These right-wing public figures make little effort to hide the racial undertone of their message. Such discourse is significant in understanding the state of race relations and racial oppression in the U.S. Yet, it is rarely discussed in the mainstream medias. Instead the focus is placed on issues relating to criminality, violence, poverty, drug abuse and so on—all of which have racial implications that are rarely mentioned (Chapter II will address this).

---

[53] See Rinku Sen, "Race and Immigration: Behind the Debate" [Video], 2:00 minutes, <http://www.accidentalamerican.us/video/>.

[54] Buchanan, op. cit., p. 1.

"Look at the facts," Noam Chomsky often reminds his audience—not values, ideals, or virtues, but facts; what really happened, not what people tell themselves happened; and what is taking place today, not what people say is or should occur. There appears to be a discrepancy between what Americans say makes up their communal identity and the reality. In order to cover this up, those in power have found ways to legitimize difference.

America's inability to distance itself from its ideals and take a critical look at its history has blurred its vision in dealing with the current immigration situation. When former President Bill Clinton addressed Congress on July 27, 1993, for more money to stem the flood of illegal immigrants and crack down on crime syndicates and terrorists who exploit the nation's open borders, he stated, "the simple fact is that we must not and we will not surrender our borders to those who wish to exploit our history of compassion and justice..."[55] This demonstrates to what depths American identity is dependent on denying reality. The U.S. does not simply have a history of compassion and justice; it also has a history of colonialism and exploitation. American identity has conveniently allowed the U.S. to ignore the darker side of its history. The next section will present a historical overview of relations between the U.S. and Mexico, in order to shed light on the country's imperialistic past.

The immigration situation is very much linked to America's unwillingness to accept the reality that American power and dominance in the world is being increasingly challenged.

1.2 Historical Overview of Relations between U.S. and Mexico

Migration has always existed—people have always moved in search of food and shelter and later wealth and exploit, as well as a host of related factors. Yet, what

---

[55] Joseph Nevins, *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*, New York: Routledge, 2002, p. 42.

is today known as "illegal immigration" in the U.S. is the recent product of the American legal system. Yet, this is rarely acknowledged: it is the law that makes people illegal. With such a growing undocumented population, these laws must be questioned. While law cannot be applied retrospectively, looking to the past can provide insight in analyzing the present. Looking at how the foundation of the U.S. and the repopulation of North America were arguably the result of what is now referred to as "illegal" immigration provides an interesting parallel to examine the current situation. From this perspective, much of early American history can be viewed as a clear breach of the principles that underpins the U.S. legal system. Using current terminology, there is ironic truth in reassessing America's past: "white people are here illegally and African Americans were brought here illegally by human traffickers"[56]. Yet, in the current discussion on immigration, the settlement of the U.S. is still often depicted as a matter of volunteerism rather than violence, and "the forced land contributions of the Native Americans and the forced labor contributions of enslaved Africans are often masked"[57]. The U.S. has still not come to terms with this past. Until it does so, the current discussion will appear to be in a vacuum, distorting the perception of reality.

Relations between the U.S. and Mexico go as far back as when the first Europeans arrived in the Americas in the 16th century. Nevins writes, "The origins of the U.S.-Mexico boundary are to be found in the imperial competition among Spain, France and England for 'possessions' in North America"[58]. These early interactions were driven by the economic self-interest of these Europeans colonizers. Stavig writes, "Among the first observations...of Old World-New World globalization was

---

[56] As one blogger, "The Evil Socialist" wrote. See <http://evilsocialistic.tumblr.com/post/556257956/all-white-americans-are-illegal-immigrants>.

[57] Rinku Sen with Fekkak Mamdouh, *The Accidental American: Immigration and Citizenship in the Age of Globalization*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2008, p. 51.

[58] Nevins, op. cit., p. 13.

that the New World contained a source of labor to be exploited. Columbus also set the precedent in scouring the earth in search of raw materials"[59].

Manifest destiny, characterized the 18th and early 19th centuries, and as Joseph Nevins explains, "combined the ideas of Anglo-Saxon superiority with capitalist territorial expansion that has deep root in American political culture."[60] The land of the indigenous populations was claimed, the natural resources expropriated, and population either enslaved or exterminated. Very little of this history is popularly known in the U.S. It was Winston Churchill who said, "Those that fail to learn from history, are doomed to repeat it." The U.S. has yet to learn from this part of its history. Here is a prime example: in 1830, Mexico outlawed slavery and prohibited further American immigration to Texas[61]. This shares an eerie similarity with the U.S. immigration "crisis" of today—with growing American immigration into Texas, Mexico was increasingly concerned about its ability to maintain control and authority over its territory. Today's situation is similar although the U.S. has significant responsibility for the current situation because of their history of colonialism. Through learning the history, the reasons why this is taking place become more evident.

The border between the U.S. and Mexico was established by war. The relationship between these two countries, during the first half of the 19th century, centered on the dispute over the ownership of Texas, which led to the 1845 annexation of Texas by the U.S., and culminated in the 1848 Mexican-American War—or, as it is

---

[59] Ward Stavig, "Latin American Globalization: Human Reality and the First and Second 'Global' Eras," *Journal of Developing Societies*, vol. 21, no. 3-4 (2005), p. 233.

[60] Nevins, op. cit., p. 14.

[61] Ibid.

called in Mexico, the War of the North American Invasion[62]. As a result, half of Mexico's territory was transferred to the U.S.[63]

"People cross borders, going from one nation to another, usually because they are compelled to do so or they are invited. Historians of immigration usually cast this as "push-pull" factors"[64]. It is important to question what pushes people from their homelands and what pulls them towards another. Violence, famine, and extreme lack of opportunities often compel people to migrate. Where they choose to go is most often based on proximity, economic opportunity and/or escape from danger or fear. During the 19th century, Mexicans could travel freely within the U.S., yet because the push or pull factors to do so were limited, migration was also limited[65].

As Americans moved West, large numbers settled along the Rio Grande River, developing large-scale agricultural operations. The greater number of workers required represented a significant "pull" factor that coincided with the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution in 1910[66]. In the early 20th century, tens of thousands of Mexicans crossed the border looking for work[67]. The border did not represent an obstacle to migration. It was not until 1875 that the federal government enacted legislation against certain potential immigrant groups, marking the beginning of Congress' role in creating categories of "undesirables." The Chinese were the first to suffer[68]. Such policies had not yet touched on Mexicans. Even in 1907, the Dillingham Commission identified Mexican workers as the best solution to the labor

---

[62] Jim Norris, The On-Again, Off-Again Mexican Border, in *On Second Thought*, publication of North Dakota Humanities Council, Summer 2009, p. 3. <www.ndhumanities.org/PDF/Journey.pdf>.

[63] Daniel Cosio Villegas, et al., *A Compact History of Mexico*, Mexico: El Colegio de Mexico, 2000.

[64] Ibid., p. 2.

[65] Sen, op. cit., p. 52.

[66] Norris, op. cit., p. 4.

[67] Sen, op. cit., p. 52.

[68] Norris, op. cit., p. 5.

shortage in the southwest U.S.[69]. It has not always been the case that Europeans were seen as some of the most desired immigrants. That same commission that encouraged Mexican immigration, warned against immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe as representing a serious threat to American society. The threat of the Other has always been present, especially in times of economic recession or conflict, but who constitutes the Other has changed dramatically over the course of U.S. history and will continue to do so. During World War I, farmers asked the Department of Labor not to impose immigration restrictions on Mexican workers until the end of the war. This is representative of the attitude many still have today and what Almaguer describes as the import-export cycle: Mexican workers are imported when needed, exported when not[70]. In 1929, with the onset of the Great Depression, 500,000 Mexican nationals and their U.S.-born children were repatriated to Mexico[71]. The flow of French Canadians over the Northern border into the U.S. also came to a standstill during the Great Depression. The country has gone through this cycle of "alien" anxiety many times before, which has helped create what Jim Norris describes as the "on-again, off-again" border[72].

This was representative of a certain type of trend: "While programs affecting Europeans were increasingly liberalized in the 1930s and 1940s, those affecting Mexicans remained restrictionist"[73]. Pathways allowing Europeans to come and live permanently existed, while Mexicans could come only to work temporarily. As the U.S. intervened in World War II, the need for manual labor brought the U.S. and Mexican governments to sign the Bracero Program in 1942. Close to 5 million

---

[69] Sen, op. cit., p. 53. See Immigration Timeline <http://rs6.loc.gov:8081/learn/features/immig/timeline.html>.

[70] Tomas Almaguer, "Toward the study of Chicano colonialism." *Aztlan*, vol. 2 (1971), p. 9.

[71] Norris, op. cit., p. 5.

[72] See Jim Norris, The On-Again, Off-Again Mexican Border, in *On Second Thought*, publication of North Dakota Humanities Council, Summer 2009, p. 2-6 <www.ndhumanities.org/PDF/Journey.pdf>.

[73] Sen, op. cit., p. 53. (See Fernandez-Kelly, p. 106, for early history info)

Mexican workers came to the United States between 1942 and 1964. The immigration law of 1952 created the Guest Worker Program, still in existence today. It granted H-2 visas to farm workers coming from countries other than Mexico. In the middle of the economic boom that followed the war, President Dwight Eisenhower ordered Operation Wetback, in 1954, which expelled 1.5 million Mexican nationals—some legal residents of the U.S.—from the United States. It was the first massive deportation sweep since the Great Depression[74]. It was only in 1964 that the Guest Worker Program was extended to Mexican workers, putting an end to the Bracero Program. Farmworkers, led by Cesar Chavez, had been organizing for decades, and with help from groups affiliated with the growing Civil Rights Movement, were able to put enough pressure on politicians to end the Bracero Program[75]. Although this appeared to uphold the values of this time period in terms of equal treatment, it was not so.

Amendments to the Immigration and National Act passed in and after 1965 restricted the paths for legal immigration from Mexico. Fernandez-Kelly explains, "They did this first by applying numerical limits to immigration from the Western Hemisphere, then by applying a numerical quota to Mexico itself, and finally by forcing Mexicans to compete for scarce visas with immigrants from the entire world"[76]. Post-Bracero, a growing fraction of Mexicans entered in unauthorized status[77]. "In essence, after 1965 the United States shifted from a de jure guest worker program based on the circulation of braceros, to a *de facto* guest worker program based

---

[74] Ibid. Some estimates are as high at 4 million for the entire period. Also, see Francisco Balderrama and Raymond Rodriguez, *Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the 1930s.*

[75] United Farm Workers, "UFW History" <http://www.ufw.org/_page.php?menu=research&inc=history/03.html>.

[76] Fernandez-Kelly, p. 106.

[77] Ibid., p. 107.

on the circulation of braceros, to a *de facto* guest workers program based on the circulation of undocumented labor"[78].

The progressive movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, changed the national political scene—overt discrimination in U.S. immigration policy was no longer acceptable for public officials[79]. National quotas that dated back to the 1920s were removed, in 1965. Immigration policy, from that point on, included only preferences that were not explicitly racial, though they did have racial consequences that followed the former pattern[80], (to be discussed in Chapter II). This was occurring in parallel with a shift in the labor demand: from this period on, unskilled labor, which had been so essential to the growing prosperity and the American capitalist economy, became secondary to the new highly educated working class labor[81]. By this time, the U.S. was entering the "post-industrial" age.

In 1986, Reagan extended amnesty to 3 million Mexican-American workers. Ironic, considering that today's Republicans look at Reagan as a role model. Yet, this took place during a period in the 1980s and 1990s, when "policy recast immigration law as criminal law and immigrants as lawbreakers," argues Rinku Sen, of the Applied Research Center[82]. With growing public concern regarding the U.S. government's ability to patrol the U.S.-Mexico border, the Clinton Administration launched Operation Gatekeeper in 1994[83]. It adopted a "prevention through deterrence" strategy instead of apprehending these individuals after they entered the U.S., with the goal of decreasing unauthorized crossings into California. Yet, this was carried out during a period of unprecedented economic and demographic growth within the border

---

[78] Fernandez-Kelly, op. cit., p. 107.

[79] Sen, op. cit., p. 54.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Almaguer, op. cit., p. 11.

[82] Sen, op. cit., p. 54.

[83] Nevins, op. cit., p. 2.

region[84]. It is almost counterintuitive how during this period of rapid transboundary socio-economic development and integration, that the border was being reinforced against human mobility. This is one of the great contradictions of globalization, and considering the history between the two countries, it is further counterintuitive.

It is also interesting to note how the labor movement transformed in relation to immigration. It went from pro-immigrant around 1890 to anti-immigrant for most of the 20th century and became somewhat pro-immigrant again in the 1980s.[85]

There is a long history in Latin America of U.S. intervention, specifically political and economic domination, which bares some responsibility for the current immigration flows. The term immigrant does not reflect this history or the relationship of Mexicans or Chicanos living in the U.S., especially in the Southwest U.S., that was once Mexican territory. Studying the history, makes these deep colonial roots come to the surface, as well as their repercussions, as is the case with Mexican migration to the U.S. This is where the internal colonialism theory has much to offer (See Chapter II).

Especially since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the "on-again" border has been re-enforced with vigor. Border security has become a major tenant of the U.S. War on Terror. Immigration, criminality and terrorism are even more linked than at any previous time in U.S. history. Massey and Sanchez argue that, "in the past several decades, a "Latino threat narrative" has come to dominate political and media discourse. In the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan began framing immigration as an issue of "national security," they explain. In the 1990s, the image of the immigrant-as-freeloader gained wide circulation. And in the 2000s, there was commentator Lou Dobbs, blasting the "invasion of illegal aliens" that were waging "war on the middle class"[86].

---

[84] Ibid., op. cit., p. 2-3.

[85] Daniel J. Tichenor, *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, p. 167.

[86] Campo-Flores, op. cit., p. 1.

Behind the scenes, an underground, "off-again" border continued (and continues) to thrive as a significant number of employers hire undocumented workers, especially in certain industries[87]. The U.S. economy continues to depend heavily on these individuals. What is rarely questioned is whether the reinforcing of U.S. borders may in reality be keeping people inside the U.S. Circular migration between Mexico and the U.S. was the norm prior to the establishment of the Southern border, and up until the early 20th century it was tacitly allowed. Especially in the past half century, U.S. border enforcement policy has made this difficult. Individuals who wished to come to the U.S. as part of seasonal or temporary migration has become permanent migrants because of such restrictive border policies. Although recent research suggests that in the past few years, since the economic downturn, undocumented Mexican migration to the U.S. is at a significant low—levels comparable to the 1950s—while enforcement is at an all time high[88].

Restriction to human mobility is a significant way in which the North American case differs from that of the European Union, where free migration of all member states is allowed. Yet, this has been a contradiction especially in the midst of numerous failed attempts to facilitate North American development with neo-liberal policies, such as the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA (to be discussed in Part II). Yet, Mexican migration to the U.S. is different because of its history (continuity) and the simple fact that no other First World country has a land border with a Third World country, this large, let alone 2,000 miles[89]. The economic difference and income gap is also one of the largest between neighbors[90]. These would be reasons to allow migration. The U.E. allowed free migration with the hopes it would equalize the countries. Though, it is clear the U.S. does not share this desire.

---

[87] Norris, op. cit., p. 4.

[88] Cave, op. cit., p. 1.

[89] Huntington, op. cit., p. 3-4.

[90] Ibid. (see David Kennedy)

The disposable Mexican workforce was critical in developing the U.S. economy and this is a reality that continues today, unacknowledged. The post-Bracero period has been characterized by an unspoken agreement between the U.S. government, the corporations, and these undocumented workers and has persisted, allowing for America to prosper in the way it has, at the expense of these workers.

Instead of addressing these realities, in the midst of what certain states label as the federal government's incompetence, some U.S. states have taken action into their own hands. Certain states have begun passing draconian immigration policies, such as Arizona's SB 1070. This law threatens immigrant rights and safety. It allows local law enforcement to racially profile, in essence, by mandating them to ask for identification of anyone believed to be undocumented. Alabama is the most recent state to pass such legislation. In June 2011 the Alabama legislature passed an Arizona-style immigration law (HB53) that allows law enforcement to detain anyone they have a reasonable suspicion is undocumented. Yet, on August 1, 2011, the Justice Department filed a challenge, arguing that the Constitution prohibits states and local governments from creating a national "patchwork" of immigration policies[91]. On August 29, 2011 a federal judge temporarily blocked the law from going into effect, scheduled for early September[92]. Parts of the law took effect in September 2011. The Southern Poverty Law Center has studied the harmful repercussions of this piece of legislation on the economy and farmworkers.[93]

Such pieces of legislation regardless of how effective they are, have significant repercussions. "Anti-immigrant legislation like that being pursued in Arizona will

---

[91] Julia Preston, "In Alabama, a Harsh Bill for Residents Here Illegally," June 3, 2011; "Justice Dept. Challenges Alabama Immigration Law," August 1, 2011 <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/02/us/02alabama.html>.

[92] Mark Guarino, "US judge blocks harsh Alabama immigration law for month of further review." *The Christian Science Monitor*, August 29, 2011 <http://www.splcenter.org/alabamas-shame-hb56-and-the-war-on-immigrants>.

[93] Southern Poverty Law Center, *Alabama's Shame: HB 56 and the War on Immigrants*, February 2012 <http://www.splcenter.org/alabamas-shame-hb56-and-the-war-on-immigrants>.

continue to cultivate an environment where crimes like Lucero's murder are likely."[94] Marcelo Lucero was an Ecuadorean immigrant who was stabbed to death by a white teenager in Patchogue, NY in 2008, in a racially (and anti-immigrant) motivated hate crime. Chapter II, that follows, will examine in more detail the current anti-immigration sentiment that is spreading across the U.S.

[94] Witness for Peace, *Solidaridad*, vol. 2, issue 2 (summer 2010), p. 2.

CHAPTER II

ANTI-IMMIGRATION SENTIMENT AND RACISM IN THE U.S.

Understanding the historical relations between Mexico and the U.S., puts the changing nature of the border into context. It also helps to do the same with the current anti-immigration sentiment that has swept the U.S. In the current economic crisis, border enforcement is at an all-time high, even through undocumented immigration has actually been at a low in recent years. This hints at the irrationality and bias behind the current anti-immigration discourse in the U.S.

Deep-seated cultural factors drive the anti-immigration sentiment. All that is cultural powerfully shapes public perception of the immigration issue[95]. These cultural factors have roots back to the settlement and founding of the U.S. Looking back in history, it becomes apparent to what extent what is legal is affected by what is cultural. It is U.S. immigration policy that creates the notion of the "illegal" immigrant by criminalizing certain types of migration. Government policy sets the demarcation line between who is to be deemed legal and illegal. Because such policy is legally binding it is assumed to be representative of the "American values" that the government is expected to uphold—those enshrined in the American Creed. Yet, after deeper analysis, it is evident that other, less altruistic, motives are at play. Often these policies are rooted in fear and prejudice. The use of law to justify injustice is not new. All one must do is look back at the laws that restricted the rights of women and African Americans, for example. Aviva Chomsky writes, "In every generation people

---

[95] Peter Dizikes, "Understanding Anti-Immigrant Sentiment" <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2010/anti-immigrant-sentiment-0219.html>.

have found rationales for systems of social and legal inequality"[96]. This remains true today with undocumented immigrants and other groups. There are a large and growing number of people living within the U.S. without full citizenship rights, and it continues to be justified by those in power. This policy has been legitimized by the criminalization of this population, reinforced by the current anti-immigration sentiment and discourse.

In their book *Brokered Boundaries*, Douglas Massey and Magaly Sánchez cite research showing that such rapid demographic change tends to trigger anti-immigrant sentiment when it becomes entangled in "inflammatory political rhetoric"[97]. It is this rhetoric that is key to understanding the situation the U.S. finds itself in. Regardless of where one lives, the current national discourse on "illegal immigration," which links immigration and criminality, has reinforced anti-immigrant sentiments throughout the U.S. population. Such discourse is so powerful that it is in areas with low concentrations of immigrants that the inhabitants perceive immigrants as more of a burden, according to a recent Pew study[98].

The term "illegal"—which is popularly used to designate an undocumented individual—has become a "bad" word. It acts as a Scarlet Letter, excluding these individuals from the rights and privileges of full participation in U.S. society. The current political climate has in effect made the term "illegal" synonymous with Mexican. "Mexican" has become the all-inclusive label for anyone who "looks" Hispanic. The term evokes certain, very specific images--of Hispanics crossing the Southern border in the dark of night, but not of Canadian students overstaying their visas, for example. The term is used "in conjunction with images of brown-skinned people, particularly Latinos, and popularizes the notion that individuals are to blame

---

[96] Chomsky, op. cit., xiii.

[97] Campo-Flores, op. cit., p. 1.

[98] Chomsky, op. cit., p. 158.

for our systemic challenges"[99]. The manner in which the term has been used by public figures should put into question with respect to its objectivity. In the fall of 2010, a senatorial campaign advertisement endorsed by Nevada's Republican candidate Sharron Angle, included the comment, "Harry Reid, the best friend an illegal alien ever had"[100]. Harry Reid was the Democratic candidate who won the election with fifty-five percent of the votes. The argument her ad was attempting to make was quite clear: the people of Nevada struggle with unemployment, and these "illegals" that sneak across the border in the middle of the night (images showing people of Hispanic origin passing by a fence in the dark of night), to take advantage of U.S. social programs, are to blame.

These individuals, who find themselves in the U.S. without legal status, have increasingly been referred to as "illegals" by a growing segment of the population, especially by the medias and politicians. The term "illegal(s)" has benefited from an "on-the-air strike," according to "TV Trends," a website that follows what is said on national television stations[101]. By 2010, the use of the word "illegal(s)" on television had quadrupled since 2009[102]. Conservative news station Fox News was the top user of the term (CNN and MSNBC followed). Americans have been inundated with this terminology that only further supports the growing anti-immigration sentiment in the country.

In 1982, Justice Brennan wrote in the decision for *Plyler v. Doe*, "It is wrong to equate illegality with criminality, inasmuch as many illegal acts are not criminal.

---

[99] See Rinku Sen, "Why I Don't Use the I-Word in ANY Form," *Colorlines*, October 14, 2010 <http://colorlines.com/archives/2010/10/why_i_dont_use_the_i-word--in_any_form.html>.

[100] See Sharron Angle television advertisement: "Best Friend" <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tb-zZM9-vB0>. Note: Harry Reid was the Democratic incumbent who won the November 2010 election.

[101] Maddie Oatman, "There's No "I" in Undocumented Worker," *Mother Jones*, September 29, 2010 <http://motherjones.com/mojo/2010/09/drop-illegal-word-immigration-debate>. (See <http://www.snapstream.com/tvtrends/>)

[102] See "Drop the I-Word Campaign" video at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v6GcPft7mqU> (1:18 mins).

Illegal alien is not an opprobrious epithet: it describes one present in a country in violation of the immigration laws (hence "illegal")[103]. This decision was made almost three decades ago during a much different political climate than that of today. It is difficult to argue that it is not used as an "opprobrious epithet" today. Yet, some disagree; the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), a nonprofit that has as its stated mission "to improve border security, to stop illegal immigration, and to promote immigration levels consistent with the national interest"[104], is an example. Understandably, it has been labeled as an "anti-immigration group" by the Southern Poverty Law Center[105]. FAIR argues, "America uses the term 'illegal alien' to describe someone in our country in violation of our immigration laws not to demean someone, but rather because it is the correct, and legally recognized, term"[106]. This neglects to address the reality and again uses law to hide the presence of injustice.

In spite of this, the use of the term "illegal" has been increasingly challenged. In the following sections, the racist roots of such terminology will be examined. Section 2.1 will look at the link between racism and immigration policy. Section 2.2 will follow this argument by using internal colonization theory to explain the treatment of these individuals in American society.

2.1 Racism and Immigration

Race is a socially constructed concept, meaning it is not as simple as drawing a colorline between black or white. It is complex, adapting to the specific context of a place and time. In the United States, race is often used to discuss relations between

---

[103] Bryan A. Garner, *Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage*, New York: Oxford Press, Second ed., 1995, p. 899.

[104] See FAIR, "About US," <http://www.fairus.org/site/PageNavigator/about.html>.

[105] See "Anti-Immigration Groups," <www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?sid=175>.

[106] FAIR, "Illegal Alien or "Undocumented Immigrant?" <http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=20887&security=1601&news_iv_ctrl=1007>.

African Americans and "white" Americans, but also increasingly Latinos or Hispanics. In the 1960s, various theorists had argued that, as societies transitioned from being traditional to modern, race would become increasingly irrelevant and eventually disappear[107]. It soon became evident that this was inaccurate and the revisionists argued instead that race would remain, at least, as central as class to the social order of the U.S. Furthermore, it was theorized that race and racism were also central to U.S. economics, politics and culture. Robert Blauner argued that they are basic elements rather than just phenomena and that "racial oppression occupies a central and independent role in American life"[108]. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.

Many institutional structures within American society have allowed for certain individuals ("whites") to accumulate power based on their race. Yet, racism is just one form of oppression that permeates American society. To provide a simplified explanation of the concept of racism in the U.S., see the formula below:

White = Privileged; Black, Brown = Underprivileged/Oppressed

Of course, the relationship between race and privilege is constantly changing and is marked by many complexities. Throughout U.S. history, being labeled "white" has been a mark of privilege; although who is considered to be "white" in American society has changed with the changing context. For example, Noel Ignatiev writes, "the flood of Irish famine emigrants during the 1840s sparked a strong nativist reaction, which viewed the Irish as both physically and culturally similar to black"[109]. The fact that the Irish, known for their pale skin color, were at this period in time set in the racial category of "black" demonstrates to what extent the socio-political context

---

[107] Robert Blauner, *Still the Big News: Racial Oppression in America*, Temple University Press, 2001, p. 13 <http://www.temple.edu/tempress/chapters_1400/1566_ch1.pdf>. See writings of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Ferdinand Toennies, Georg Simmel.

[108] Ibid., p. 21.

[109] Sen, op. cit., p. 52 (See Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 1995).

shapes this concept of race. Another example of how contextually specific race is, is the fact that until 1930, the U.S. Census classified Mexicans as "white," but after this point, the separate racial category of "Mexican" was added. This change in categories was representative of the time period—the Great Depression, when Mexicans were excluded from society and some forcibly repatriated. The U.S. Census also acknowledges race to be a socio-political construct[110].

The treatment of immigrants has always been "racialized," leading to the creation of racial hierarchies that reflect the changing socio-political context[111]. Sen argues that over the years these hierarchies have shifted and racial definitions have also changed as European immigrants gained status while "Third World" immigrants, namely those from Mexico, lost status[112]. Those who were forcibly incorporated into the U.S., such as the Native Americans, African Americans whose ancestors where brought over because of the slave trade, Mexicans living in Southwest that became American territory after the war, tend to be at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. Understanding U.S. history is necessary for understanding the changing dynamics of oppression, especially with regard to these groups. The history of colonialism and internal colonialism/domestic neocolonialism, to be discussed in the next section, laid the basis for the systemic oppression that permeates U.S. society today.

The national discourse on "illegal immigration," not only leads to anti-immigrant sentiments, but also impedes the formation of useful multiracial alliances. There is an unwillingness to understand the struggle of other U.S. minority groups. Sandoval explains, "It is through this process that the negative framing of citizenship is able to reproduce a racial order that keeps whites on top and both groups

---

[110] Chomsky, op. cit., xvi.

[111] "Race and Immigration: Behind the Debate," [Video] (3:50 mins) <http://www.accidentalamerican.us/video/>.

[112] Sen, op. cit., p. 51-52.

marginalized, with no real gains for either blacks or Latinos"[113]. Blacks are framed as African Americans, thus U.S. citizens, while Latinos are framed as "illegal immigrants," meaning non-U.S. citizens. Blacks are made to symbolically belonging. "This black-white alignment can make right-wing white Americans' anti-immigrant argument appear non-racist, while simultaneously exacerbating tensions between blacks and Latinos"[114]. At the same time, many of the difficult realities facing African Americans are disregarded, even though they are often the same realities many minorities must deal with. The same "divide and conquer" strategy can be applied to various groups often labeled at "Latinos," "Chicanos" or "Mexicans." Nicholas De Genova, from the Department of Anthropology and Latina/o Studies at Colombia University, in the article "'American' Abjection: "Chicanos," Gangs, and Mexican/Migrant," discusses the divide and "othering" that occurs between undocumented Mexicans and Chicanos still today[115].

The historical relationship between Mexico and the U.S., as described in Chapter I, can help explain why many Mexicans cross the border into the U.S. But without a clear understanding of colonialism in its various forms, it is difficult to understand the situation where "Mexicans" find themselves at the bottom of the racial hierarchy in the U.S. People want to believe the U.S. is a meritocracy—a place where people get ahead based on their own hard work without prejudice or favoritism. What happened to the belief that everyone had a shot at attaining the American Dream? The current reality is one of denial that ignores current injustices that permeate American society. The reality today is that if you make the rules, you get the rewards[116]. At

---

[113] Claudia Sandoval, "Citizenship and the Barriers to Black and Latino Coalitions in Chicago," *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 39.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Nicholas De Genova, "'American' Abjection: "Chicanos," Gangs, and Mexican/Migrant," *Aztlan*: A Journal of Chicano Studies, vol. 33, no 2 (Fall 2008), p. 159-160 <http://www.nicholasdegenova.net/.../De+Genova+-+American+Abjection.pdf>.

[116] Channing Kennedy, "'Merit:' Word Hijacks the Conversation around Racial Disparities" [VIDEO], June 18, 2009 <http://colorlines.com/archives/2009/06/merit_word.html>.

present, Hispanics have a very small voice in the U.S. today. They are disproportionately unrepresented in government and positions of authority. Hispanics suffer in many ways.

It is clear that the term "illegal" is used as a racial code and a racial slur. Some argue the use of the word "illegal" is a way of legitimizing violence against a group of people. In 2008, 51 percent of hate crimes were motivated by race, while another 11 percent were motivated by ethnicity and national origin, according to the FBI Uniform Crime Report[117]. Hate crimes against Latinos have risen by 40 percent since 2008[118]. The consequences of this use of the term can be significant. Melissa Harris-Lacewell, Associate Professor of Politics and African American Studies at Princeton University, in her Keynote Address at the Facing Race 2010 Conference explains, "Bad behavior may be a necessary condition but is not a sufficient condition for bad outcomes"[119]. She presented the following formula:

"Bad behavior + privilege = U.S. presidency

Bad behavior + marginal status/underprivileged status = prison"[120]

The first equation makes reference to President George W. Bush, but is representative of many people in power today. Of course, this is not always the case and the reality is more nuanced especially with the recent prosecutions of American politicians Rod R. Blagojevich and Tom DeLay, and lobbyist Jack Abramoff. The second equation reflects the reality of many people living in the U.S. and the outcome is not only prisons, but for many undocumented individuals, expulsion. Because these individuals are "illegal" they will always be in the wrong, placing them in a position of constant fear and extreme vulnerability. With this Harris-Lacewell spotlights the

---

[117] See 2008 FBI Uniform Crime Report, <http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/hc2008/index.html>.

[118] "Drop the I-Word Campaign," [Video] (1:34 mins) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v6GcPft7mqU>.

[119] Melissa Harris-Lacewell, "Keynote Address." Facing Race 2010 Conference <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=49ocDVphfRA> (41 mins).

[120] Ibid.

structural inequality that affects not only African Americans, but also undocumented and other minority groups. The term "illegal" in fact describes a social reality, that of inequality. It divides society between those with rights and those without[121].

Although historically race has driven U.S. immigration policy in some very overt ways; today it is more hidden, since overt discrimination is no longer socially acceptable. So, "Through a combination of straightforward exclusion, bureaucratic exceptions, and the creation of different mechanisms for entering the country, federal law expanded or reduced immigration based on labor needs, economic anxiety, war and xenophobia"[122]. The U.S. immigration system, assumed by many to be objective and fair, is, in reality, a system plagued with injustice. The U.S. has a two-track immigration system, which makes it relatively easy for wealthy, professional Westerners to gain entry, while those from more disadvantaged backgrounds are met with hurdles that, too often, make it impossible to migrate freely or legally[123].

Race and class are closely linked in the issue of immigration. Although this dissertation focuses on race, the role of other forms of oppression (those based on race/ethnicity, gender, religion, sexuality, class, disability, and other markers of difference) cannot be ignored. They do not act independent of one another, but instead interrelate, based on how they apply to a given individual; this is known as *intersectionality*[124]. The current discussion ignores the existence of systemic racism, or system oppression more generally, in U.S. immigration policy, and society.

The discussion on immigration is overwhelmed with arguments that this population takes American jobs, burdens tax payers by freeloading on public services

---

[121] David Bacon, *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes Immigrants*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2008, p. 45.

[122] Sen, op. cit., p. 51-2.

[123] Bauer, op. cit., p. 12.

[124] Anne Bishop, *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression*, Fernwood Books Ltd., 1997, p. 19.

and goods, increases national crime rates, and so on. The variants of these arguments are never ending, often rooted in racism and lacking foundation. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to discuss the long list of arguments, but Aviva Chomsky does a wonderful job, dispelling many of them in her book, *They Take Our Jobs! and 20 Other Myths About Immigration*[125]. Due to their vulnerability and the attacks against them, many undocumented individuals suffer in silence. The "average American" suffers as well. While the undocumented are being scapegoated, the real issues are being ignored.

The reason why a population is scapegoated evolves based on the circumstances—fears, insecurity, etc.—and is rarely grounded in logic. Yet, this process of dehumanization has proven to be timeless, although too often hidden. The U.S. remains in denial about this. The controversy over terminology is representative of the issue itself. So much of the real situation is hidden behind words and arguments that are based on various forms of hidden oppression locked into the system, immigration and other. Those involved in the migrant justice movements are working to end racism against these minority groups. Changing the terms of the debate is seen as a first step is addressing the broader issue. Some are working on the "Drop the I-Word Campaign"[126], launched on September 28, 2010, which refers to the term "illegal" as the "I-Word"[127]. The campaign encourages individuals to take a pledge to drop the I-Word but also targets media outlets, which it asks to "uphold reason, dignity and ethics" by dropping the term[128]. This initiative is aimed at raising the public awareness of, and commitment to, human rights, dignity and racial justice for all people. Linking the immigration situation to the fight for racial justice is important in the U.S. context. The No One is Illegal movements taking place in numerous cities

---

[125] See Aviva Chomsky, *They Take Our Jobs! and 20 Other Myths About Immigration*, New York: Beacon Press, 2007, 236 p.

[126] Campaign launched by those at the Applied Research Center and ColorLines.com.

[127] See "Drop the I-Word Campaign" at <http://colorlines.com/droptheiword/>.

[128] Ibid.

across Canada have pushed for a mass public awareness campaign around the concept that humans cannot be and are not illegal—"crimes are illegal, people are not." Individuals who have been branded with this, risk repercussions in every action they take. FAIR argues that such campaigns are 'political correctness' campaigns[129]. This type of argument is weak. It must come to be accepted that the term illegal is something of the past, like the term "wetback." Yet, changing the terminology, if done superficially, will not eliminate the real issue--the racism hidden beneath the surface.

Migration does not take place in a vacuum and neither does the response to it. In *Operation Gatekeeper*, Joe Nevins points out that language is significant in the immigration debate and always has been. The term "wetback" was the preferred, "official" term in the 1950s (hence Operation Wetback in 1954) and when it was no longer politically correct, "illegal" took its place. As previously mentioned, by the mid 1960s, overt discrimination in U.S. immigration policy was no longer politically viable and so the same dynamics of racism had to go underground. It was at this time that the Bracero Program came to end, so that all guest workers would be dealt with under the same structure. Yet again, at first glance such a change may look to uphold equal treatment of such individuals, but in reality, it is quite the opposite. Few today would deny the racism that was hidden behind the term "wetback." The current terminology has the same racist roots.

De Genova writes, "the conceptual problem embedded in the terminology are symptomatic of deeper problems of intellectual—and ultimately political—orientation."[130] He makes an important point in explaining that in doing research with "policy relevance," too often it is formulated and conducted from the standpoint of the state, as opposed to the migrants. Because of this, the migrant is seen as the problem,

---

[129] FAIR, "Illegal Alien or 'Undocumented Immigrant?'" <http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=20887&security=1601&news_iv_ctrl=1007>.

[130] Nicholas De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthology*, vol. 31 (2002), p. 421.

not the state. He quotes Whiteford: "...what does seem surprising is that social scientists...share the worldview of the bureaucrats"[131]. De Genova does a thorough analysis of the use of the term "illegal" and the creation of migrant "illegality"[132].

The next section will dive even deeper into the debate, using internal colonization theory to strengthen this argument that today's immigration policy has very clear racist roots.

2.2 Theory: Internal Colonization of Mexicans

Colonialism marked the early relations between Mexico and first European settlers in North America. Once the United States of America was founded, internal colonialism, a form of "domestic neocolonialism, was established. The concept will be used throughout this thesis to describe the institutionalized oppression that has affected (and continues to affect) Chicanos/Hispanics/Mexican Americans, Native Americans and African Americans in the U.S.

The roots of internal colonization are found in dependency theory that emerged out of Latin America in the 1960s. It was developed by radical economists and sociologists who looked to explain the difficulties that the Global South had in developing both economically and politically[133]. These *dependentistas* attributed global inequalities to the long legacy of colonialism, as well as contemporary power relations between states[134]. Dependency theory understands development and underdevelopment as relational. It was diametrically opposed to modernization theory that had dominated since the 1950s and understood these concepts as simply being the

---

[131] Ibid.

[132] Ibid., p. 419-447.

[133] David S. Walls, "Internal Colony or Internal Periphery? A Critique of Current Models and an Alternative Formulation," p. 7 <http://www.sonoma.edu/users/w/wallsd/pdf/Internal-Colony.pdf>.

[134] Christopher Chase-Dunn, "Dependency and World-Systems Theories," *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, p. 1-3 <www.beossubmissions.com/docs/D0337.pdf>.

result of internal conditions that differ between countries (specifically, economies). The *dependentistas* argued that global inequalities are socially structured and the resulting hierarchy is a key trait of the global system[135]. Dependency theory argued that the world is divided into a core of wealthy countries that dominate a periphery of poor ones that provide raw materials and cheap labor to the core. The core relies on the periphery to maintain its status, as well as for sustained economic and political expansion. It is the core that benefits from this system—as it becomes progressively richer and more developed—while the periphery suffers as its surplus is continually expropriated[136]. This is maintained through a relation characterized by exploitation and colonization of the periphery by the core. The Europeans found their way to North America, "The New World," while searching for new sources of raw materials. Underdevelopment became understood as the direct result of the development of the core. This can best be seen in Africa, for example. But it is also clear in the relation between the U.S. and South American and Latin American countries, especially Mexico.

Dependency theory initially focused on classical colonialism as characterizing the core-periphery relationship because it was representative of the international dynamics of the time. Colonialism, broadly speaking, is the practice of domination where one group is subjugated at the hands of another. Its classical form is characterized as "a system of organizing society that concentrates all the power over the local population in the hands of an invading outsider group"[137]. This is often used to describe the intervention of the Europeans powers in regions of Africa, Asia, and South America, for example. The colonial process is justified by the oppressor or dominant group's defining the local population as inferior.

---

[135] Ibid., p. 1.

[136] Ibid., p. 1-2.

[137] Flavio Francisco and Stephen Kulis, *Diversity, Oppression and Change: Culturally Grounded Social Work*. Chicago: Lyceum Books, 2009, p. 114.

Classical colonialism was followed by neocolonialism, as previously colonized countries gained their independence. The same dynamics continued as the economic and political policies of the core, seeking to sustain their hegemony, worked to indirectly maintain and extend influence over their former colonies. David S. Walls, an activist and academic who has made significant contributions to Appalachian studies and to the popular understanding of social movements, explains the importance of "infrastructures of dependency"[138]—structures internal to the dependent (peripheral) country that are "the functional equivalent of a formal colonial apparatus, but in-so-far as it is internalized and institutionalized much more difficult to overcome"[139]. These infrastructures, which can be seen in public education systems, patterns of urbanization, and the formation of social classes, are central to the concept of neocolonialism. While it was Mao Zedong who once said, "All power grows out of the barrel of a gun," neo-colonialism marked a shift in that the wealthy class did not simply need police or military backing—hard power—instead they realized that forms of soft power could be more effective in preserving their privileged status[140]. This shift marked a change in the global paradigm that made overt discrimination, exploitation and colonization politically unviable, as international human rights became the name of the game.

In the 1970s, world-systems theory emerged out of classical sociology, Marxism, political economy, and the thinking of the *dependentistas*, with Immanuel Wallerstein as its father[141]. World-systems theory can be found within the school of dependency theory, yet took it to a new level. It focused on "world-systems," as

---

[138] Walls, op. cit., p. 3.

[139] See Susanne Bodenheimer, "Dependency and Imperialism: The Roots of Latin American Underdevelopment," in *Readings in U.S. Imperialism*, ed. Fann and Hodges, p. 62-64.

[140] Nicolas Kanellos, *Handbook on Hispanic cultures in the U.S.: Anthropology*. Arte Publico Press, 1994, p. 99.

[141] William Robinson, "Globalization and the sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A critical appraisal." *International Sociology*, vol. 2 (2011) <www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/Wallerstein.pdf>.

opposed to the nation-state, as the unit of analysis. It emerged in reaction to modernization theory that did not account for the interconnectedness and interdependence between "world-systems" and most especially, the role played by peripheral countries in the development of the core, as above mentioned. Wallerstein argued: "the world had expanded through an ordered pattern of relationships among societies driven by a capitalistic system of economic exchange"[142]. In essence, this was part of globalization. It is these relations (globalization) that are fundamental to understanding development. World-systems theory also moved beyond the dichotomy of the core-periphery and divided the capital world-system into core, semi-periphery and the periphery. The semi-periphery includes those industrializing countries (Mexico is an example) that are positioned between the periphery and core and have organizational characteristics of both. They help mediate the economic, political, and social interactions of the core and periphery[143].

Gunder Frank further developed the theory of internal colonialism by explaining that the exploitative core-periphery relationships were reproduced between countries in the periphery, as well as within countries[144]. Instead of a dominant core country exploiting the natural and human resources from the poor periphery, an internal colony is found within the same political and economic system as the expropriators. Frank gives the example: "as the rich countries are to Brazil, so is Brazil to Paraguay, and the industrial-commercial centre of Sao Paulo to the impoverished Brazilian northeast"[145]. Neocolonialism and internal colonialism differ in that the source of the exploitation in the former is external, while in the latter it

---

[142] Erwin Epstein, "Education as a Fault Line in Assessing Democratisation: Ignoring the Globalising Influence of Schools." *International Handbook on Globalisation*, Education and Policy Research, 2005, p. 625.

[143] Robinson, op. cit., p. 8-9.

[144] Simon Bidwell, "Foreign Dominance or Internal Conflict? A critique of dependency theory," Victoria University of Wellington, Fall 2008 <http://www.andean-observer.com/dependency-theory.html>.

[145] Ibid.

comes from within. After foreign domination reaches its limits, it continued by being internalized, infiltrating minority populations with the goal of assimilation and control[146].

Black activists initially brought the theory of internal colonialism forth in the early 1960s. They attempted to demonstrate how African Americans were facing many of the same social conditions in the U.S. as those in developing countries that suffered under European colonialism[147]. These activists argued the importance of internal colonialism to understanding racial oppression in the U.S. Race did not become increasingly irrelevant or eventually disappear like some theorists had argued would happen as societies modernize[148]. The inability of race theory to accurately account for the major changes that would take place during the Civil Right Era signaled the failure of that theoretical path. These individuals insisted on a revision of the historical record and a new theoretical path. These revisionists argued instead that race would remain, at least, as central as class to the social order of the U.S. and that race and racism were also central to U.S. economics, politics and culture. Robert Blauner argued that they are basic elements rather than just phenomena and that "racial oppression occupies a central and independent role in American life"[149].

In the case of African Americans, the proponents of internal colonialism theory argued they were forcibly taken (trafficked, in current terminology) from their native lands and then placed under a colonial status in the U.S. The adoption of this theory was representative of a shift in black consciousness that was significant to the Civil Rights Movements. It placed the focus on community cohesion and self-determination by promoting Black Nationalism as opposed to racial integration, which had

---

[146] John Dougherty, "Unmasking systemic oppression: The development and applications of Internal Colonialism," p. 1.

[147] Francisco, op. cit., p. 116.

[148] Blauner, op. cit., p. 13.

[149] Ibid., 21.

previously been the focus[150]. "Do we really want to be integrated into a burning house?" asked James Baldwin, in his 1963 book *The Fire Next Door*[151]. It also insisted that this issue would not have a quick fix but was deeply rooted and inherent to the global system of domination at the hands of the American Empire. The black community became aware that it was allowing American culture to influence (oppress) their community and that by doing so, they were, in essence, participating in their own domination. It became clear to many black leaders that active resistance—rejecting this outside influence and promoting Black Nationalism—was the only solution. John Dougherty insists that any analysis that does not acknowledge the colonial status of blacks and other racialized minorities in the U.S. cannot hope to deal with the problems faced by the communities[152].

The concept of internal colonialism was later taken up in the 1970s and articulated by academics, most notably Robert Blauner, who extended it to other racialized minorities in the U.S., including Native Americans, Chicano/Latinos, and Asian-Americans. These groups have been subject to the same colonizer-colonized relationship that many countries of the Global South have experienced. Robert Blauner, sociologist at University of California at Berkeley, translated the social problems of black communities into the academic arena and also was one of the first to directly apply the theory outside of the black community. He uses the model to understand the colonial situation of Chicanos in the Southwest U.S., specifically Southern California. He also looked at how internal colonialism fits into the largest function of colonialism as a whole. Chicanos were forcefully incorporated into the U.S. and then forced into a second-class status[153]. Rodolfo Acuna, historian, professor and scholar in Chicano studies, dealt with this history in his book, *Occupied America:*

---

[150] Francisco, p. 124-5.

[151] Dougherty, op. cit., p. 1.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Cruz, op. cit., p. 15.

A History of Chicanos (first edition, 1972, which has since gone through five revisions, most recent 2006).

Racial oppression that persists today in the U.S. stems from the colonial experience of these racialized minority groups. The theory of internal colonialism attempts to uncover the structural, systemic, and internalized methods of colonialism that have been used[154]. Blauner's model included four criteria for the existence of internal colonization: 1) "Forced, involuntary entry" of the colonized must be carried out by the colonizers into their territory; 2) Negative impact on local culture as a result of colonialism as the colonizer carries out policies that constrain, transform and destroy indigenous values, orientation and ways of life; 3) The lives of subordinate group are administered by representatives of dominant power (managed and manipulated by outside); 4) "Racism as a principle of social domination"[155]. There is a strong case for the enslaved Blacks from Africa, the conquered Native Americans, and the Mexican people of the Southwest. Blauner made a clear distinction between "colonized and immigrant minorities" and insisted that the circumstances of entry of white European ethnic immigrant groups was different.

Black power was important in the African American quest for positive sense of identity. It also forced members of the majority to confront their "whiteness," reflect on their responsibility and role in racial equality. Blacks made it difficult for whites to keep their whiteness confined to "remote corners of their consciousness," as Blauner described it[156]. He explained, "People who saw themselves as fair-minded and committed to equality and individual responsibility did not want to face the possibility that their social position might be, even in part, the product of racial privilege"[157]. In

---

[154] Dougherty, p. 1.

[155] Jack Hicks, "On the Application of Theories of 'Internal Colonialism' to Inuit Societies." Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Political Science Association, June 5, 2004, p. 4.

[156] Blauner, op. cit., p. 3.

[157] Ibid., p. 9.

essence, because taking responsibility was inconceivable to many—blaming the system would threaten their interests—the victims were made responsible for their situation. The Black Power movement challenged the myth of colorblindness. It made it so that whites had to fear blacks who saw them categorically as "racists" or "whitey"[158]. It attempted to reverse the experiences of whites and blacks. By exposing the racist structures, black militants challenged the belief that minority groups could find equality and justice.[159] These same methods could apply to other minority groups. Today, the fringe of the local foods movement has begun to call out the "whiteness" of the mainstream local foods movement.

Mario Barrera, who argued that "racial and ethnic discrimination are part of the same exploitative social structure" as colonialism, saw the Chicanos of the Southwest as representing an internal colony[160]. This has persisted since U.S. acquired large tracks of Mexican territory. Francisco recounts a common saying among older Mexican Americans residing in the borderlands of the Southwest: "The border crossed us before we ever crossed the border," referring to the annexation of Mexican territories by the U.S.[161]. The racial undertone cannot be ignored. English-speaking Americans started to move to the Southwest in the 1800s to farm and look for gold. But it was not until the gold rush that these Americans intensified efforts to displace Mexicans, Spaniards, and Native Americans and independence became seen as a means to secure control over the resource-rich land[162]. Once the land had been annexed, the Mexicans who remained were guaranteed rights of citizenships, although it was soon evident that these provisions were ignored. Barrera explained these Chicanos had been colonized and exploited for economic gains at the hands of "White

---

[158] Ibid., p. 10.

[159] Ibid., p. 5.

[160] Marrio Barrera, *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1979.

[161] Francisco, op. cit., p. 126.

[162] Franciasco, p. 127 (See Truett, 2006).

capitalists," through a system of race and class domination that persistently privileges whites over all others[163]. Mexicans in the newly acquired U.S. territory soon found themselves at the bottom ranks of the U.S. labor market, forced into a subjugated racial class that most clearly manifested itself in the lack of political and economic power. This does not even begin to explain how it affects one's self-perception and how they are regarded and how they conduct themselves. Section 2.3 will examine the bi-polar nature of the U.S. immigration situation and to what extent economic factors play a role in this.

2.3 The Bi-Polar Immigration Reality

Though there is a strong anti-immigration movement that dominates mainstream American political life, the U.S. is nonetheless conflicted. Publicly this sentiment is strong, with reference to closed borders, heavy policing, sanctions, etc.; yet, behind the scenes, there is an understanding that the U.S. economy depends on these individuals. This is nowhere more true than in the corporate food industry, where there is a demand for cheap, disposable labor. But in order for this to exist, the immigration climate must be such that it creates such a group. The U.S. economy relies heavily on these individuals for the country's prosperity[164]. The business sector, in general—and the food industry in particular—supports the maintenance of an undocumented labor force. This is kept private because, "Producing undocumented migration is not a politically acceptable goal in the United States," writes David Bacon[165]. It may not be popular, but it is a profitable one.

In reality, it is quite contrary to what the U.S. supposedly stands for. The idea that everyone has access to the American Dream has long been a part of American

---

[163] Cruz, p. 15.

[164] Although some would challenge this conception of prosperity. Recently alternatives to GDP for calculating economic health and quality of life have gained backing.

[165] Bacon, op. cit., p. 78.

culture. Yet, the origins of the American Dream date back to the origins of the U.S., its foundation of exploitation and genocide. The dream is based on the idea that life can be richer, fuller, brighter (with religious freedom, racial equality, personal fulfillment, home ownership, etc.) although it has become clear that in order for some to attain that, others had to suffer and die. What made the American Dream possible? The Dream was built on, and maintained by, a system of domination and exploitation. 12 million native people, north of the Rio Grande, died, Robert Jensen explains, so that it would be possible—it was a genocide with a 95 to 99 percent extermination rate. African slavery soon followed[166]. Jensen, author of *The Anguish in the American Dream*, argues that because of this, the concept of the American Dream is unjust and fundamentally unsustainable[167]. With half of the planet living on less than $2.50 a day, according to the World Bank, how is a universal American dream possible or desirable? The American Dream has created a social order, deeply rooted in the ideology of the dominant political class. Jensen writes, "The American Dream is inconsistent with social justice and ecological sustainability. I don't want to rescue redefine or renew the American Dream... I want us all to recognize the need to transcend the domination--subordination dynamic at the heart of the American Dream. And if we can manage that, the dream would fade as dreams do as we awaken and come into consciousness"[168]. The American Dream is based on domination. The undocumented workers do not have access to such a "dream," instead they are the reason that other, more privileged, individuals are able to enjoy it. Nonetheless, the dream is what fuels the American mission to spread democracy around the world—a phenomenon that dates back to the presidency of James Madison[169]. While foreign wars are fought, major funding cuts have been made to a host of public programs and

---

[166] Robert Jensen, "The Anguish of the American Dream," *Alternative Radio*, July 2011 <http://www.alternativeradio.org/programs/JENR003.shtml>.

[167] Ibid.

[168] Ibid (7:30-8:00 mins).

[169] Francisco, op. cit., p. 126-7.

in order to justify the hard times at "home," fingers have been pointed at the country's immigrant communities. Interestingly enough, immigrant populations are often lured by the hope of this Dream and perpetuate it. Yet, their reality is far from a dream.

Most economists agree that the cheap labor of undocumented workers results in a net benefit to the U.S. economy, and one estimate is that, "Deporting these immigrants en masse would shrink the American economy by as much as $2.6 trillion over 10 years"[170]. If this were the case, regardless of all the anti-immigration rhetoric being spread, no effective enforcement policy would ever be taken. The economy has always had primacy in U.S. politics. In 2008, approximately 8.3 million undocumented immigrants were in the labor force, representing 5.4 percent of the workforce[171]. The statistics varied from state to state, with a high of approximately one-in-ten workers in Nevada, California and Arizona and most other states being below average in the share of unauthorized immigrants in their labor force[172]. As a result of the concentration of undocumented immigrants working in certain occupations, there are some occupations where they also represent a high proportion of workers. For example, 25 percent of farmworkers are undocumented immigrants, although other estimates are as high as 60 or 70 percent[173]. They are also overrepresented as a share of food preparation workers and servers (12%), production workers (10%) and transportation and material moving workers (7%)[174]. Again, it can be assumed that these numbers are, in reality, higher due to underreporting. These individuals play an important role in the U.S. economy and especially certain sectors, such as in the food industry; otherwise they would not be here in such high numbers.

---

[170] Bauer, op. cit., p. 8. (See Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, "Raising the Floor for American Workers: The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform," Center for American Progress, Immigration Policy Center, American Immigration Center, January 2010).

[171] Cohn, op. cit., p. 12.

[172] Ibid., 13.

[173] Ibid., 13. Arturo Rodriguez of UFW.

[174] Ibid., 15. [See Table B5 for estimates by major occupation groups]

What follows from the anti-immigration rhetoric is the argument that undocumented workers take jobs from American workers. The "Take Our Jobs" Campaign, launched by the United Farm Workers (UFW) on June 24, 2010 attempted to demonstrate the vital role these individuals plays as farm workers but was also seen as symbolic of the niche they fill in working the jobs most Americans refuse to do because pay is low (often below minimum wage), working conditions are poor, and the work is both physically and psychologically demanding[175].

While much of the public spotlight has been placed on issues that incite anti-immigration sentiments, little attention has been given to the economy's demand for undocumented labor, and how American industry has encouraged undocumented immigration. Most blatantly, Tyson Food Inc. was indicted in 2001 on 36 counts of recruiting and smuggling undocumented workers into the U.S.[176]. Practices such as funding advertising campaigns in border regions of Mexico to encourage individuals to come work in the poultry processing plants are more common place, yet would shock many U.S. citizens. Corporations actively seek out these undocumented workers often because they are exploitable and disposable. Unlike citizens, they have a much more limited ability to seek recourse when wronged, even though they should have equal rights before the law.

There is an increasingly well-documented human rights crisis in the U.S. food industry. In Florida's tomato fields, for example, farm workers who harvest tomatoes are paid by the piece and the average piece rate today is 50 cents for every 32 pounds of tomatoes they pick, a rate that has remained virtually unchanged since 1980. In order for them to earn minimum wage, in a typical 10-hour workday, a worker must

---

[175] See Jennifer John, "'Take Our Jobs' – Please," *Solidaridad,* Witness for Peace, Sept/October 2010, p. 10.

[176] David Barboza, "Tyson Foods Indicted in Plan To Smuggle Illegal Workers," *New York Times*, December 20, 2001 <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/20/us/tyson-foods-indicted-in-plan-to-smuggle-illegal-workers.html>.

pick more than 2.25 tons of tomatoes[177]. This is just one example, but what is certain is that few American citizens would volunteer to work under such conditions. Federal Civil Rights officials have successfully prosecuted seven slavery operations involving over 1,000 workers in Florida's fields since 1997, prompting one federal prosecutor to call Florida "ground zero for modern-day slavery"[178]. Although a few cases have been prosecuted, these are rare examples of justice. The situation in this industry has not changed much since the broadcasting of the CBS televised-documentary "Harvest of Shame" on Thanksgiving Day 1960 (to be discussed later). Although some progress has been made, the U.S. has a long way to go in fighting for justice within the food industry.

It is clear that like many industries, making the largest profits possible is what matters, and the U.S. food industry is no different. Yet, most Americans are not aware to what extent the conditions under which their food is produced conflict with their so called "American values." It leaves room to wonder what other dynamics are making this reality possible. Part II will build on the link between the corporate food industry and undocumented immigration in the U.S. Chapter I will focus on corporate globalization and, most specifically, free trade agreements as well as failed development attempts and their role in Mexican migration to the U.S.

---

[177] Coalition of Immokalee Workers, "Dear Manager" letter, <http://www.ciw-online.org/Resources/tools/manager%20letters/GenLTR.pdf>.

[178] Ibid. See CIW, "Slavery in the Fields and the Food We Eat," <http://www.sfalliance.org/resources/10SlaveryinFields.pdf>.

PART TWO

IMMIGRATION-FOOD INDUSTRY LINK

CHAPTER III

IMMIGRATION-FOOD INDUSTRY LINK

This chapter will begin to develop the link between undocumented immigration and corporate globalization, specifically in the U.S. food system. Systemic racism in the U.S. has helped to build up a strong anti-immigration sentiment that has been used to distract Americans from the current economic crisis. Certain politicians and media outlets have shifted the focus and blame on the current immigration situation for many of the problems facing society today. Although immigration, especially undocumented immigration, accentuates popular insecurities in the current economic hard times, the root causes of migration are rarely discussed. It is more common to hear the affirmation of "They take our jobs!" Yet, few question the role of Corporate America in these migrations. Most U.S. citizens would be shocked to learn that corporations recruit undocumented worker in their home countries, and have gone so far as to smuggle or traffic such workers into the U.S.[179]. This is a symptom of a larger reality that can be, in part, attributed to neo-liberal or corporate globalization in the U.S. Section 1.1 will examine this as one of the root cause of migration, specifically today's undocumented Mexican immigration. Part I, in presenting a historical overview of the relations between the U.S. and Mexico, touched on some causes of cross-border migration. The following sections will build on this.

A holistic examination of the forces at play in migration is essential to understanding the undocumented immigration situation in the U.S. today. When immigration is treated as if it exists in a vacuum, a distorted picture can easily be painted. What follows is an example of this: Samuel Huntington, the American

---

[179] Barboza, op. cit., p. 1.

political scientist widely known as the author of *Clash of Civilizations,* enumerates five distinctive characteristics of Mexican immigration in his book *Who Are We? Challenges To America's National Identity*[180]. Firstly, Mexican immigration to the U.S. can be distinguished by the fact that the two countries are contiguous. Immigrants are not arriving from the Statue of Liberty or Ellis Island, or JFK airport. Instead, they cross over a land border that separates the two countries. Huntington points out, "No other first-world country has a land frontier with a third world country—much less one of 2,000 miles. The significance of this border is enhanced by the economic differences between the two countries"[181]. This touches on a significant factor in migration: economics. Secondly, Mexicans make up a majority of the total immigrant population[182]. This is unique because prior to 1965, no single non-English linguistic group was a majority. Thirdly, illegality became a post-1965, Mexican phenomenon. Fourthly, Mexican immigrants were concentrated in particular regions of country, specifically the Southwest U.S. The Founding Fathers had made it clear that immigrants needed to disperse and assimilate, Huntington explains. Although, recent data (since 2000 when the article was published) shows that Mexican immigrants are more evenly dispersed across the country than they once were. Fifthly, this present "wave" of Mexican immigration is persistent; it has no end in sight. In fact, Mexican migration to the U.S. is the largest sustained flow of migration in the world[183].

Clearly Mexican migration to the U.S. is unique as Huntington attempts to point out. But Huntington presents these five points as a simple reality, while leaving out much-needed context and complexities. He makes no reference to the history

---

[180] Huntington, op. cit., p. 221-8.

[181] Huntington, p. 222. (see historian David Kennedy).

[182] They made up half of the total immigrant population between 1970 and 1996. See Huntington.

[183] Matthew Sanderson and Rebecca Utz, "The Globalization of Economic Production and International Migration: An empirical analysis of undocumented Mexican migration to the United States," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 50, no 2 (2009), p. 138.

between Mexico and the U.S., notably the long history of colonialism and imperialism. He does mention, "As David Kennedy has pointed out, the income gap between the U.S. and Mexico is the largest between any two contiguous countries in the world"[184]. This fact is not followed up with any clarification and he does not develop what this means and why it is the case. It is simply mentioned. Yet, inequality is only the surface and its nature and context must follow in order for the term to have deeper meaning. The manner in which these five characteristics were presented in a vacuum is very much representative of how immigration is currently dealt with in the U.S. Leo R. Chavez challenges Huntington's arguments and in *The Latino Threat*: *Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*, he investigates how prejudices and stereotypes have been used to smear "Latino" immigrants and re-define what it means to be an American.[185]

This next section will attempt to move past this roadblock in the dominant paradigm for addressing undocumented Mexican immigration. Research shows that the majority of undocumented migrants currently in the U.S. entered after the implementation of NAFTA in 1994, which raises questions about the impact of corporate globalization and more specifically economic restructuring on migration patterns[186]. This will be the focus of the next section.

3.1 Globalization's Role in Migration

Globalization in and of itself is neither good nor bad. It is a phenomenon that broadly refers to the large-scale transnational flows of goods, ideas, jobs and people. Increased communication between diverse and distant peoples is one positive consequence of globalization. Individuals can travel across the world in a day, NGOs

---

[184] Huntington, p. 1.

[185] Leo R. Chavez, *The Latino Threat*: *Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*, Stanford University Press, 2008.

[186] Sanderson, op. cit., p. 139.

from around the world can work in solidarity with one another, and modern technology has made amazing advances improving the quality of life of many. However, globalization has occurred disproportionately, with some geographic areas and economic sectors benefiting, while many other suffer. Richard D. Vogel argues that combating globalization is one of the most urgent tasks of our times. In the mission statement of his website "Combating Globalization" he writes, "The megatrend of increasing globalization, the outcome of the neoliberal free trade policies of transnational capitalism, is producing rising inequality, growing absolute poverty, escalating militarism, and catastrophic climate change"[187]. He is making reference to what will be referred to as neo-liberal or corporate globalization. This is the form of globalization that is most alarming to those concerned about issues relating to poverty, militarism, climate change, and in the case of this dissertation: trade and migration. Although discussing the negative consequences of corporate globalization is a topic too vast for this dissertation, it is important to mention that they all indirectly affect migration as well, highlighting the complexity of the issue at hand.

The United States, like other developed countries[188], has implemented a number of public policies—including those involving free trade and immigration—that have contributed to the free reign of corporate globalization. Globalization as Thomas L. Friedman, defines in his book, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, is "[T]he inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before-in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before...the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every

---

[187] See Combating Globalization, <http://www.combatingglobalization.com/>.

[188] Those countries that have a high level of development according to primarily economic criteria, such as high GDP, industrialization, etc. This concept has received much criticism and has been the focus of fierce debate. Also known as "The Global North" or "First World."

country in the world"[189]. Corporate globalization was propelled by what became known as the Washington Consensus—a term coined by economist John Williamson in 1989. The points of the Consensus represented the free-market economic policies supported by economist Milton Friedman, that some refer to as representing "market fundamentalism." It broadly describes a set of ten economic policy prescriptions that Williamson considered constituted the "standard" reform package Washington, D.C.-based institutions (such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank) promoted for developing countries, especially in Latin America, in economic crisis[190]. These policies that included trade liberalization, opening markets to investment, the privatization of state industries, tax reform, and deregulation are increasingly criticized as mechanisms for increasing inequality within these societies and increasing the gap between Global North and South. They also encouraged the development of a small, wealthy elite in these developing countries who rose to power and found a vested interest in maintaining the status quo even as their own people suffered[191]. The U.S. had found a way to have the native leaders of these countries take-over the exploitation of their own people, which further hid the neo-colonial relationship that in reality existed below the surface. Many public figures have criticized the Washington Consensus; including Noam Chomsky, Naomi Klein, Tariq Ali, Joseph Stiglitz, and Susan George. Various Latin American political leaders have also been vocal opponents of it as well, such as Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, former Argentine President Nestor Kirchner, former Cuban President Fidel Castro, and Bolivian President Evo Morales.

---

[189] Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999, p. 7-8.

[190] John Williamson, "A Short History of the Washington Consensus," Paper commissioned by Fundación CIDOB for a conference "From the Washington Consensus towards a new Global Governance," Barcelona, September 24–25, 2004, p. 2.

[191] IBON International, "Primer on Development and Effectiveness," 2007, p. 15 <http://iboninternational.org/resources/primers/27>.

This is further linked to corporate globalization in that this method of trade liberalization, opens labor markets in developing countries to multinational corporations (MNCs) from the Global North. The prescribed reduction and elimination of trade barriers allows the free movements of goods across borders, even though workers are not allowed the same freedom. The reality is that goods are manufactured using cheap labor in unregulated conditions in developing countries and exported to the Global North where they are sold at a significant mark-up. The Washington Consensus is a term that evokes such animosity in its critics. Many associate it with severe economic crises and the accumulation of external debts that crippled many developing countries leaving them indebted to countries in the North[192]. This form of globalization was hailed as the cure all for the world's economic problems, promising to level the playing field, creating a rising tide and prosperity for all. Yet, this never happened. Instead, it set the Global South back even further. For example, the massive subsidies that were given to corporate agribusiness enabling them to dump grains in developing countries, below market prices, forced small farmers out of business, unable to compete. Chapter II will discuss this in more detail.

In the past few decades, "the U.S. has pursued an increasingly contradictory set of policies with respect to Mexico, moving toward greater integration in markets for capital, goods, services, commodities, and information while insisting on separation in labor markets"[193]. The free movement of people in North America has yet to become a reality. In fact, nation-states are reinforcing their borders. Certain have begun using technology to extend their sovereignty extraterritorially. One of the great contradictions of globalization is that as countries are becoming increasingly interconnected, they are also becoming increasingly closed off to certain forms of transboundary migration. The border region between the U.S. and Mexico has become

---

[192] See Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, New York: Picador, 2007.

[193] Fernandez-Kelly, op. cit., p. 108.

increasingly porous and intertwined to the movement of capital, goods and ideas, yet it has also become increasingly closed off to the movement of individuals[194]. Limiting human mobility has long been used as a colonial tactic. Most countries in the Global North have attempted to build a sort of fortress around their countries, to keep certain people out—those from the South[195]. Nonetheless, an important and inevitable consequence of globalization is human mobility.

It is important to note that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was done in a manner that is contrary to European Union model of both economic and political integration. Human mobility is unrestricted between E.U. member countries. There has been much written on how migration can aid development, for example the United Nations issued a report in 2009 titled "Circular Migration and Human Development"[196]. Circular migration once characterized the migration of Mexicans to the U.S. but rising enforcement of the border has prevented this. Although it has been unsuccessful at curbing unauthorized border crossings into the U.S., it has made undocumented Mexicans less likely to return home after a crossing. Some have faulted the lack of political integration for why, "Agreements such as NAFTA have certainly not lived up to their promises of prosperity"[197].

An important reality that the immigration debate ignores, Sen argues, is that "Globalization is incomplete, creating a situation in which corporations are free to move jobs, operations, and capital anywhere they wish, while workers' mobility is

---

[194] This does not include Americans who travel to Mexico on vacation or business, and wealthy Mexicans who travel to the U.S. for the same.

[195] Hence the modern use of the term "Fortress Europe" that makes reference to the system of immigration controls and detention center that work to prevent non-EU citizens from entering the zone. It also makes reference to its previous World War II use during Nazi occupation.

[196] Kathleen Newland, "Circular Migration and Human Development," Human Development Research Paper, No 42 (2009), 26 p. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/newland_HDRP_2009.pdf>.

[197] Stavig, op. cit., p. 235.

limited by borders and immigration laws"[198]. The injustice of this is rarely discussed, even though it hints to a fundamental flaw in the current development paradigm. While worker's mobility is legally limited, it is increasingly accepted that "neoliberal globalization creates the conditions that drive people to migrate"[199]. This is what has made illegality a "Mexican, post-1965" reality, as described by Huntington. It is time that the role of corporate globalization and neoliberal economics, such as the IMF and World Bank structural adjustment plans and free trade agreements, such as NAFTA, be addressed.

Globalization does not respect borders. It necessarily influences the factors pushing people out of Mexico as well as the factors pulling people to the U.S. As previously mentioned, at the end of the 1800s, even though Mexicans were able to migrate freely across the border, there were limited reasons to do so. Today, the reasons are many; although since the economic crisis, fewer Mexicans are crossing the border and are instead choosing to stay in their home country[200]. This shows to what extent the (relative) economic and political situation between countries strongly influences the decision to migrate. The larger the inequality between countries, the more strength the various "push" and "pull" factors have. Poverty, lack of opportunity, farmer disenfranchisement and displacement, drug-related violence, government repression, are just some of the realities pushing people to leave Mexico. The hope of partaking in the "American Dream," as well as having family and other ties in the U.S. are major factors drawing Mexicans into the U.S.

Germain writes, "Globalization has maintained the status quo—the division of wealth and labor based on racial criteria"[201]. Unfair trade policies have enslaved much

---

[198] Sen, op. cit., p. 6.

[199] Ibid., p. 7.

[200] Cave, op. cit., p. 1.

[201] Felix Germain, "'Presidents of Color,' Globalization and Social Inequality," *Journal of Black Studies*. vol. 40, no 3 (January 2010), p. 449.

of the Global South in a neo-colonial relationship. This reality also encourages migration and when individuals from these countries make their way to the U.S., they experience internal colonialism. Yet, this reality is rarely discussed. The focus of the dissertation will be on the link between globalization and undocumented immigration, and more specifically, as it relates to the food industry, which will be discussed in Chapter II. First, the impact of NAFTA on undocumented Mexican immigration will be discussed in more detail.

3.2 NAFTA induced Migration from Mexico

NAFTA came into effect in 1994. Stavig writes, "'free markers' have done little to create 'free people'"[202]. Mexico is the classic example of this. Economic restructuring in Mexico predates NAFTA. In fact, "between 1980 and 1991, Mexico underwent a series of economic restructuring initiatives, including 13 structural adjustment loans from the World Bank and six agreements with the IMF"[203]. NAFTA simply accelerated this process of tearing down barriers to the free movement of capital. According to Sanderson, "Economic restructuring in Mexico is ostensibly related to sustained outflows of undocumented migrants"[204]. The following section will look at some specific consequences of NAFTA, specifically on Mexico, and how they produced an environment conducive to migration.

One of the most notable political concessions the Mexican government made in order for NAFTA to pass was the repeal of Article 27 of the Mexican constitution. It also set the tone for the changes to come with this form of "free trade." Article 27 had created the *ejido* system, a communal land system through which land was given in

---

[202] Stavig, op. cit., p. 236.

[203] Sanderson, op. cit., p. 138.

[204] Sanderson, p. 139.

trust by the Mexican government to small farmers for subsistence agriculture[205]. This system had been in place since the Mexican Revolution of 1910. Many peasants, notably the indigenous of Chiapas, depended on it for their livelihood. Fernandez-Kelly writes, "Although it had been the cornerstone of Mexico's political system for six decades, the constitutional change authorized private ownership of *ejido* land"[206]. It in essence allowed for agribusiness and multi-national corporations to come in and take over these peasant lands. It was this that fueled the Zapatista Rebellion (EZLN)[207]. It was no coincidence that the group went public on January 1, 1994, on the same day NAFTA came into effect.

In the aftermath of the racially motivated killing of Marcelo Lucero, an immigrant from Suffolk Country, New York, and in response to rising tensions around immigration in Long Island, fifteen Nassau and Suffolk County residents took part in a Witness for Peace delegation to Mexico to learn more about why people from Latin America are migrating to the U.S. in the first place[208]. They learned that as a result of NAFTA, the quantity of cheap imported corn in Mexico exploded, undercutting locally grown product and driving small farmers out of business. Since NAFTA was enacted in 1994, roughly 2 million people have been displaced from the Mexican agricultural sector, while the rural poverty rate has climbed to 85 percent[209]. Foreign grain, especially corn, which flooded the Mexican market, undermined already marginalized, rural farmers who depended on their *milpas* (cornfields) for their livelihood[210]. NAFTA was disastrous to peasants and small farmers in Mexico—a country where a

---

[205] Eric Holt-Gimenez and Raj Patel, with Annie Shattuck, *Food Rebellions! Crisis and the Hunger for Justice*, Oakland: Food First Books, 2009, p. 55-9.

[206] Fernandez-Kelly, p. 104.

[207] See Chiaspas Support Committee, <http://www.chiapas-support.org/main.htm>.

[208] Witness for Peace, *Solidaridad*, vol. 2, issue 3 (summer 2010), p. 2.

[209] Arty Mangan, "Farmworkers, Immigration and NAFTA," Interview of Anne Lopez, author of *Farmworker's Journey* <http://www.bioneers.org/campaigns/food-farming-1/articles-interviews/farmworkers-immigration-and-nafta>.

[210] Stavig, op. cit., p. 235.

quarter of the workforce, approximately 10 million individuals, lives off the land. Some of these displaced farmers surely make up some of today's undocumented immigrants. Although proving a direct correlation is difficult, Alejandro Portes, the Director of the Center for Migration and Development at Princeton University explains, "States that had barely a handful of "Hispanics" in 1990 now count a sizable Hispanic population. In Georgia, for example, the Latin-origin population went from 1.7 percent in 1990 to 5.3 percent in 2000, a 312 percent increase due to an inflow of 300,000 persons, overwhelmingly from Mexico."[211] Without addressing international trade agreements (such as NAFTA), agricultural subsidies and displaced farmers, it is difficult to understand the context of recent undocumented immigration. It is a foreign policy (not just immigration) issue as well. "As long as free trade makes life unlivable for so many people south of the border, the immigration issue will be unsolvable"[212]. The Trade Reform, Accountability, Development and Employment (TRADE) Act introduced in 2009 would renegotiate NAFTA and address the economic policies that have devastated Mexico. It supports small-scale farmers allowing them to stay in their communities. After the delegation returned, Congressman Tim Bishop of New York's first district signed on as a co-sponsor of the TRADE Act.

Not only is corn a major part of the Mexican economy, it holds an important place in Mexican culture. This has caused many to organize around the slogan of "Sin maíz, no hay país" (Without corn, there is no homeland)[213]. Another disastrous repercussion associated to the influx of cheap, subsidized American corn is the presence of GMO (genetically modified) corn from U.S. companies threatening

---

[211] Alejandro Portes, "NAFTA and Mexican Immigration," SSRC, July 31, 2006 <http://borderbattles.ssrc.org/Portes/>.

[212] Witness for Peace, p. 4.

[213] See Campaña Nacional Sin Maiz No Hay Pais, <http://www.sinmaiznohaypais.org/>.

Mexico's indigenous varieties.[214] Native and varieties are being lost in the process as corporation like Monsanto are moving in. What was once a basic part of Mexico's cultural heritage is now becoming the dominion of corporate business. The loss of America's food culture makes understanding the relationship between the Mexican people and corn almost incomprehensible. Yet, the digging away of a people's culture is a very effective colonial tactic to disempower the colonial subject.

There was also hope that NAFTA would bring prosperity in the form of industrial manufacturing to Mexico, specifically in the border region. Once again, it did not produce the benefits many expected. Stavig writes, "The jobs and the wages just have not been the engine of growth, wealth and prosperity that their promoters, let alone the workers, dreamed about"[215]. This is just one of many examples of how foreign corporations make their way into these developing countries with the empty promise of future prosperity. Stavig explains, "Low wages and few controls on the environmental impact are part of what, after all, give the *maquillas* their advantage in costs of production"[216]. These corporations are profit driven and disregard the human and environmental costs of their activities, and in fact, that is why they often choose to carry out operations in developing countries where there are limited regulations of such activities and they can often proceed unchecked.

These are simply a few of the critiques of NAFTA from the Mexican perspective. However, Americans should not simply oppose the current state of NAFTA for altruistic reasons. Corporate globalization has also negatively impacted the U.S., most notably American small farmers. The next section 2.1 will discuss in more detail that shift from small family farms to corporate conglomerate that took place during the 20th century. It is this shift that has allowed for the paradox of capitalist agriculture to flourish: ever-greater numbers remain hungry and

---

[214] Sen, op. cit., p. 127.

[215] Stavig, p. 236.

[216] Stavig, p. 236.

malnourished despite an increase in world food supplies and food overproduction[217]. The way in which these trends have affected the U.S. landscape is consistent with internal colonization theory, previously discussed in Part I. The fact that food desserts tend to be found in inner-city, low-income neighborhoods that tend to be predominately African American and minority has significant implications. But what is also shocking and ironic is that food desserts are also found in rural America, in areas that were once "breadbaskets." These rural areas once predominately white have experienced an influx of more diverse people and poverty, making them insignificant to the country's powerful elite.

Who truly benefits from free trade? Clearly not small farmers, either in Mexico or in the U.S. Fernandez-Kelly sums it up by saying, "...the narrow interests of financial, industrial, and policy elites on both sides of the border did less for workers in either country than for the consolidation of a new and powerful bi-national class of professional, investors, managers, and politicians"[218]. Some have argued that the rise of transnational economies should be a justification for transnational immigration. "We live in a transnational economy. If Disney is in their backyard, they have right to be here"[219], argues Eric Tang, visiting professor at Harvard University. It is a question of basic fairness. There could be, for example, an index of how much investment and trade is done with another country (trade imbalance), which is translated into a formula to determine how many people to let in from that country.[220] Because the power the corporate-political complex maintains, it is difficult to envision this in the near future, although, in the current economic crisis, there is a glimpse of hope.

---

[217] Holt-Gimenez, p. 60. See Frederick Buttel et al. *Hungry for Profit: The Agribusiness Threat to Farmers, Food, and the Environment.* Monthly Review Press, September 2000.

[218] Fernandez-Kelly, p. 106.

[219] "Race and Immigration: Behind the Debate," (7:34 mins, Eric Tang is speaking) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cS8PnbLptwo>.

[220] Ibid.

Free-trade proponents argue that increased trade and decreased government regulation would solve rural poverty and increase food security. Deborah James argues that these agreements were never intended to solve global poverty and hunger. Instead they represent an unprecedented hijacking of the global food supply for corporate profit[221]. This section provided a look at how corporate globalization has encouraged Mexican migration to the U.S. This next section will focus on how the U.S. food industry factors into this equation.

It is quite evident that the limitations placed on Mexicans mobility, the loss of their cultural autonomy, notably with the loss of their native corn varieties, due in part to unfair trade agreements that have also damaged the Mexican economy, are all the result of a colonial legacy and the neo-colonialism that persists. When undocumented Mexicans cross the border, internal colonization takes over. Yet, the oppression that Mexicans experience is part of a larger reality in the U.S. that affects many minority communities.

---

[221] Deborah James, "Food Security, Farming, and the WTO and CAFTA," *Global Exchange* <http://www.globalexchange.org/campaigns/wto/Agriculture.html>.

CHAPTER IV

THE CORPORATE TAKE-OVER OF FOOD

As previously discussed, the United States was built on a foundation of genocide, slavery, institutionalized racism, and patriarchy. This is also true of the dominant food system in the U.S. In order for it to be established, people of color (Native Americans, Mexicans in the Southwest U.S., African Americans, etc.) were disposed of their land, wealth and cultural heritage[222]. Today, this system survives through the labor of these oppressed groups, especially undocumented immigrants, who work, disproportionately, in farm labor, food processing and food service[223]. Just as institutionalized racism intersecting with class, gender, and other forms of oppression is visible in the domain of immigration, so it is with regards to food. Not only do these groups contribute in large part to the country's food production, but they experience higher rates of obesity, hunger or food insecurity. They are also more likely to live in a "food dessert" and have children who attend school where the lunch food is referred to as "jail food"[224]. In 2006, 35 million people were food insecure in the U.S.[225]. In 2010, that number increased to 49 million[226]. The economic recession has brought to light some of the injustice engrained in the food system. As with immigration where a 2-track system has developed, so has one developed in relation to

---

[222] Rachel Slocum, "Race in the study of food," *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 35, no 3 (2010) p. 327 <http://www.rslocum.com/Slocum_final_PiHG_racefood.pdf>.

[223] Gottlieb, p. 20.

[224] Ibid., p. 213. See the campaign, <http://news.change.org/stories/do-prisoners-eat-better-than-school-children>.

[225] Holt-Gimenez, p. 8.

[226] USDA, "Food Security in the United States: Key Statistics and Graphics," September 7, 2011 <http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/foodsecurity/stats_graphs.htm#how_many>.

food, where the privileged can access a wide array of food choices, but the underprivileged, often poor, people of color, because of the food and transportation gaps in certain areas (most notably inner cities but also in rural America), are left with few options others than fast food. The next section (4.1) will look at the dominant U.S. food system. The case of Tyson Foods will be given special attention in section 4.1.1. Finally, 4.1.2 will look at the corporate take-over of food in America and its repercussions.

4.1 The U.S. Food System

The dominant food system has increasingly relied on industrial agriculture, "chemical-industrial" in particular, since World War II when war technology was transferred into the domain of agriculture[227]. The food system is characterized by "commercialized, capital-intensive and highly specialized" production, where agricultural inputs have become "commodified" and controlled by corporations[228]. The dependence on national and global markets for exchange is another of its defining characteristics. In the U.S., the dominant food system is synonymous with the food industry. The food industry is a term used to describe the web of companies that produce, process, manufacture, sell and serve food products[229]. Broadly speaking, it encompasses the entire collection of enterprises involved from production to consumption of edible goods. It is the second most profitable industry in the United States—following pharmaceuticals—with annual sales over $400 billion[230]. The more vast "food and fiber" industry accounts for over a trillion dollars in sales yearly,

---

[227] Gyorgy Scrinis, "From Techno-Corporate Food to Alternative Agri-Food Movements," *Local Global*, vol. 4 (2007), p. 112.

[228] Ibid., p. 113.

[229] Nestle, Marion. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007, p. 7.

[230] Buttel, p. 27.

representing 13 percent of the U.S. gross national product (GNP), and employing 17 percent of the U.S. labor force[231]. It was in 1956 that the term "agribusiness" was coined in an article of the *Harvard Business Review*[232]. The food industry is part of agribusiness in so much as the latter deals with more than just simply food products, yet they both share the same essence.

The U.S. food industry is large-scale, far reaching and possesses a significant amount of power, even more so because it is able to spend $11 billion a year trying to make consumers crave their products[233]. Furthermore, the global food industry's annual advertising budget is $40 billion, and as the book *Food Justice* put this into perspective: this is larger than the GDP of 70 percent of the world's countries[234]. In response to the enormous sums of financial resources spent on marketing, some refer to it as the "waste of capitalism." Chris Williams explains that the entire system of capitalist production is geared toward what he called, "planned obsolescence and waste"[235]. It is argued that it produces nothing concrete that directly serves anyone. Yet, marketing is a key characteristic of the dominant food system today. In a typical dollar's worth of US-produced food, 84.2 cents pays for food marketing, while just 15.8 cents is spent on the raw farm commodities themselves[236]. The USDA uses a broad definition of marketing, including transportation and anything necessary to get the product to the consumer. These corporations have consolidated their ownership

---

[231] William Edmondson, "Economics of the Food and Fiber System," *Amber Waves*, February 2004 <http://www.ers.usda.gov/amberwaves/february04/datafeature/>.

[232] Gottlieb, p. 82. See John H. Davis, "From Agriculture to Agribusiness." *Harvard Law Review*, January-February 1956, p. 109-115.

[233] Jim Mason and Pete Singer, *The Ethics of What We Eat: Why Our Food Choices Matter*, Rodale Books, 2007, p. 4.

[234] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 70.

[235] Chris Williams, "Capitalism and the Environment," Boulder, CO: Alternative Radio, 2010.

[236] Patrick Canning, "A Revised and Expanded Food Dollar Series: A Better Understanding of Our Food Costs," Economic Research Report No. (ERR-114), February 2011 <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err114/>.

and control of the food system and are thus able to exercise an unprecedented amount of power.

The dominant food system has not always been synonymous to food industry. Instead, it is the result of a trend that "took shape during the 20th century which led from small farms to giant corporations; a society that cooked at home to one that buys nearly half its meals prepared and consumed elsewhere; a diet based on whole foods grown locally to one based largely on food that have been processed in some way and transported long distances"[237]. There is a long, complex history behind the shift and this section will attempt to shed some light on it. In 1900, 40 percent of the population lived on farms, today no more than 2 percent do[238]. What is evident, is that small family farms have been replaced by large-scale corporate food industries. Because the food industry is so vast, this dissertation will focus on the case of animal farming, especially the meat sector. This is an area where the corporate takeover continues accelerating both domestically and globally.

There were concerns about monopoly control and unfair working conditions dating back to the 19th century before Upton Sinclair's 1906 book *The Jungle* in which he describes the shocking conditions in Chicago's meat packing industries. This book led to the immediate passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act and the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906[239]. Today, vertical integration has come to characterize the meat sector. In the early 1990s, five meatpacking companies made up the fabled Chicago-based Beef Trust that dominated the American red meat market. Today a like number of firms, such as Tyson, Perdue, and Pilgrim's Pride in chicken; Tyson, Excel, and Swift in beef; and Tyson and Smithfield in pork, bestride the meat and poultry

---

[237] Nestle, op. cit., p. 11.

[238] Ibid., 12.

[239] Human Rights Watch, "Blood, Sweat, and Fear: Workers' Rights in U.S. Meat and Poultry Plants," January 24, 2005, p. 11 <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/usa0105.pdf>.

sectors in the United States[240]. Yet, up until the 1940s and 1950s, animal farming remained relatively small operations where farmers had some degree of independence[241]. There was a major shift in the 1950s/1960s and again in the 1980s out of which "a massive, industrial system arose, complete with vertical integration from farm to market that extended globally, with highly concentrated ownership and enormous changes for the workforce"[242]. Industrialization shifted from urban area to the rural countryside as the farm became a factory. "The 1980s saw the destruction of good jobs in the meatpacking industry. Many companies relocated from decades-old, multi-story urban factories to single-floor layouts in rural areas closer to cattle and hog feedlots"[243]. As working conditions dramatically declined, the meat industry increasingly became a domain for immigrant workers. The poultry sector with the Tyson Foods, Inc. is one of the best examples of this. In the past decade, immigrant workers from Mexico and Central America have replaced the rural white and African-American workers who once filled the Northwest Arkansas poultry plants where Tyson is based. This is a trend that characterizes the poultry industry nationwide. For example, "Between 1990 and 2000, the foreign-born population of the two largest counties in the area increased more than 600 percent"[244]. Section 2.1.1 will examine the case of Tyson Foods in more detail.

4.1.1 The Case of Tyson Foods, Inc.: What it means?

The rise of Tyson Foods as the largest poultry producer in the world begins with McDonald's, and more specifically the Chicken McNugget. In the early 1980s,

---

[240] Ibid., p. 15.

[241] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 29.

[242] Ibid., p. 30.

[243] Human Rights Watch, p. 12.

[244] Ibid., p. 9.

as McDonald's was establishing the McNugget it had turned to Tyson Foods to guarantee its supply of chicken. This contributed to Tyson Foods becoming "one of the giant food behemoths" of the time[245]. By this point, Tyson Foods had already evolved from producing to processing chicken and selling a number of reconstituted products, having established the first processing facility in 1957. The company continued to expand its operations by buying out smaller companies and adopting industrial production methods, including the use of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs)[246]. It is seen today as a prime example of vertical integration in the food industry. The company has attempted to put a positive spin on the reality by explaining, "We use vertical integration to control product quality from the egg to the finished product on your table"[247]. Yet, there is significant evidence to paint a very different picture of its operations. As it has grown to dominate the poultry industry and has also become a major global food player, its power is more difficult to regulate and hold accountable. Because it is able to control the whole process of production—from raising the animals to processing the meat, and distributing the final products—it is able to set standards and prices, often forcing smaller farms or companies to either adapt or get out of the business. Farmers under Tyson contracts are in essence reduced to powerless contract labor supplying the "fuel" for the corporation, yet it has been estimated that as many as 71 percent of those contract farmers earn below poverty-level wages[248]. To keep up with Tyson's demands, CAFOs have become the norm in the industry despite the environmental hazards associated with them, in terms of water and air quality, not to mention animal welfare. This corporation has become a power machine, driven by a strong profit motive. Little else matters, including public health, environment, food quality, or the treatment of workers. For example, it is estimated that Tyson's workforce at its processing facilities, experience as much as a 75 percent

---

[245] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 35.

[246] Ibid., p. 36.

[247] Tyson Foods, Inc. <http://www.tysonfoods.com/About-Tyson/Live-Production/Chicken.aspx>.

[248] Gottlieb, p. 37.

annual turnover rate and come from a low-paid immigrant labor pool that worked in hazardous conditions, exploiting their vulnerability—especially undocumented workers[249]. Only society's most oppressed and vulnerable are willing to do the work. Steve Striffler, in his book *Chicken: The Dangerous Transformation of America's Favorite Food*, describes in detail many of the issues plaguing the industry today, especially with respect to its treatment of workers.

The secretive nature of the food industry is one of its defining characteristics, although much of the public is unaware of this reality. Most Americans are fairly detached from the food they consume, a reality depicted in a popular American TV reality show, Jamie Oliver's "Food Revolution," where the host asks elementary school children to identify various fruits and vegetables and they have difficulty pointing out even a tomato. The present detachment has a much longer history. Although there have long been concerns about the conditions in which food is produced, today's issues are magnified by the large-scale, mass production, corporate model that dominates the U.S. food system. Because of the size of these operations and the large, complex networks that food passes through, it is a system that is difficult to navigate. To make the situation more difficult, corporations are rarely transparent about their activities. Corporations keep hidden the reality of how food makes its way to grocery stores. Yet, every so often, revelations surface that cause the public to question the activities of the food industry.

The recent E. coli outbreak in Europe in May/June 2011 was one example.[250] Not only does the transnational nature of the current food system make tracing the origin of an outbreak difficult, but it also encourages food production in environments that are conducive to such outbreaks. It was found that the epidemic of avian

---

[249] Gottlieb, p. 36. See Steven Striffler, *Chicken: The Dangerous Transformation of America's Favorite Food*, Yale University Press, 2005, p. 8.

[250] William Neuman, "Outbreak in Europe May Revive Stalled U.S. Effort to Tighten Rules on Food Safety," *New York Times*, June 3, 2011.

influenza ("bird flu"), that spread across Asia in 2003 and reached Europe in 2005, could be traced to intensive chicken production. In October 2005, United Nation Task Force stated one of its root causes as being: "farming methods which crowd huge numbers of animals into small spaces"[251]. But these corporations ask themselves "what is the least amount of floor space necessary per bird to produce the greatest return on investment."[252] In their quest to maximize profits, a typical chicken shed measures 490 ft long by 45 feet wide (30,000+) with a stocking density of 96 square inches (less than a sheet of paper). These are the modern-day CAFOs. Tyson Foods is the number one producer of "broiler" chickens.[253] Because most consumers would find these conditions to amount to "cruel" treatment, these corporations also spend millions in lobbying for limited regulations (so they can legally do what they please) and advertising to paint a picture far different from the reality (especially when they are not keeping up with standards). Journalists, animal rights activists, and concerned consumers are barred from visiting these CAFOs. This was depicted in the documentary *Food, Inc.* Farmers are mere contractors and are given rigid guidelines that allow them little leeway. It is the corporate headquarters that make the decisions and these contractors are in a feudal, near slave relationship with them. They are dependent on the constant renewing of their contract in order to survive.

In a Human Rights Watch Report, it was summarized: "They contend that instead of exporting production to developing countries for low labor costs, lax health, safety and environmental enforcement, and vulnerable, exploited workers, U.S. meat and poultry companies essentially are reproducing developing country employment conditions here." This is Tyson's "Third World" Strategy[254]. Tyson Foods is

---

[251] UN News Center, "UN Task Forces Battle Misconceptions of Avian Flu, Mount Indonesian Campaign," p. 1 <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=16342&Cr=bird&Cr1=flu>.

[252] North, MO and Bell Dd, *Commercial Chicken Production Manual*, 4th edition, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990, p. 456.

[253] Tyson Foods, Inc. <http://www.tysonfoods.com/About-Tyson/Live-Production/Chicken.aspx>.

[254] Human Rights Watch, p. 16.

nonetheless a MNC with operations in Russia, China, Mexico, India, Indonesia, and Holland to name a few[255]. The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) report "Injustice on Our Plates," focused on the experience of immigrant women in the food industry. The story of Rosa hints to the injustice of the system: "On the chicken line, Rosa earned $6.25 per hour. The breasts she cleaned were sold in grocery stores, three per package, for about $3 a pound. For each $6.25 she earned, she trimmed and deboned $900 worth of chicken breasts--hour after hour"[256]. This profit goes to the corporation and it is only made possible because it does not pay its workers a fair wage and cuts corners wherever possible.

The HRW report shows the U.S. is failing to meet its obligations under international law by not guaranteeing its corporation act in accordance with human rights policies. It is the responsibility of U.S. health and safety regulations to address the hazards in this industry, yet they have failed. Laws that are supposed to protect workers' freedom of association (right to form unions, etc.) are instead manipulated by employers to prevent workers from organizing and demanding fair working conditions. In other words, "Federal laws and policies on immigrant workers are a mass of contradictions and incentives to violate their rights"[257]. The U.S. government has taken few steps to curb this oppressive corporate power. A food sovereignty newsletter, Nyéléni, explains that the role of governments has been to help their corporations navigate these markets and they do so by signing bilateral trade and investment agreements or by launching diplomatic missions to overturn import restrictions. It appears as if governments are there to serve corporate interests and no longer the interests of the people.

To sum this up, Tyson was listed as one of the ten worst corporations of the year in the 1999 Corporate Crime Report, which made reference to their use of child

---

[255] Ibid., 10.

[256] Bauer, op. cit., p. 36.

[257] Human Rights Watch, p. 2.

labor, low wages, and cuts in health benefits[258]. Because this dissertation is exposing the link between the corporate food industry and undocumented immigration, the illegal hiring practices of Tyson will again be discussed. Tyson Food Inc. was indicted in 2001 on 36 counts of recruiting and smuggling undocumented workers into the U.S.[259]. But practices such as funding advertising campaigns in border regions of Mexico to encourage individuals to come work in the poultry processing plants are more common place, yet would shock many U.S. citizens. Corporations actively seek out these undocumented workers often because they are disposable and exploitable. Unlike citizens, they have a much more limited ability to seek recourse when wronged. It was found that, "Tyson was investigated for financial gains derived from the alleged offense [of hiring undocumented workers], which was estimated to be in excess of $100 million"[260]. This is not unique to Tyson Foods, but is a systemic issue within the food industry. Tyson was indicted not for employing undocumented workers but other acts such as conspiring to transport them within the U.S. and providing them with counterfeit documents. The company's defense took advantage of the corporate set-up, arguing that managers who broke the law "decided by themselves" to do so "without the knowledge or encouragement of senior management," defense attorney Thomas C. Green proclaimed at trial[261]. The undocumented workers and certain low to mid-level employees of Tyson lost their job because of this but its top executives were left untouched.

Tyson Foods' power continues to increase. In 2001, Tyson Foods became the world's largest red meat company after acquiring the company IBP[262]. Gottrieb writes, "IBP had also secured a reputation for food and social injustice that rivaled

---

[258] Mason, p. 23.

[259] Barboza, p. 1.

[260] Joseph Rosenbloom, "Victims in the Heartland: How immigration policy affects us all," *The American Prospect*, June 30, 2003. See *U.S. v. Tyson Foods, Inc.*

[261] Rosenbloom, p. 1.

[262] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 36.

Tyson's"[263]. As a result of their growing power, just as with marketing, Tyson Foods and other agribusiness can lobby government to help ensure that U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) policies do not conflict with their economic interests, by limiting regulations on their industry but also by receiving agricultural subsidies or other financial incentives to further their business as usual. This dissertation is not able to address all the consequences of the type of power corporations such as Tyson Foods have been able to accumulate. What is certain is that Tyson Foods has helped transform what was once thought of as a leaner, low-fat chicken into a highly processed, reconfigured product, contributing to the current health crisis. The current health crisis is affecting the same demographics from which the worker's themselves come from. This is another significant way in which the U.S. poor, immigrant populations are targeted. In order to hide this reality, Tyson Foods, like many corporations, use marketing to build an image that hides the large-scale nature of today's modern agriculture—the CAFOs and processing plants being central components for Tyson. The reality is a far cry from the small-town farms of a half-century ago. The newsletter Nyéléni published after the Forum for Food Sovereignty, in Mali in 2007, summed it up: "This intensive way of producing meat is systematically spoiling the planet, endangering biodiversity, exploiting workers, jeopardizing human and animal health, abusing animals and undermining the survival of rural communities and family farmers"[264]. This is true not only for meat production but other sectors within the food industry. Yet, despite this, intensive meat production is increasing globally and the global food system is becoming more corporate in nature. As with many other commodities, corporations in the Global North are moving their businesses to developing countries where they can produce more cheaply. As developing countries adopt a more "Western" lifestyle, their domestic companies are also setting up their own factory farms. Some based in the Global South have grown

---

[263] Ibid., p. 37.

[264] Nyeleni Newsleter, no 2 (January 2011) <http://www.nyeleni.org/DOWNLOADS/newsletters/Nyeleni_Newsletter_Num_2_EN.pdf>.

into large transnationals (TNCs), with their own aggressive strategies. The global food system has been taken over by these MNCs.

Americans are out of touch with the food they consume. The consumerist mindset, representative of the capitalist framework, is part of the problem. The relation between people and the land that was integral to life—the food that fueled their survival—has vanished. Most Americans do not know where their food comes from, how it is produced (under what conditions, by who, and its repercussions). The cost of it is also abstract. They desire cheap and the monetary cost is the only thing that matters to most (most environmental cost or labor/human rights cost, animal cost, social cost, etc). This paper cannot discuss all these externalities in detail and will focus on those relating to the use of undocumented labor that is often described as "exploitive."

Another point, Nestle summarizes well, "The greater efficiency, specialization, and size of agriculture and food product manufacture have led to one of the greatest unspoken secrets about the American food system: overabundance"[265]. The industry is extremely effective at producing a lot of food but the externalities of doing so are overwhelming and they include producing too much food, which appears counter intuitive considering that millions go hungry around the world, and the strong tradition of family farming in the U.S.[266]. With only 2 percent of the population working as farmers, the U.S. has long been a post-agrarian society. But for many societies around the world, significant proportions of their population work off the land for livelihood. Allowing this system to grow unrestrained, will bring disaster for millions, like it has done in Mexico, for example. The industrial system continues to become further integrated from the seeds to retail, with corporations like Monsanto, Tyson and Walmart. Section 2.2 will look at what this means for the global food system.

---

[265] Nestle, p. 13.

[266] Gottlieb, p. 28.

4.2 The Link to the Global Food System

It is difficult to separate the domestic food system from the global system because they are so integrated today. The domestic reality is very much linked to the global food system that is also in crisis. People are going hungry, not because of shortage of food, but because of poverty that the global economic system produces.[267] Colonialism, imperialism and neo-liberal capitalism have laid the foundation for this, and then the structural adjustments and free trade agreements of the past decades formalized (and somewhat legitimized) these unfair relationships. In this period, as a result, historic food exporters (many developing countries) became importers of food originating from the U.S. and other developed countries[268]. Poverty, malnutrition and hunger all increased as a result of these policies that were intended to help "develop" the Global South. Although the failure of these programs is today acknowledged, the neo-colonial legacy that has made its way into such "free trade" agreement has not.

There remains no mainstream critique of the modern global system. This is to be expected since those countries that put it in place remain in positions of power and have no intention of relinquishing that or leveling the playing field. Migration and the displacement of people are both part of this global economic system that is involved in using that labor in countries like U.S. corporations to further their economic interests. Law is used to make such migration "illegal" so that they may benefit from the labor of the workers who are turned into disposable, cheap commodities by the unjust system. For example, the Smithfield Farm Hog Feeding now located in Vera Cruz, Mexico, was once on the east coast of the U.S. Because it was being forced to spend millions on a treatment plant due to health regulations, after the passage of NAFTA, it opened a sewage treatment plant in Vera Cruz were regulations were not as stringent. But for the people of that area, life became unbearable due to the smell and

---

[267] Raj Patel, *Stuffed and Starved: The Hidden Battle for the World Food System*, Melville House, 2008.

[268] Holt-Gimenez, p. 34.

environmental damage and health consequences that resulted. It is said that it was the origin of the H1N1 virus. Of course, Carrol and Smithfield deny any responsibility and because of the nature of the global food system, it is difficult to trace its origin with certainty[269]. When the workers and community tried to organize and demand better working and living conditions, they are met with strong retaliation. People are being displaced because the home economies are being transformed in a way that allows corporations to transfer the wealth out, often with the help of the indigenous elite[270].

This food system produces economic catastrophes. It is linked to the broader environmental crisis, and specifically the climate crisis, the world is facing. Raj Patel explains, "There is something systemic about the way our food is produced and the way economy works that means we are destined to work for environmental destruction, of exploitation of labor and of course to the diseases that are externalized from the production of our food system"[271]. The current system is unsustainable. The U.S. has created a politics that prevents us from dealing with the real issues. Monsanto is working to create, what Jeffery Sachs calls, a "gene for climate change," but this ignores the reality facing the world today[272].

The problem is that, although the privileged will often be able to adapt to the coming challenges and buy themselves out of problem situations, the majority of the world's population will be unable. Those who will suffer are also those who hold little responsibility for the making of the current situation. As more become aware that "industrial agrifood is... one of the planet's major drivers of global poverty and

---

[269] David Bacon, "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food Systems," UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010.

[270] Bacon, *Illegal People*, p. 69.

[271] Raj Patel, "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food Systems." UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010, 8:48 <http://vimeo.com/17013736>.

[272] Ibid., (10:45 mins).

environmental destruction," people around the world are beginning to take action[273]. There are always segments of a colonized or oppressed people that will fight for freedom and independence. The food movements that are beginning to emerge can be seen through this lens of fighting against oppression. In 2008, when global food prices experienced record highs, food riots resulted. The world's poor spend as much as 70 to 80 percent of their income on food and when, in June 2008, the World Bank reported that "global food prices had risen 83% over the previous three years and the ...FAO cited a 45% increase in their world food price index in just nine months" people began to take to the streets[274]. Chapter III will discuss the evolution in the food movements in the U.S. and globally.

[273] Holt-Gimenez, p. 3.

[274] Holt-Gimenez, p. 6-8.

CHAPTER V

THE FOOD MOVEMENTS

It is evident that the dominant food system is in crisis. It is a major driver of both global poverty and environmental destruction[275]. One sixth of the world is hungry and just as many people are considered obese[276]. Eric Holt-Gimenez and Raj Patel refer to the food crisis as the "less-silent 'tsunami twin'" to the current global financial crisis[277]. Because food is such a core issue, food riots hint to a widespread crisis of any social system. The problems of the food system are not new and neither are the solutions individuals and communities have found to its shortcoming, inefficiencies and structural problems. Food-related activism is growing into a social movement, one that is decentralized and multi-faceted[278]. This activism has developed sometimes together and sometimes in parallel with the workers' unions within the industry, although they remain few. The food movements are broad, decentralized network of groups working to build an alternate food reality. The concern over food access has once again become mainstream concern in the U.S. This can be seen in the return of Farmers' Markets in communities across the country and the redevelopment of local food cultures. It can also be seen in the return of the White House vegetable garden, the first since Eleanor Roosevelt's victory garden on the White House lawn during World War II[279]. It is also evident in the growing number of groups working on issues related to hunger, food insecurity and food justice, and the general questioning

---

[275] Holt-Gimenez, p. 3.

[276] Ibid.

[277] Ibid., p. 4.

[278] Mair, p. 1.

[279] Hesterman, xiv.

of the dominant food system[280]. Individuals and communities across the country are organizing to make healthy, local, fair food accessible to all. Concepts of food sovereignty, food justice and food democracy are changing the way people relate to food. The next section, 2.4.1, will look at the evolution in the food movement in the past half century in the U.S.

5.1 Food Movements: A Recent History

On Thanksgiving Day 1960, the CBS documentary "Harvest of Shame" was broadcast on national television. Broadcast journalist Edward Murrow showed the conditions in which American migrant workers, primarily African American, labored. It exposed how "farmworkers were a core part of a food system whose harvest of plenty masked a harvest of shame"[281]. The 1960s were a time when various forms of social injustice were being exposed and brought to the forefront. It was the time of the Civil Rights Movement. The Black Panthers are today seen as being among the original leaders of the U.S. food justice movement.

Through their anti-racist activism and food distribution programs in poor neighborhoods, they embraced food justice activities long before the phrase was coined. Today, the Oakland-based Black Panther Legacy Tours carries out historical bus tours to the various sites significant to the Black Panther Party, the civil rights movement and U.S. history. An upcoming tour in November 2011, "Panthers to Pitchforks: Food Justice and the Black Panthers Legacy," will make stops at St. Augustine's Episcopal Church where in 1969 the party initiated a free breakfast for children program and at the Second Black Panther Party office at 4419 West St, which

---

[280] Nikki Henderson, "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food System." UC Berkeley. November 12, 2010 <http://vimeo.com/17014990>.

[281] Gottlieb, p. 13.

was the site for their free fresh vegetable distribution[282]. In a 1972 video interview, Bobby Seale the co-founder of the Black Panther Party (BPP) explains how it is the role of politicians to serve the people, not the other way around, and that the BPP was exemplifying this in collecting 6,000 bags of groceries to be distributed at one of their voter registration events[283]. Bobby Seale explains, "People won't be asked by their politicians to endorse them, but the politicians will have to endorse the people's community survival program, such as free food 'cause people got to eat everyday"[284]. The Black Panthers were one of the first to realize that in organizing for social change, food is an essential component. Yet, food is part of a bigger project for social transformation in the fight for dignity of oppressed peoples, African Americans in the case of the BPP. Their concept of food justice inevitably was linked to a much larger vision for social change than simply a food movement to change the food system[285]. The Panthers realized that in order to change the food system a lot of other things had to be changed as well. The BPP 10-Point Platform made public in October 1966, included very simple yet radical demands. They included: freedom, full employment, decent housing, education, an end to police brutality, exemption from military service, release of prisoners, etc. These demands were made for African Americans solely. The Panthers were seen as radicals to the American base of the time. It created a divide even among African Americans. Martin Luther King, Jr. adopted a non-violent stance in addressing the plight of African Americans and thus was in many respects in opposition to the violent demands of the BPP.

The 1960s and the Civil Rights Era was a time when various "fringe" groups questioned the status quo. The Hippies represented another sub-culture of the 60s, but

---

[282] "Panthers to Pitchforks: Food Justice and the Black Panthers Legacy" <http://www.foodsovereigntytours.org/u-s-tours/cfsc2011/panthers/>.

[283] See "Black Panthers distribute free groceries." San Francisco Bay Area Television Archives <https://diva.sfsu.edu/collections/sfbatv/bundles/190199>.

[284] Ibid., (00:43-56 mins).

[285] Patel, op. cit. (10:59-12:01 mins)

instead of directly engaging in the political sphere, their rejections of American culture was nonetheless threatening to the dominant classes. Anti-war centering on the Vietnam War was also a major concern especially after 1963 when Johnson escalated U.S. involvement until 1973 when the conflict came to an end. At this same time, the migrant justice movement was taking shape. In 1962, Cesar Chavez co-founded the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA) with Dolores Hertz. NFWA eventually became the United Farm Workers (UFW) union, today seen as food justice champion. The slogan of the UFW, ¡Sí, se peude! (Spanish for "Yes, it can be done!"), has inspired Latino ethnic identity ever since[286]. This too received attention from the mainstream media of the time. Robert Kennedy even joined Chavez in 1968 when he carried out a 25-day fast in protest of the treatment of grape pickers in California[287]. Yet these various initiatives were often isolated from one another and as time passed, they lost momentum.

On May 28, 1968, another CBS televised documentary, "Hunger in America" was broadcast. While addressing the issue of hunger, it also focused on the shortcomings of the government food program. Because of it, $200 million of additional funds were directed toward food programs and a U.S. Senate inquiry began[288]. This began the slow process to understand the meaning of hunger in the American context. Although there was awareness of a general problem there was no established universal definition or method of measuring hunger or malnutrition[289]. These terms were often used interchangeably. It was not until the economic downturns of the mid-1980s, that "food security" became of national concern and the issue of hunger came to the forefront again. The Task Force on Food Assistance found

---

[286] See United Farm Workers, <http://www.ufw.org/>.

[287] See Bender, Steven. *One Night in America: Robert Kennedy, Cesar Chavez, and the Dream of Dignity*. Paradigm Publishers, January 30, 2008.

[288] CBS, "Timeline," <www.cbs.com/specials/cbs_75/timeline/1960.shtml>.

[289] CNSTAT, "Food Insecurity and Hunger in the US: An Assessment of the Measure," 2006, 156 p. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11578>.

that the terms "poverty," "unemployment" and "hunger" were used interchangeably and it finally established a definition for hunger. In the 1980s, government agencies, such as the USDA, began to add questions pertain to food sufficiency in surveys and consensus studies, for example. It was not until 1990 that a consensus had formed regarding the appropriate conceptual basis for defining and measuring hunger in the U.S. Report: defined food security, food insecurity and hunger, which allowed for further research and for policy makers to take action[290]. To sum up, the study of hunger and food security in the U.S. is fairly recent.

In 1970, NBC broadcast a so-called sequel to "Harvest of Shame". It was titled "Migrant," and looked at farm labor abuse in Florida's citrus groves, especially by contractors of Minute Maid, a Coca-Cola subsidiary[291]. The farmworkers themselves were the firs to realize that their plight was linked to the structure of the food industry—the large, concentrated, industrial-oriented farming operations, that paid below minimum wages and were abusive in various ways. Beyond the contractors who exploited their workers, stood fast food chains, global retailers, and corporations, such as Tyson Foods, that ensured the status-quo. These corporations benefited from the use of cheap labor but were free from responsibility or accountability. In 1993, the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) began to expose the slave-like conditions of farmworkers, often undocumented, that were not much different that those exposed decades prior.

In 1996, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations held a "World Food Summit" in Italy that was attended by 180 countries with the goal of eliminating world hunger. Over two decades prior, in 1974, governments at the World Food Conference, examined the problems within the global food system, and proclaimed that "every man, woman and child has the inalienable right to be free from

---

[290] Ibid.

[291] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 14.

hunger and malnutrition in order to develop their physical and mental faculties." With the goal of eradicating hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition "within a decade," as expressed by that Conference, has not been reached. The World Food Summit in 1996 again made a commitment to reduce by half the number of undernourished by 2015. Doing so has proven more difficult that originally thought. The Five Years Later Report attempted to look at why they had again been unsuccessful and one explanation made reference to the short-comings of the Washington Consensus and other development schemes that had not only proven inefficient but damaging to many developing countries.[292] In 2009, the FAO held a "World Summit on Food Security," again in Rome. After the economic crisis, by 2007 the world was experiencing a food crisis, not because of a food shortage but because of inflation[293].

The food sovereignty approach emerged led by peasants and rural-based movements in developing countries whose small peasant landholdings were in jeopardy. In 1992, representatives from eight different farm organizations met in Managua, Nicaragua to discuss the development of a new peasant and farmer-based global organization. The next year, they met to sign the Managua Declaration, the founding document of the La Via Campesina[294]. Its core concept was food sovereignty. In 1996 they defined food sovereignty as "the right of each nation to maintain and develop its own capacity to produce its basic foods, respecting cultural and productive capacity" as well as the "right of peoples to define their agricultural and food policy"[295]. The United Nations picked up the concept as well as various nonprofit organizations. José Bové of the Confédération Paysanne became a food sovereignty advocate. The concept of food sovereignty is in many ways paralleling

---

[292] FAO, "The World Food Summit 5 Years Later: Mobilizing the Political Will and Resources to Banish World Hunger" <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/004/Y1780e/Y1780e00.HTM>. (See paragraph 2.15)

[293] Holt-Gimenez, p. 9.

[294] Gottlieb, p. 116.

[295] Gottlieb, p. 116.

food justice. They characterize themselves as alternatively global as opposed to anti-global, hence the French word *altermondialism*. At the 2002 "World Food Summit: 5 Year Later," Via Campesina released its declaration, "The Right to Produce and Access to Land: Food Sovereignty: A Future Without Hunger." At the 2007 Nyeleni Forum for Food Sovereignty, the six pillars of food sovereignty where defined. It was declared that, "food is a human right and that right along with the 6 pillars needs to be incorporated into national constitutions[296]. In 2008, Via Campesina held its Fifth International Conference in Maputo, Mozambique[297]. The act of producing food has become a critical battleground for food justice.

Another very different movement originated around the same time: The Slow Food Movement can be traced back to 1986, when Carlo Petrini led a protest against the opening of a McDonald's restaurant in Piazza di Spagna, Rome. It was in protest of all Fast Food represented--"the increasing industrialization of food and standardizing of taste"[298]. Delegates from over 20 countries sign the Slow Food Manifesto, in 1987[299]. According to their website's mission statement, "Slow Food is an international grassroots membership organization promoting good, clean and fair food for all"[300]. The trinity of the movement is good, clean and fair yet many have criticized the lack of action in the "fair" domain. In 2008, Slow Food Nation gathered 60,000 people under the motto of "Come to the Table," yet Eric Schlosser pointed out that the field and food court workers did not have a place at the table; that was "not fair"[301]. Yet, Slow Food argues that they are not about high-class gastronomy and

---

[296] Ibid., 117.

[297] La Via Campesina <http://www.viacampesina.org/en/index.php option=com_content&view=article&id=623:declaration-of-maputo-v-international-conference-of-la-via-campesina&catid=47:declarations&Itemid=70>.

[298] "History of Slow Food" <http://www.slowfoodusa.org/index.php/about_us/details/manifesto/>.

[299] See "Slow Food Manifesto" <http://www.slowfoodludlow.org.uk/docs/manifesto.html>.

[300] See "Slow Food: Our Philosophy" <http://www.slowfood.com/international/2/our-philosophy>.

[301] Eric Schlosser, "Slow Food for Thought," *The Nation*, September 3, 2008 <http://www.thenation.com/article/slow-food-thought>.

would like to be part of an inclusive, food movement. Yet, some, such as Rachel Laudan, have questioned whether the clean and fair criteria are not incompatible. "Is it not the mechanized, industrial food system that allowed us to move past the reality where a few enjoyed wonderful food and the majority labored to produce it?"[302]. The fundamental question that might be answered is: How to have fair food in an unjust society? Over time, Slow Food has developed into a subculture with Cittaslow (Slow Cities), Slow Living, Slow Travel, and Slow Design. This again, brings forth the concept that food is just a piece of the puzzle in creating sustainable, just societies.

The Organic Movement took shape in the early 20th century as the modern, large-scale production of food developed. Organic was often associated with small, family farming. But by the early 2000s, it was clear that this was far from true, and the corporate take-over of organic foods was well underway. By 2005, Horizon Organic, which controlled 55 percent of the organic milk market, was selling $16 million worth of organic milk a month. It is owned by Dean Foods, the nation's largest dairy producer[303]. Major global retailers like Walmart and Cosco now sell organic products. The integrity once associated with the term has lost much of its value although many consumers still trust that organic is higher quality, contains more nutritional value and is produced is better, more sanitary, environmentally-friendly conditions. Many critics argue it has been co-opted by the corporate food industry.

The Local Food Movements is the most recent mainstream manifestation of the food movement. Farmers' Markets have popped up in communities across the country. The marketing of local meat, eggs and produce is increasingly common. Yet, this hints to the inequality within the current food system. Some communities can access healthy, local, organic foods at their Farmers' Markets or health food stores

---

[302] Rachel Laudan, "Slow Food: Is Elitism the Problem?" September 7, 2008 <http://www.rachellaudan.com/2008/09/slow-food-is-elitism-the-problem.html>.

[303] Kim Severson, "An Organic Cash Cow," *New York Times*, November 9, 2005 <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/09/dining/09milk.html>.

while others live in food desserts with few options other than fast food. That fact that so many within the U.S. are food insecure and many live in what is now termed "food desserts," is concerning. The inequality in the food system is one of its defining characteristics. The inequality again stems from system oppression, as with the broken immigration system.

5.2 Today's Food Movements

The Local Food Movement continues to grow and evolve. Every year, more and more communities across the country are holding Farmers' Markets and with that local economies are also growing. Local food systems shine as an example of alternatives to the global corporate models where producers and consumers are separated through a chain of manufacturers/processors, shippers and retailers. As the food industry grows, the middle man is increasingly able to control the quality of food. Conversely, the local food system redevelops these relationships and encourages a return of quality control to the consumer and the producer respectively. Yet in defining quality in such narrow terms (in line with the term fair/just), it ignores an important facet of the issue: the treatment of farmworkers—especially undocumented ones. The movement has been inclusive in terms of relating local food politics to the environmental/sustainability movement, nutrition/health awareness, local economic revival but has ignored the treatment and well-being of those producing the country's food, when it cannot be done on this idealistic, local-scale. At present, it is not feeding the country. So ignoring the corporate food system is the equivalent of living in a gated community, hiding in a bubble, blocking out the problems of the world.

The concept of the "Locavore" has developed out of this movement. It first appeared in a *San Francisco Chronicle* article in 2005. It came to be used by many to

mean eating only local foods, with "local" being defined by distance only[304]. These individuals popularized things such as the 100-Mile Diet--eating only food grown within 100 miles of their home. Although, often the link between the local food and the particular cultures are lost in the process. Gottlieb and Joshi explain that it has been, "promoted by some as a universal concept, shorn of any social and cultural context"[305]. The movement though has received an "elitist" connotation because such a diet demands a certain amount of resources, unless one has a personal or community garden and even then, that takes significant personal time. It does not often provide a broader perspective on the food system, for example; hence, the term "lazy locavore"[306].

Furthermore, "the absence of any well-articulated social, cultural, environmental, or food justice context for local preference has created a type of 'greenwashing'...by...global food players"[307]. PepsiCo, Walmart, McDonald's have all jumped on the bandwagon taking advantage of a new group of potential consumers. Walmart announced plans in 2008 to spend $400 million during that year on locally grown produce[308]. As with the organic food movement, many have reason to be concerned about co-optation. But many are choosing alternative methods of obtaining food products. As alternatives are being created, co-optation is more difficult. One alternative is Community Supported Agriculture (CSA), in which individuals by a share of a farmer's harvest, paid for at the beginning of the growing season, every week they receive a share of what has been picked. This supports small-farmers who are providing the consumer with fresh, local produce. There is no official count of the

---

[304] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 182.

[305] Ibid., p. 183.

[306] Gottlieb, p. 183.

[307] Gottlieb, p. 184.

[308] Marian Burros, "Supermarket Chains Narrow their Sights," *New York Times*, August 6, 2008 <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/06/dining/06local.html>.

number of CSAs across the country but LocalHarvest, has over 4,000 listed in their grassroots database[309].

There remains a great deal of "myth" associated with the concepts of: food miles, organic crops, and meat eating, from a perspective of global sustainability, explains McWilliams[310]. Increasingly within the movement, people and groups are beginning to reflect on basic questions such as: do real greens eat meat? Do they eat local? Do they eat organic? For each question there are various perspectives: the environmental perspective, various social perspectives, human rights perspectives, economic perspective, political perspective and so on. For example, The British Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs did a study in which it found that "local tomatoes grown outside of the usual outdoor season were responsible for three times the CO_2 caused by growing tomatoes in Spain and trucking them in Britain"[311]. Local does not necessarily means more sustainable, for example. This specific concern is why food advocates often encourage consumers to buy foods that are both local and seasonal. When local food is not possible, fair trade is a better option[312]. The Del Cabo Coop is a prime example. There is no mechanism within the U.S. to protect local specialties. In the E.U., for example, there are 746 regions protected as areas of origin (The French call it "appellation d'origine controlée, AOC). This is a way, not only to support local economies and small farmers but the development of a local food culture. Food advocate, José Bové of the Confédération Paysanne, uses the term "malbouffe" (junk food) to describe food that not only has no taste and nutritional

---

[309] See LocalHarvest <http://www.localharvest.org/csa/>.

[310] See James E. McWilliams, "Just Food: Where Locavores Get It Wrong and How We Can Truly Eat Responsibly." New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009.

[311] Mason, p. 146.

[312] Mason, p. 147-9

component but also lacks cultural and geographic identity[313]. He and many of the food movements protest the standardization of food.

The food movement has grown over the years from responding to concerns over food security to challenging notions of democracy, social justice and critiquing the corporate food system. The food justice movement is the most powerful and deep critique of the dominant food system. It is also the most inclusive with the potential to include a broad critique of internal colonization in the U.S. It has the potential to highlight many major concerns that too often go ignored. Part III will discuss the power within this movement.

---

[313] Gottlieb, p. 60.

PART III

FOOD JUSTICE FOR MIGRANT JUSTICE

CHAPTER VI

FOOD JUSTICE

6.1 The Significance of the Food Movements

Due to the limited ability of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations in regulating the global food system, especially in terms of regulating its workings in the interests of the people, many individuals and communities are taking things into their own hands. Communities are organizing around food that supports their interests. Mair explains, "Social movement theory places the food activism movement within the context of civil society in response to the growing gap between state activity and the power of economic actors"[314]. These food movements are examples of "globalization from below" movements, seeking to control and reform corporate globalization[315]. They are "trans-local" and "trans-national" and exemplify the inter-connected workings of modern social movements[316]. Latin American social movements at the turn of the 21st century worked to challenge neo-liberal governments that ruled most of the region during the 1990s, pushing for systemic changes. They did so by building "powerful social movements comprised of the most marginalized sectors of society that challenged global capitalism and racism

---

[314] Mair, 1 (See Hassanein, N. "Practicing Food Democracy: A Pragmatic Politics of Transformation." Journal of Rural Studies, 2003, 19, pp. 77-86.)

[315] Ibid.

[316] Ibid.

in Bolivia, Ecuador, and elsewhere"[317]. There is a lot to learn from this history—the history of many immigrants in the U.S.

There is also a lot to learn from how these marginalized groups build power. In the book, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, James C. Scott addresses what appears to be a contradiction at first sight. Some have also written with a focus on the power that "illegals" possess because of their extreme vulnerability and marginality from society. It is often only when life becomes very difficult that people feel forced to take action. It can be argued that these individuals have nothing left to loose from taking action. Often it is in desperation that individuals and groups find the courage to find radical solutions to problems. HR 4437 (Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005) was a major factor in motivating immigrants to unite and protest.

Mair writes, "While growing, cultivating, and preparing food has always been an essential cultural and social component of human welfare, food-related activism is gaining momentum as health and environmental impacts resulting from systems of food production and consumption are exposed"[318]. This is a way to counter the mounting implications of fast food and the corporatization of the food industry, but also to express and empower and identity-building. Globally, people around the world are working to build "people power" exemplified in their food systems, not corporate power. The two concepts have come to represent almost two ends of the ideological spectrum for many. The food movements in this respect are movements of empowerment, with the goal of empowering individuals and community, in order for them to regain some sense of self-determination and autonomy over a basic but essential component of their life—food. One of the basic tenants of the movement is that food is a human right. The right to food is central to all. Just as many people,

---

[317] Alfonso Gonzales, "Beyond the Consensus: Oppositional Migrante Politics in the Obama Era," NACLA Report of the Americas, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 18-9.

[318] Mair, p. 1.

especially peasants and small farmers, in developing countries argue, without social and economic rights, civil and political rights are irrelevant. These new movements are also working on being more inclusive. This also marks a paradigm shift in food advocacy from food charity to food justice[319]. This expects government intervention as opposed to simply private agencies and feeding programs[320]. Communities are finding new frameworks through which to demand their rights—rights that in fact already enshrined in international human rights law. Most importantly, many are choosing to work on "Undoing Racism in the Food System," which Lila Cabbil of the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network, explains includes shifting from "doing for" (project/charity work) to "doing with" (movement work)[321]. Unlikely allies are finding that food has the potential to act as a unifier. Food movement work holds within the goal of transformation, not only of the food system, but society in general. For communities, such as the city of Detroit that many would characterize as "dying," the growing social activism that is taking place around the country, especially with regards to food work, is breathing new life.

Gyorgy Scrinis outlines two forms of political activity that act as alternative to the dominant food system: oppositional and constructive. Oppositional forms of politics directly oppose and challenge the existing institutions, structures and practices in order to reform or transform the dominant system[322]. These include the anti-McDonald's, anti-WTO, anti-GMO and other movements. Although they tend to be focused on a single issue, they often also present a broader critique of the dominant food system and put forward alternatives to it. Constructive forms of political activity work to directly create and support alternative practices, structures and institutions

---

[319] Gottlieb, p. 95.

[320] Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 91.

[321] Lila Cabbil, "Food Movements Unite!" UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://vimeo.com/16464046>.

[322] Scrinis, op. cit., p. 122.

either in opposition or parallel to the system[323]. This can be seen in the fair trade movements, the rise of CSAs, food co-ops, vegetarianism and so on. Oppositional and constructive forms tend to overlap or interconnect and often groups are involved in both. Oppositional forms also tend to create space for constructive forms of political activity to develop. Today's food movements engage in this two-front approach.

The food movements are also linking themselves with various other social and economic justice movements. They do not see themselves as isolated and neither do the participants view their issue as isolated from other issues. Just as, "Community food advocates critique the modern food system as a force destructive of local, sustainable and smaller-scale farming, local economies and ecological, public and animal health"[324], they also see it as part of a larger process of destruction, taking place today: the rise of unregulated corporate power, the loss of democratic practice, rising global inequality, etc. In challenging the racist policies and practice which have been central to the development of the industrial food system, the same challenges are being made against the global system in general. Challenges to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the acknowledgement that the Millennium Goals to curb global poverty will not be reached by their deadline of 2015 are just a few. Inequality continues to increase, both within societies and globally. The politics of food involves global issues of labor, justice, subsistence and inequalities[325].

6.2 The Food Justice Movement

Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi, the authors of *Food justice*, explain that food justice "seeks to ensure that the benefits and risks of where, what, and how food

---

[323] Ibid., p. 123.

[324] Slocum, p. 328.

[325] Flannery, p. 423.

is grown, produced, transported, distributed, accessed and eaten are shared fairly"[326]. It looks to transform of the current food system. This includes eliminating disparities and inequities within it. The framework is inclusive in that it allows food advocates to work on several different issue areas, but share the common goal of challenging the injustices that exist throughout the dominant industrial and increasingly globalized food system. In striving to eliminate the various injustices within the food system, this movement is linked to and supports allied movements, such as those related to the environment, land use, health, immigration, worker rights, economic and community development, and cultural integrity[327]. It is very much linked to the broader social justice movement.

In today's context, food choice has become a form of political action. Yet, the food justice movement maintains that this is not enough. Much has been written about the limitations of lifestyle choices in creating change. This has been the critique, for example, of dumpster diving--the practice of sifting through "trash" to find items that have been discarded by their owners, but which may be useful. Some have said that it is not such a revolutionary way to live outside the system but "amount[s] to nothing more than a parasitic way of life which depends on capitalism without providing any real challenge"[328]. The food justice movement is not only a powerful critique of the dominant food system, but it also works to create room for alternative food system models.

The local food movement tends to be a movement of farmer's markets, community gardens, skill shares, local food processing, home cooking, and health food stores. Of course, these things take resources--time, money, and energy. Darker

---

[326] Gottlieb, p. 11.

[327] Ibid., p. 12.

[328] "Rethinking Crimethinc," p. 1.

issues of food discrimination, food insecurity, and the various forms of apartheid within the food system must also be adressed. Communities must find ways to deal with food insecurity needs. Nonetheless, the local food movement has succeeded in presenting a glimpse of an alternative, but it is vital to continue pushing for reform within the current system so as to be inclusive, and not become an elitist movement. Broad base support is necessary, which needs broadening the issues addressed. The goals of the movement will not be attained if it does not take into account the realities facing most Americans. Political change in this domain will be gradual (a food revolution does not seem foreseeable). The American public is beginning to demand more from their food. This can be seen in the popular rise of organic products, especially in the last decade. Yet, this has been face value only. The conditions of farmworkers and others involved in the food industry have remained, for the most part, in the dark and ignored by mainstream food movements. This has been facilitated by the status of many of the industry's workers—undocumented immigrants. The reality is that most Americans are not willing to do the work that these individuals do for little pay, under extreme conditions, like the United Farm Workers' (UFW) Take Our Jobs Campaign. America's food industry needs these individuals and until the local food systems found in affluent neighborhoods are replicated across the country and are made accessible to all, the public needs to address the treatment of those to fuel the food system that so many depend on. The next section (1.2.1) will look at the possibility of food that is more in line with American values (of equality, justice and pursuit of happiness), and the values of the food justice movement.

6.2.1 A Friendlier Chicken? A Fairer Tomato?

The time when the leading producers of industrial chicken, notably Tyson Foods, were able to ignore "organic" and "free-range" has long passed. Their profit

from the sale of such products in actually quite significant. More and more consumers are demanding it, and there is significant profit to be made from its marketing and sale. This trend reflects a growing consumer concern about the healthfulness of the food they consume. But the definition of "health" remains quite narrow and does not venture far beyond what the bird is fed and its nutritional content. Steven Striffler argues that the public concern should not end there but the health of the surrounding environment, the workers and the farm must be taken in consideration. This should not be done simply with the motive of "fairness" but he points out, the farmers and food workers are "the people who are most likely to watch out for consumer interests"[329]. After the reoccuring cooptation of various food movements, it has become evident that concept of: "Know your farmer!" gives power back to the consumer who is charged with the responsibility of knowing under what conditions their food is produced.

Even for food advocates who seek local and organic foods and are willing to pay higher prices, ensuring justice at all levels does not appear to be as important to them, as groups such as CIW or UFW would like. Many food advocacy groups across the U.S. are adopting the concept of justice and/or fairness in their organizing, yet some question whether they intend to live up to their principles. At Slow Food Nation, in 2008, the concept of "good food" still presented the treatment of farmworkers as a marginal issue, low on the list of important things to address with regards to food. Yet as Eric Schlosser, author of *Fast Food Nation*, questioned: "Does it matter whether an heirloom tomato is local and organic if it was harvested with slave labor?" This question is at the core of the food justice movement. The concept of food justice cannot be taken lightly. The likelihood of Tyson Foods coming out with a "friendlier" chicken (one 'produced' in line with the principle of food justice') is nearly zero. In fact, two are completely contradictory concepts. But from the food justice movement,

---

[329] Striffler, op. cit., p. 156.

there is the possibility for more and more people in the U.S. to have access to "friendlier" chickens, produced not by Tyson but local, small farmers. When local and seasonal is not possible, there is room for the development of a vast network of domestic fair trade products. Beyond organic labeling, the development of a system of domestic fair trade including labeling is in the workings[330]. Beyond this, the international fair trade can also be further developed in line with the concept of *terroir*, supporting farmers who wish to cultivate products unique to their locality[331]. The concern, again, is with cooptation from the global food players who have significant profit to loose from such a transformation in the system.

Furthermore, because it is unlikely that most Americans will return to the farm, although there has been a slight increase in the number of farmers in recent years, it is important to empower farmers and agriculture workers. In the past few years, the number of small farmers in the U.S. has increased, according to Census[332]. Although Striffler writes, "It is difficult to be optimistic about an industry in which power is so concentrated, government involvement is so one-sided, and abuses so routine and outrageous"[333]. There is hope in change. Despite the disillusionment regarding the dominant food system, things have begun to change.

Yet, making room for a "friendlier" chicken, will not transform the system. The Coalition of Immakollee Workers discovered something significant in 2005—a way to hold the global food players accountable. In 2001, CIW led the first-ever farm worker boycott of a major fast-food company—Taco Bell. After years of boycotting Taco Bell, it agreed to fund a penny per pound "pass-through" with its suppliers of Florida tomatoes and undertake joint efforts with the CIW to improve working

---

[330] See Domestic Fair Trade Association, <http://www.thedfta.org/>.

[331] Gottlieb, p. 191.

[332] Steve King, "The Growth of Small Farms." *US News*, February 25, 2009.

[333] Striffler, p. 167.

conditions in Florida's tomato fields. "The agreement between world's largest fast-food corporation [Taco Bell] and a coalition of about 2,500 largely uneducated, mostly Latino farm workers..." was a major victory and step forward in the transformation of the food system[334]. This again exemplifies how those who many would perceive as having little or no voice can help create great changes in society.

Today, farm workers, growers and retail food corporations are "cooperating" to produce a fairer tomato. In November 2010, the CIW and the Florida Tomato Growers Exchange (FTGE) reached an agreement extending the CIW's Fair Food principles (including a strict code of conduct, a cooperative complaint resolution system, a participatory health and safety program, and a worker-to-worker education process) to over 90 percent of the Florida tomato industry[335]. The role of the Student/Farmworker Alliance (SFA), a national network of students and youth organizing with farmworkers to eliminate "modern-day slavery," was found to be essential to the organizing of the CIW. CIW' alliances with SFA and other groups formed a powerful front that could not be ignored, demanding better working conditions. It was done in a two-step process: First, for the 2010-2011 season participating FTGE members have agreed to pass through the penny-per-pound from participating purchasers and cooperate with a financial audit of the penny-per-pound funds. Second, they would also adopt the Fair Food Code of Conduct, to be fully implemented by the beginning of the 2011-2012 season. A working group would be charged with developing and evaluating the protocols and systems necessary to implement the Code of Conduct[336]. Yet, this still represents only a small proportion of the industry. Furthermore, the corporations are not taking these actions because of "food justice" but because they are being forced to. Despite the position CIW has put

---

[334] Mason, p. 169.

[335] CIW, "Historic Breakthrough in Florida's Tomato Fields," November 16, 2010 <http://www.ciw-online.org/FTGE_CIW_joint_release.html>.

[336] Ibid.

them in they are nonetheless able to spin the situation in positive light, making it appear to consumers that they are cooperating in the spirit of food justice. This is far from the reality. Although, this is only a small step forward, it does set an example for future action. It also demonstrates that a small group of the most vulnerable individuals from society can nonetheless build power and take action.

The success of the CIW is an example of food democracy in the workings. Food democracy is a framework for making food systems more responsive to the needs of its citizens and decentralizing control. Tim Lang developed the concept in mid-1990s as a response to the increasing corporate control and lack of consumer participation in the food system[337]. "Food citizens" have the power to determine food policies and practices locally, regionally, nationally and globally. It challenges the corporate structure and allows for bottom-up control of the food system. The goal of food democracy is food justice. It goes beyond the "vote with your fork" ideology which does not provide a democratic way to change the food system. With this ideology, the more money you have (and spend on food), the more votes you have. In other words, those with little income are not heard. Food democracy is one person-one vote. It decentralizes power to the masses and removes it from corporate control. The main challenge is moving citizens from being "passive" to "active" actors[338]. Individuals—citizens, not simply consumers—need to become engaged in their food system again. There is a pressing need to democratize our food system. The CIW exemplifies this, yet many involved in the food system still do not believe they have a voice. This is the role of food organizing. In order to build food democracy, the development of local government concern for the issue is vital, including the development of local food councils. Gottlieb and Joshi ask an important question, "If

---

[337] Alexander Fisher, "What is Food Democracy?" *Food First*, April 7, 2010 <http://www.foodfirst.org/en/node/2868>.

[338] Fisher, p. 1.

food is a basic human need, on a par with water, housing, and health services, why don't local governments have a department of food?"[339]. The Toronto Food Policy Council is one of the best (and rare) examples of such an initiative in North America[340]. There is also the Los Angeles Food Security and Hunger Partnership (LAFSHP) and the New Orleans Food Policy Advisory Committee that are examples of food policy council that are successful in the U.S.[341]

There is much to be done with the food movements in order develop a strategy for the transformation that needs to take place. Yet, little strategic reflection on just how the movements plan on getting where the current system is to where these fringe movements become the norm. There is no clear political vision for such as transformation[342]. This is the focus on the upcoming book *Food Movements Unite!* It is the sequel to *Food Rebellions: Crisis and the Hunger for Justice* by Eric Holt-Giménez, Raj Patel and Annie Shattuck. Although the food justice movement "...is much more coordinated than previously thought," writes Mair[343], there is still much work to be done to insure that the movement is able to move the "issue silos" into a coherent and powerful movement[344].

An important first step for the movement is to examine and work to understand how the dynamics of oppression and colonialism operate within it. These permeate all of society and it is naive and oppressive to assume that they are not present in the well-intention food justice movement. Section 1.3 will address this.

---

[339] Gottlieb, *Food Justice*, p. 201.

[340] See Toronto Food Policy Council <http://www.toronto.ca/health/tfpc_index.htm>.

[341] Gottlieb, p. 153, 204-5.

[342] *Food Movements Unite!* (To be published in Fall/Winter 2011)

[343] Mair, p. 1.

[344] Gottlieb, p. 233.

6.3 Injustice within the Movement: Need for an Anti-Oppression Framework

In order for a food movement that purports to uphold "justice" it is essential the oppression is not hidden within it and ignored. Slocum writes, "Community food work promises to build a more just food system, but it fails to act on the complicity of white middle class privilege with institutionalized racism extant in the food system and the community food alliance"[345]. Yet, the food justice paradigm has not yet made room for examining its own workings and auto-critiquing possible injustice in it. The article "Food as Power" by Ezekiel Flannery and Diana Mincyte looks to examine the power dimension of food and eating that revolve around power hierarchies. Only recently has academic writing begun addressing the inequalities inherent in organization around food issues. The food justice movement must work to, "Explore and expose how food systems play an integral part in the reproduction of inequalities" of class, race and ethnicity, gender, age and other[346]. Often it is among those who experience this oppression within the food movement itself that the most thought-out critique exists.

Malik Yakini, chair of the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network spoke of the work being done on food security, mostly in African American and Latino communities. He explained that often the work being done is by young, white people, often women[347]. There is a serious imbalance of power in the world (white people control the world) and this same reality replays itself within the food movement. In 2006, forty people from various parts of food movement came together to create this Network, reflecting the actual composition of the people in that community. The primary goal was to empower the African American population. Detroit has a long

---

[345] Slocum, p. 343.

[346] Flannery, p. 430.

[347] Malik Yakini, "Food Movements Unite!" UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://vimeo.com/16075527>. (1:05-1:30 mins) 85-90% of the population of Detroit is Black, yet most of the major players in the food movement are white.

history of struggle for black empowerment and this new movement looked to link black power to "green" power. Power, is the ability to define reality and have people accept it, according to African American sociologist Wayne Knobles[348]. Malik Yakini, asked a very important question that has not been given enough attention within the movement: With a population that is 85-90 percent African American (in Detroit), why are most of major players in the food movement white?

Lila Cabbil, spoke on "Undoing Racism in the Food System" (Detroit), discussing the difference between "doing for" (project/charity work) and "doing with" (movement work)[349]. She reiterated the fact that institutionalized racism is an economic system (skin color is one of its codes) and it determines who are the workers and who has the wealth[350]. Amongst the panelists at the 2010 "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food Systems" conference, it was the people of color who had the most poignant critique of the dominant food system and the broader American socio-political system, still based in domination.

So why has there been no sustained coalition between African Americans and Latinos? They share many things in common: have low socio-economic status, high hates of incarceration and drug abuse, high incidents of police brutality and in terms of inequality within the food system, they experience some of the highest rate of food insecurity. Nonetheless, there have been obstacles to the development of a social and political coalition[351]. There are a few explanations for this: competition for scarce resources has created animosity between the groups; anti-immigration discount has

---

[348] Ibid. (5:04-5:53 mins)

[349] Lila Cabbil, "Food Movements Unite!" UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://vimeo.com/16464046>.

[350] Ibid.

[351] Claudia Sandoval, "Citizenship and the Barriers to Black and Latino Coalition in Chicago," *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 36-9. See: Karen Kaufmann, "Cracks in Rainbow: Group Commonality as a Basis for Latino and African-American Political Coalitions."

also played a role. African Americans have been separated from Latinos and have been grouped with whites as "lawful, hardworking citizens" using the citizenship divide. In the resulting hierarchy, Latinos are at the bottom, labeled as criminal aliens, African Americans are placed above them as *de jure* citizens but yet certain *de facto* rights, and Whites remain on top[352]. By making the Black-White alliance, African Americans have instead been used again by the dominant class to make the right-wing anti-immigration discourse appear non-racist.

Interestingly enough, the work many Latinos find themselves in today, is work African Americans traditionally did. When slavery was officially abolished, many African Americans worked as sharecroppers in conditions that were not much better than the pre-emancipation period. In the past few decades, Latinos have gradually taken over, replacing the poor white and African Americans who worked their previously. Today, three million people currently employed in agriculture in the U.S. One third of them are undocumented, mostly Hispanic and from Mexico. This is what Raul Delgado Wise refers to as the "Mexicanization of U.S. agriculture"[353]. In this respect, African Americans and today's Latinos share a similar history. Yet, the unwillingness of African Americans in general to recognize the experience of racial groups other than U.S. born Blacks has been a barrier to coalition building explains Sandoval[354]. The Mississippi Immigrant Rights Alliance (MIRA) is one example of a successful alliance between Blacks, immigrants, and unions building power together.

Beyond the composition of the movement, the issues it values must also be questioned. The poor status of farm workers is given little attention compared to that given to food quality, food safety, accessibility and affordability[355]. Not only is it not a visible part of the consumer experience, but these issues tend to affect different

---

[352] Sandoval, p. 37.

[353] Gottlieb, p. 20.

[354] Sandoval, p. 39.

[355] Gottlieb, p. 22.

classes of the U.S. population. Some argue that advocacy starts in the "upper classes"—those with more discretionary income, and those who do not necessarily participate in social change for altruistic reasons. This can be seen in the local food movement, where Gourmet magazine buyers use food to distinguish themselves from others within their own "class." Yet, this advocacy and activism must be pulled down into the lower-income, "lower class" ranks. If a social movement stays among the upper classes with roses, rainbows, and images of what agriculture "used to be," it will prove to be a failure, ignoring the diversity within it (in terms of gender, class, race, ethnicity, and nationality). Others also point out that it is often those who have nothing to lose who are willing to risk challenging the system that oppresses them. It is in its diversity and especially its marginalized constituents that it can find power and legitimacy.

A major critique of the movement is that food organizations have not connected the dots among white privilege, institutionalized racism, their community food work and the larger food system[356]. Slocum writes, "Community food, a predominantly liberal, white, middle class social change effort, is part of the larger story of whiteness..."[357]. Groups must address these concerns and the reality of the persistent whiteness of the movement. Organizers must ask themselves, how does white privilege, a form of racism, play out in community food efforts? Slocum explains, "Practicing anti-racism requires an analysis that recognizes intersecting forms of power, privilege cognizance and specific ways of working in alliance"[358]. Anti-racist practice notes how race, class and gender relations operate and intersect within the food system. In doing so, one might focus on land ownership, farm worker, food processor and food server exploitation, and/or the politics of hunger, for example.

---

[356] Slocum, p. 330.

[357] Ibid., p. 331.

[358] Ibid.

The Delmarva Poultry Justice Alliance, became the National Poultry Justice Alliance in 2004[359]. Carole Morison, the Executive Director of DPJA discussed how their group discussed issues of race and gender...[360]. She explains, "Even though some progress has been made, the white left has still not come to appreciate racism's power and the growing complexity of U.S. race and class identities"[361]. The movement has only recently addressed the issue of food deserts in economically oppressed and/or of color neighborhood (Food Trust). Often "...the white face of the movement is perceived as a diversity problem rather than as a relational process embedded in society that constitutes community food"[362].

A critique from the migrant justice movement has also put the assumption of fairness and justice into question. Some scholars have already adopted an anti-oppression lens to critique the community food movement as a white, upper-class, male movement.[363] A similar critique has been made of the "green" movement, using the term "greenwashing" to describe what green PR or green marketing firms do to deceptively promote the perception that a company's policies or products are environmentally friendly. The food justice movement argues that the local foods movement similarly paints a pretty picture to appeal to wealthy consumers but lacks deep meaning.

This dissertation will take this critique further and argue that, not only what the movement supports is oppressive, but also what it has chosen to ignore—the role of undocumented workers in the food industry. As with all new social movements, a

---

[359] See "Organizing for Justice: Delmarva Poultry Justice Alliance" <http://www.ocw.jhsph.edu/courses/.../PDFs/Lecture_7.pdf>.

[360] Slocum, p. 339-340.

[361] Ibid., p. 341.

[362] Ibid., p. 331.

[363] Janani Balasubramanian, "Sustainable Food and Privilege: Why is Green Always White (and male and upper-class)" <http://www.racialicious.com/2010/05/20/sustainable-food-and-privilege-why-is-green-always-white-and-male-and-upper-class/>.

continual re-examination of the motives and methods of organizing is essential to ensure they remain true to their values and goals. Reforms to U.S. food production can support more just and equitable immigration policies and practices; specifically, how the food justice movement could support the migrant justice movement and, in turn, make for a "deep" and sustainable local foods movement.

CHAPTER VII

PUSHING FORWARD: LINKING THE MIGRANT JUSTICE AND FOOD JUSTICE MOVEMENTS

While official statistics estimating that 25 percent of farm workers are undocumented, others argue the figures are in fact as high as 60 or even 70 percent. Rob Williams, director of the Migrant Farmworker Justice Project, estimates that 85 percent of farm workers are immigrants, the vast majority being undocumented[364]. These individuals work for some of the biggest corporations that dominate not only the U.S., but the global food system. Because of the legal status of these workers, they often are forced to work in conditions most Americans would compare to a Third World sweatshop operation, or modern-day slavery. This is a characteristic of the dominant food system where the profit motive trumps all else.

While the movement for immigrant justice has not had much success in the current anti-immigration climate of the U.S., the food justice movement brings forth hope for change. The food justice movement, in rejecting this corporate model of organizing the food system, has been forced to address the treatment of undocumented workers in the industry. As undocumented individuals represent a growing segment of the population, they will also represent a significant population of food producers, consumers and activists. This leaves room for a power coalition between the two movements. The food justice movement has become part of the broader sustainability

---

[364] UFW. "UFW's national 'Take Our Jobs' campaign invites U.S. citizens to replace immigrant farm workers." June 24, 2010 <http://ufw.org/_board.php?mode=view&b_code=news_press&b_no=7195&page=1&field=&key=&n=661>.

movement with the goal "to build more locally based, self-reliant food economies—one in which sustainable food production, processing, distribution, and consumption is integrated to enhance the economic, environmental and social health of a particular place." While the economic and environmental aspects of "heath" have been addressed in detail, the social aspect must continue to be developed.

The linkage should be seen as a radically different way of addressing the undocumented situation in the U.S. The food justice movement has within it a critique of the dynamics of oppression, engrained in the U.S., that are essential to understanding the immigration situation today. The power behind the food justice movement, that continues to grow, may be able to put a positive spin on a movement that has been losing hope, especially in the midst of the current economic recession. The power of food may be one of the only things able to push for government action and limit corporate abuses.

The first issue to address is that of migration: the right to migration and the right of migrants. Individuals should be able to enjoy the right to not migrate. This goes hand in hand with the right to economic development in order to guarantee basic needs for people at home. In order for this, the method of development, countries of the Global North impose on developing countries must be questioned. The interest of the people must trump that of corporate interests. If people must leave home because their needs are not being met, they should be able to enjoy their rights as migrants. These include basic human rights and labor rights, as well as a legal status in their new country. Industry must not be allowed to take advantage of the broken immigration policy for a supply of cheap labor. When individuals are marginalized because they lack legal status, they are more likely to experience other forms of insecurity as well. This issue is very much linked to that of food sovereignty, due to the fact that, without legal status and basic rights, it is difficult to have food security. The concept of food

security takes this all into account[365]. Congress must enact comprehensive immigration reforms that provide a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants. AgJOBS would create a path to legalization for many farmworkers. It is a first step. In working to ensure all humans are food secure, the issue of legal status would have to be addressed.

Governments must be held accountable. Personal action is not enough. Mason, for example, lays out five ethical principles that people should share in the food they eat: First, transparency: We have a right to know how our food is produced; Second, fairness: Producing food should not impose costs on others; Third, humanity: Inflicting significant suffering on animals for minor reasons is wrong; Fourth, social responsibility: Workers should have decent wages and working conditions; and fifth, needs: Preserving life and health justifies more than other desires[366]. These reflect the principles of justice and democracy. Yet, they remain simply personal acts. Communities and American society as a whole must come to enshrine these values. Personal changes alone will not end the suffering of those the dominant food system exploits. More must be done.

Bauer argues, "The only way to bring a measure of fairness to the system—to truly improve the living and working conditions for immigrant[s]—is to enact wholesale reforms at the federal level"[367]. These include a path to citizenship for the undocumented workers who are feeding the country. They also must include stronger worker protections—for all workers, whether they labor in the field or in the factory, and whether they have legal status or not.[368] With regards to worker protection, there are certain policies in place that must be upheld. In the U.S., all are equal before the law, whether undocumented or not. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protects

---

[365] Holt-Gimenez, op. cit., p. 48.

[366] Mason, op. cit., p. 270.

[367] Bauer, op. cit., p. 50.

[368] Ibid.

all individuals in the U.S. from discrimination, regardless of whether they are legal or undocumented. This is the same with union rights (the right to organize). For example, in 1984, The U.S. Supreme Court held that "an employer violated the National Labor Relations Act by firing undocumented workers because of pro-union activities, even though immigration laws made them ineligible to work in this country"[369]. Immigration status is irrelevant in the case of these basic rights. But rights on paper are very different from the ability of individuals to exercise them. The small numbers of cases brought forward by undocumented workers hints that there is problem in this respect. "It wasn't until more than 40 years after the Civil rights Act of 1964 was enacted that a farmworker woman had her case heard before a federal jury... [this] case is the only one to reach a federal jury"[370]. The food justice movement must address this.

Congress must pass legislation to empower these workers so that they may exercise a legal remedy to address exploitative labor practices. This includes ending special exemptions from labor rules for agricultural employers, because this is a domain where a high proportion of undocumented end up. For example, many farmworkers are excluded from federal minimum wage laws and other labor protections. There is no justification for it, and it is clearly a legacy of discrimination and racism, and a product of political power wielded by growers. The food justice movement needs to advocate for these changes, but also inform farm and other workers of their rights and work to ensure they are upheld. The Department of Homeland Security must do a better job helping to protect crime victims, including issuing guidance so that law enforcement agencies may not engage in enforcement actions against immigrant crime victims when they come forward to report crimes. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration must do a better job keeping workers

---

[369] Ibid., p. 48.

[370] Ibid., p. 46.

safe on the job[371]. The U.S. Department of Labor must do a better job ensuring workers are paid their lawful wages. For example, implementing initiatives to investigate wage theft against low-wage immigrant workers, a complaint often made by undocumented workers. States, too, play a critical role in protecting vulnerable workers[372]. There are so many actions that can be taken to ensure justice for undocumented food industry workers is upheld. Yet, they must be linked to the activities of the food justice movement and not simply remain in the domain of migrant justice movement.

The rights exist; it is just a matter of ensuring they are upheld, which of course is the difficult part. This is especially true when fighting against part governmental and corporate powers. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families recognize that economic and social rights must accompany civil and political liberties for full protection of human rights[373]. Yet, while some community food organizations are linking the two movements, little academic writing has attempted to examine the possible linkages between the two.

Alongside of addressing the abuse within the system, the food justice movement leaves room to move beyond the hostility and negative associations regarding immigrants and "shine a light on their contributions to the U.S. economy and culture?"[374]. One way is to see how immigrants provide for a healthier and more diverse food system. "Immigrants and food are joined in the fields and at the plate,"

---

[371] Bauer, p. 50-65.

[372] Ibid.

[373] Human Rights Watch, op. cit., p. 17.

[374] Gottlieb, p. 190.

Gottlieb and Joshi write.[375] Immigrants are farmworkers, but they also represent many of the new food growers in the U.S. Many of the new farmers in the U.S. are Hispanic and Asian immigrants. Often they draw on their rich relationship to the land that they brought from their home countries. These represent a few of the continuing changes and diversity of the U.S. food system, and personal food experience. This should be seen as positive considering many around the world perceive American society as having lost its food/agriculture culture.[376]

---

[375] Gottlieb, 192.

[376] Gottlieb, 190-3.

CONCLUSION

Undocumented individuals are involved, not only in U.S. food production, but also in pushing forward the food justice movement. Gottlieb and Joshi write, "For those who are concerned about food, immigration reform and immigrant rights should be part of the discussion. Immigrants should have the right to grow food and contribute to our food culture, increasing the capacity of a vibrant local food economy and a love of food that we can all celebrate"[377]. The food justice movement has the potential to make room at the table for these individuals; to give them a voice, a vote. Those concerned by the migrant justice movement should also be concerned with the food justice movement as it is one of the most powerful attempts at systemic change that exists today in American society. The migrant justice movement has been unsuccessful in obtaining immigration reform, or fighting for the rights of undocumented individuals. This movement is in need of taking on the issue from a different perspective. This is why a linking the two movements is so important - not only to help revive the migrant justice movement, but also to ensure that the food justice movement is "deep," authentic and inclusive.

It is clear that not much has changed in the past half century since Edward R. Murrow exposed the slave-like treatment of migrant workers in the televised documentary "Harvest of Shame." What has changed is that a high proportion of farm workers are now undocumented immigrants. These individuals also hold many jobs in food processing and food service. It is clear that they now represent the backbone of the dominant food system. "As Murrow said, they have the strength to harvest our fruits and vegetables but no power to influence the laws and regulations that can

---

[377] Robert Gottlieb, "Immigrants and Food: Another Way to Shape the National Discussion, MercuryNews.com, February 25, 2011, p. 1.

improve their lives. That part is up to us—the beneficiaries of their labor[378]. It is important for the food justice movement to take this one, but also for it to leave room for these individuals to organize themselves. It is important to acknowledge that they have a voice and rights as well. Individuals are not separate from one another, and neither are the issues that concern them. In moving forward, it is important to ask, How can people come together to make the structural changes needed today?

This dissertation was intended to present an overview of the present and possible future linkages between the food justice movement and the migrant justice movement. It attempted to shine light on the intersection between the Mexican undocumented/immigrant community and the food system--dominant food system and food movements within it. The food justice movement is one of the most recent and powerful evolutions in the long tradition of food movements in the U.S. It has become evident that, "...the key to improving an industry or a community is to embrace rather than further marginalize the people who occupy the bottom of the hierarchy"[379]. The present norm is not that of undocumented workers demanding rights, such is the unique case of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers in Florida[380]. Nonetheless, there is a slow transformation underway.

The U.S. needs to look to its past for inspiration in dealing with the issues of present. "Instead of thinking from a place of possibility and abundance, which is where our great creative thoughts come from, we think from a place of scarcity and fear"[381]. The U.S. has a rich history of community organizing. The food justice movement is a great example of this, bringing out many of the strengths of the American people and

---

[378] Bauer, op. cit., p. 62.

[379] Sen, 212.

[380] See CIW <http://www.ciw-online.org/>.

[381] Pramila Jayapal, "Rising Hate For Migrants WorldWide Starts With Criminalizing Them," Colorlines, December 15, 2010 <http://colorlines.com/archives/2010/12/rising_hate_for_migrants_worldwide_starts_with_criminalizing_them.html> (video, 7:40 mins).

American society. "By embracing our collective blackness, perhaps we can find the fortitude and creativity necessary to face the continuing erosion of our national social safety net in the face of a persistent economic crisis."[382] It is time to organize around food justice and migrant justice. New social movements often find that by organizing, they can build capacity, political clarity, and unity. This is currently underway. Leaders within the movement must hold it accountable and demand that the strong link between the two movements be reinforced. This will make for a stronger food movement and promote migrant justice in this domain, which could flow over into other areas supporting immigration reform in the U.S.

[382] Melissa Harris-Perry, "We are All Black Americans Now," *The Nation*, April 18, 2011 <http://www.thenation.com/article/159597/are-we-all-black-americans-now>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AbuKhalil, As'ad. "Politics of Food." Boulder, CO: Alternative Radio, 2006.

Alden, Edward. *The Closing of the American Border: Terrorism, Immigration and Security Since 9/11.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2008, 346 p.

Allegro, Linda. "Latino Migrations to the U.S. Heartland: "Illegality," State Controls, and Implications for Transborder Labor Rights." *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 37, no 1 (January 2010), p. 172-184.

Almaguer, Tomas. "Toward the Study of Chicano Colonialism." *Aztlan*, Vol. 2. (1971), p. 7-21.

Anderson, Bridget. "Migration, Immigration Controls and the Fashioning of Precarious Workers." *Work, Employment & Society*, vol. 24, no 2 (June 2010), p. 300-317.

Bacon, David. "Food Movements Unite! Challenging the Local-Global Transformation of your Food System." Conference, UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://www.foodmovementsunite.org /FMU-video.html/>.

Bacon, David. *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes Immigrants*. New York: Beacon Press, 2008, 272 p.

Barbour, Scott. *Does Illegal Immigration Harm Society?* In Controversy, Referencepoint Press: 2009, 109 p.

Basok, Tanya. "Counter-Hegemonic Human Rights Discourses and Migrant Rights Activism in the US and Canada." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 50, no 2 (April 2009), p. 183-205.

Bauer, Mary and Mónica Ramírez. "Injustice on Our Plates: Immigrant Women in the U.S. Food Industry." Southern Poverty Law Center, November 2010 <http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/publication/Injustice_on_Our_Plates.pdf>.

Beltrán, Cristina. "Going Public: Hannah Arendt, Immigrant Action, and the Space of Appearance." *Political Theory,* vol. 37, no 5 (October 2009), p. 595-622.

Bhimji, Fazila. "Contesting/Negotiating Power and Domination on the US-Mexico Border: Mexican and Central American Migrants in El Paso." *Cultural Dynamics,* vol. 21, no 2 (July 2009), p. 107-132.

Bibler Coutin, Susan. "Contesting Criminality: Illegal Immigration and the Spatialization of Legality." *Theoretical Criminology,* vol. 9, no 1 (February 2005), p. 5-33.

Bishop, Anne. *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression*, Fernwood Books Ltd., 1997.

Buchanan, Patrick. *State of Emergency. The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2006, 320 p.

Buttel, Frederick, et al. *Hungry for Profit: The Agribusiness Threat to Farmers, Food, and the Environment.* Monthly Review Press, September 2000, 220 p.

Campo-Flores, Arian. "Why Americans Think (Wrongly) That Illegal Immigrants Hurt the Economy," *Newsweek*, May14, 2010 <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/05/14/why-americans-think-wrongly-that-illegal-immigrants-hurt-the-economy.html>.

Castles, Stephen and Alastair Davidson. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging.* New York: Routledge, 2000, 336 p.

Chacon, Justin Akers and Mike Davis. *No One Is Illegal: Fighting Racism and State Violence on the U.S.-Mexico Border.* Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2006, 240 p.

Chavez, Leo R. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*, Stanford University Press, 2008.

Chomsky, Aviva, *"They Take Our Jobs!": and 20 Other Myths about Immigration.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2007, 264 p.

D'Vera Cohn and Jeffrey Passel, "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends," Pew Hispanic Center, February 2011, 32 p. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/ reports/133.pdf>.

De Genova, Nicholas. "'American' Abjection: "Chicanos," Gangs, and Mexican/Migrant." *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, vol. 33, no 2 (Fall 2008), p. 144-173.

De Genova, Nicholas. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthology*, vol. 31 (2002), p. 419-447.

De Genova, Nicholas. "Migration and Race in Europe: The Trans-Atlantic Metastases of a Post-Colonial Cancer." *European Journal of Social Theory*, August 2010, p. 405-419.

Dizikes, Peter. "Understanding Anti-Immigrant Sentiment." MIT News Office, February 19, 2010 <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2010/anti-immigrant-sentiment-0219.html>.

Ellermann, Antje. "Undocumented Migrants and Resistance in the Liberal State." *Politics & Society*, vol. 38, no 3 (September 2010), p. 408-429.

Fernandez-Kelly, Patricia and Douglas S. Massey. "Borders for Whom? The Role of NAFTA in Mexico-U.S. Migration. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2007, p. 98-118.

Fisher, Alexander. "What is Food Democracy?" *Food First*, April 7, 2010 <http://www.foodfirst.org /en/node/2868>.

Flannery, Ezekiel, and Diana Mincyte. "Food as Power." *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, vol. 10, no 6, p. 423-427.

Flores, William V. "New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship." *Latin American Perspectives,* vol. 30, no 2 (March 2003), p. 295-308.

Food Justice Project. *Our Food, Our Right: Recipes for Food Justice*. Community Alliance for Global Justice, November 2009, 71 p.

Food and Water Watch. Factory Farm Nation: How America Turned its Livestock Farms into Factories, November 2010 <http://documents. foodandwaterwatch.org/FactoryFarmNation-web.pdf>.

Food and Water Watch. "Casino of Hunger: How Wall Street Speculators Fueled the Global Food Crisis. November 2009, p. 1-14 <http://documents.foodand waterwatch.org/Casino.pdf>.

Food and Water Watch. "Taking on Corporate Power in the Food Supply." Factsheet, March 2010, p. 1-4 <http://documents.foodandwaterwatch.org/Antitrust-CorporatePower.pdf>.

Food and Water Watch. "Why Antitrust Laws Matter for Agriculture and Food." March 2010 <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/factsheet/why-antitrust-laws-matter-for-agriculture-and-food/>.

Gaventa, John and Marjorie Mayo. "Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education." IDS Working Papers, no. 327 (2009), 43 p.

Germain, Felix. "'Presidents of Color,' Globalization and Social Inequality." *Journal of Black Studies*. Vol. 40, no 3 (January 2010), p. 445-461.

Gonzales, Alfonso. "Beyond the Consensus: Oppositional *Migrante* Politics in the Obama Era." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 15-19.

Gonzales, Alfonso. "Introduction: Power, Justice, and Survival: Latino Politics Today." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 13-4.

Gottlieb, Robert, and Anupama Joshi. *Food Justice.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2010, 290 p.

Hanson, Gordon. "Why Does Immigration Divide America? Public Finance and Political Opposition to Open Borders." University of California, San Diego and National Bureau of Economic Research, March 2005 <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/022/8793.pdf>.

Harris-Lacewell, Melissa. Keynote Address. Facing Race 2010 Conference <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=49ocDVphfRA> .

Hassanein, N. "Practicing Food Democracy: A pragmatic politics of transformation." *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 19 (2003), p. 77-86.

Haugen, David, Susan Musser and Kacy Lovelace. *Should the U.S. Close its Borders*? At Issue. Greenhaven Press, 2010, 160 p.

Hesterman, Oran. *Fair Food: Growing a Healthy, Sustainable Food System for All*, New York: PublicAffairs, May 2011, 320 p.

Hickman, Laura J. and Marika J. Suttorp. "The Recidivism Patterns of Previously Deported Aliens Released From a Local Jail: Are They High-Risk Offenders?" *Crime & Delinquency,* vol. 56, no 4 (October 2010), p. 507-534.

Holt-Gimenez, Eric, and Raj Patel with Annie Stattuck. *Food Rebellions! Crisis and the Hunger for Justice.* Oakland: Food First Books, 2009, 260 p.

Human Rights Watch. "Blood, Sweat, and Fear: Workers' Rights in U.S. Meat and Poultry Plants." January 24, 2005 <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/usa0105.pdf>.

Huntington, Samuel P. "Reconsidering Immigration: Is Mexico a Special Case? *Center for Immigration Studies*, November 2000, 5 p.

Huntington, Samuel P. *Who We Are? The Challenges to America's National Identity.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004, p. 1-428.

King, Richard C. *Postcolonial America.* University of Illinois Press, 2000, 376 p.

Krikorian, Mark. *The New Case Against Immigration*: *Both Legal and Illegal.* Sentinel, 2008, 294 p.

Mair, Heather. "A Mouthful of Change: Eating and Acting for Food Democracy." Presented at 11th Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, May 17-20, 2005, p. 5.

Maloney, Field. "Is Whole Foods Wholesome? The dark secrets of the organic-food movement." March 17, 2006 <http://www.slate.com/id/2138176/>.

Mangan, Arty. "Farmworkers, Immigration and NAFTA." *Bioneers* <http://www.bioneers.org/campaigns/food-farming-1/articlesinterviews/farmworkers-immigration-and-nafta>.

Martin, Andrew. "If It's Fresh and Local, Is It Always Greener?" *New York Times*, December 9, 2007<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/09/business/yourmoney/09feed.html?_r=1>.

Mason, Jim and Peter Singer. *The Way We Eat: Why Our Food Choices Matter.* New York: Rodale Books, May 2006, 288 p.

Massey, Douglas S. and Fernando Riosmena. "Undocumented Migration from Latin America in an Era of Rising U.S. Enforcement." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July 2010; vol. 630, 1: p. 294-321.

Mcclintock, Anne, Aamir Mufti with Ella Shohat. *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Studies in Classical Philology. University of Minnesota Press, 1997, 560 p.

Miller, Debra. *Illegal Immigration*. Current Controversies. Greenhaven Press: 2007, p. 1-222.

Moses, Jonathon W. "The American Century? Migration and the Voluntary Social Contract." *Politics & Society,* vol. 37, no 3 (September 2009), p. 454-476.

Nestle, Marion. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Newton, Lina. *Illegal, Alien, Immigrant: The Politics of Immigration Reform*. New York: NYU Press, 2008, 240 p.

Nevins, Joseph. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge, 2002, 286 p.

Norris, Jim. "The On-Again, Off-Again Mexican Border," in *On Second Thought*, publication of North Dakota Humanities Council, Summer 2009, p. 2-6 <www.ndhumanities.org/PDF/ Journey.pdf>.

Orner, Peter. *Underground America: Narratives of Undocumented Lives*. Voice of Witness: 2008, 379 p.

Patel, Raj. "Food Movements Unite! Challenges for the Local-Global Transformation of your Food Systems," Conference at UC Berkeley, November 12, 2010 <http://www.foodmovementsunite.org/FMU-video.html>.

Perl, Lila. *Immigration: This land is whose land? Controversy!* New York: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2010, 127 p.

Prabhu, Anjali. "Introduction: Hybridity in Contemporary Postcolonial Theory." *Hybridity Limits, Transformations, Prospects*. State University of New York Press, Albany: 2007 <http://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/61414.pdf>.

Quintero-Rivera, Angel G. "Cultural Struggles for Hegemony: Salsa, Migration and Globalization." *Latin American Perspectives*, 2001, p. 58-70.

Raquel Gutiérrez, Marisol. "The Power of Transnational Organizing: Indigenous Migrant Politics in Oaxacalifornia." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec2010, p. 32-35.

"Rethinking Crimethinc: Your politics are bourgeois as fuck" <www.zabalaza.net/pdfs/leafs/ leaflet_rethinking_crimethinc.pdf >.

Rivera, Geraldo. *His Panic: Why Americans Fear Hispanics in the U.S.* Celebra, 2008, 272 p.

Rocco, Raymond. "The Structuring of Latino Politics: Neoliberalism and Incorporation." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 40-43.

San Juan, Epifanio. *Beyond Postcolonial Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Sanderson, Matthew, and Rebecca Utz. "The Globalization of Economic Production and International Migration: An empirical analysis of undocumented Mexican migration ot the United States." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 50, no 2 (2009), p. 137-154.

Sandoval, Claudia. "Citizenship and the Barriers to Black and Latino Coalitions in Chicago." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 36-9.

Scrinis, Gyorgy. "From Techno-Corporate Food to Alternative Agri-Food Movements." *Local Global*, vol. 4 (2007), p. 112-140.

Sen, Rinku with Fekkak Mamdouh. *The Accidental American: Immigration and Citizenship in the Age of Globalization*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2008, 248 p.

Seuffert, Nan. *Jurisprudence of National Identity: Kaleidoscopes of Imperialism and Globalisation from Aotearoa New Zealand*. Ashgate Publishing, 2006, 172 p.

Sharrad, Paul. "Enacting Postcolonial Theory." *Postcolonial Text* [Online], vol. 1, no 2, (November 2005) <http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/viewArticle/472/847>.

Slocum, Rachel. "Anti-racist practice and the work of community food organizations." *Antipode*, vol. 38, no 2 (2006), p. 327-349 <http://www.rslocum.com//Slocum _Antipode_2006.pdf>.

Slocum, Rachel. "Race in the study of food." *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 35, no 3 (2010), p. 303-327 <http://www.rslocum.com/Slocum_final_ PiHG_racefood.pdf>.

Slocum, Rachel. "Whiteness, space and alternative food practice." *Geoforum* (2006), p. 14 <http://www.rslocum.com//Slocum_whiteness%20space%20and%20 alternative%20food%20practice.pdf>.

Starr, Amory. "Local Food: A Social Movement?" *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, vol. 10, no 6 (June 2010).

Stavig, Ward. "Latin American Globalization: Human Reality and the First and Second 'Global' Eras." *Journal of Developing Societies*, vol. 21, no 3-4 (2005), p. 233-251.

Tichenor, Daniel J. *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

USDA. "Poultry and Egg Production." 2007 Census of Agriculture <http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online_Highlights/Fact_Sheets/poultry_and_eggs.pdf>.

Via Campesina Views. "Small scale sustainable farmers are cooling down the earth." Jakarta, 2009, 24 p. <viacampesina.net/downloads/PAPER5/EN/paper5-EN.pdf>.

Walls, David S. "Internal Colony or Internal Periphery? A Critique of Current Models and An Alternative Formulation." *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978.

Williams, Chris. "Capitalism and the Environment." Alternative Radio: Boulder, CO, 2010.

Williamson, John. "A Short History of the Washington Consensus." Paper commissioned by Fundacion CIDOB for a conference "From the Washington Census towards a New Global Governance," Barcelona, September 24-25, 2004 <www.iie.com/publications/papers/williamson0904-2.pdf>.

Wekerle, Gerda R. "Food Justice Movements: Policy, Planning, and Networks." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, vol. 23, no 4 (2004), p. 378-386.

Zepeda-Millan, Chris. "*Migrante* Mobilization in *El Nuevo South*." *NACLA Report of the Americas*, Nov/Dec 2010, p. 20-24.