I Introduction

There was a time, and not so very long ago, when research in the geography of agriculture had little to say about food other than as a raw commodity. By the same token, geographers of food were largely taken up with retail geography as a sub-specialism within economic geography. In other words, both were about economic activity, but in separate compartments. Both focused on issues of production as against consumption. The emergence of an agro-food geography that seeks to examine issues along the food chain or within systems of food provision derives, in part, from the strengthening of political economy approaches in the 1980s. By directing attention away from the narrow confines of the farm business, hitherto examined largely through the lenses of either neoclassical economics or behaviourism, towards relations with ‘capital’ an important reorientation and reconnection was started. However, the process has been taken much further in recent years with the (re-)discovery of consumption, linked so strongly to the postmodern or poststructuralist trends in social science. Conceptualizing consumption is, in turn, linked to the discovery of ‘culture’ in economic geography, and this has had some positive impacts on agro-food studies (Goodman and DuPuis, 2002). However, Martin and Sunley (2001) have recently raised concern that ‘what these cultural economic geographers criticise as the myopic economism of “old” economic geography could simply be replaced by an exclusionary cultural essentialism in the “new”’ (p. 152). To date, cultural essentialism has not taken hold in agro-food studies where the legacy of political economy is strong (e.g., Marsden et al., 1993). Consequently, economic realities and power remain important in many discussions of food consumption, as in Marsden et al. (2000). Nonetheless, a negative impact of the new cultural geography of consumption is perhaps apparent in how very few recent studies highlight the basic socio-economic and political issues of income inequalities which underpin and result from differential access to the process and
places of consumption (but see Atkins and Bowler, 2001). A similar point may be made with regard to actor-network theory (ANT) which, as Marsden (2000) has pointed out, is methodologically strong but substantively weak in that global asymmetries of power and value may be ignored within ANT.

However, the turns to both the food chain and to consumption are not only consequences of conceptual shifts and fashion. They also reflect political and policy realities arising out of the shift from a homogeneous agricultural commodity market to a more segmented market. Crucial to this shift of attention towards both food system and consumption issues is the need for reconnection or, indeed, new connections. The main purpose of this paper, the first of three trend reports on the agro-food sector, is to sketch out the bare bones of four sets of reconnections: farming and food, food and politics, food and nature, and farmers and agency.

II Reconnecting farming and food

The conceptual reconnection of farming and food owes much to empirical reality and, in particular, to the harsh political and market circumstances confronted by farmers in recent years. Farmers, once the suppliers of a relatively homogeneous commodity market, underpinned by complex systems of state support for markets, now face uncertain and more segmented markets. Following a period of nearly 60 years, during which agricultural producers were enjoined to produce raw commodities at volume with relatively little attention to the finer detail of market requirements, farmers are now urged to reconnect with the market. The UK Government’s *Strategy for sustainable farming and food*, published in December 2002, urges farmers to develop an understanding of the changing market and to ‘take action to make the best use of the market opportunities identified’.

There are two main drivers of this reconnection: trade policy and the alternative food economy. Trade policy provides a strong, some would argue irreversible, drive towards globalized markets and the demise of trade-distorting agricultural protection measures. Driven by both reform of the European Common Agricultural Policy and the inclusion of agriculture high on the agenda of the World Trade Organization since its formation in 1995, farmers in Europe face a continuing reduction in the level of direct support payments and other hidden support measures. However, much of the research conducted hitherto on CAP and WTO reform processes and impacts has not focused directly on the issue of reconnecting farmers to their markets. Rather in Europe there has been a particular focus on the impacts of agricultural policy reform on countryside and environmental management (Donald *et al*., 2002; Brouwer and Lowe, 2000; Potter and Goodwin, 1998; Winter, 2000; Winter *et al*., 1998). At the level of the WTO itself, most commentators have been content to seek to unravel its complexities (Swinbank, 1999) or situate discussion of the WTO within a much broader globalization discourse (Hertz, 2001), although there has been some attempt to consider some of the specific policy issues WTO poses for European agricultural and rural policy and its implementation (Potter and Burney, 2001).

The direct impacts of CAP/WTO liberalization measures on mainstream commodity markets have not attracted a great deal of attention from geographers, beyond a straightforward charting of commodity market trends (but see Walford, 2002). In some
ways this is surprising, for earlier geographical inquiry did much to demonstrate the spatial implications of policy intervention within mainstream agriculture (Bowler, 1979a; 1979b; 1985) and it is clear that liberalization will impact on spatial patterns of production reflected in farmers’ position in the food chain. Banks and Marsden (1997) provide a helpful exception to this neglect in their analysis of the regulation of the UK milk sector. It is probably fair to say that most rural geographers have tended to see farmers as hapless victims of globalization and, consequently, see reconnection as synonymous with the stark realization of market weakness. However, there have been some responses by farmers and other stakeholders through strategies of cooperation, joint venturing or vertical integration as a means of coping with lower prices, but these have been neglected in the literature hitherto (but see Davies, 1999; Hornibrook and Fearne, 2002).

By contrast, the second driver of reconnection has received considerable attention in the literature to the attempts by both farmers and consumers to challenge the global agro-food complex through establishing alternative systems of food provision. Two issues have provoked particular interest by researchers in this area: the notion of quality and the conception of embeddedness. The ‘turn to quality’ in the food market has been constructed around consumer concerns over human health and food safety, the environmental consequences of globalized and industrialized agriculture, farm animal welfare and fair trade. Such concerns are seen as the prime motivating factors in a move away from the homogenized products of the global agro-food industry in the western world, with quality seen as inherent in more ‘local’ and more ‘natural’ foods (Murdoch et al., 2000). A significant body of work is being built up around notions of quality in the food systems with much emphasis on regional and/or local branding (Gilg and Battershill, 1998; Ilbery and Kneafsey, 1998; 1999; 2000; Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000; Murdoch and Miele, 1999; Parrot et al., 2002), the organic sector (Ilbery et al., 1999; Morgan and Murdoch, 2000; Rigby et al., 2001) and quality assurance (Morris, 2000; Morris and Young, 2000). Conceptualization of these food-sector changes has shifted from a framework of postproductivism, which emerged from agrarian political economy and continues to excite some debate (Evans et al., 2002; Wilson, 2001) to that of embeddedness (Murdoch et al., 2000; Hinrichs, 2000; Winter, 2003a). However, the concept of embeddedness has been subject to a rigorous critique by Krippner (2001) in economic sociology. Within economic geography, embeddedness is cited as an example of vague theory ill defined or theorized yet ‘firmly established as part of economic geography’s conceptual vocabulary, despite the criticism and debates surrounding the notion within economic sociology itself’ (Martin and Sunley, 2001: 153).

The foot-and-mouth epidemic in Great Britain brought into even sharper focus the issue of reconnecting farming and food and, more broadly, the connection between farming and the wider rural economy. This is reflected in a number of studies published in the subsequent period. Lowe et al. (2001), Phillipson et al. (2002) and Bennett et al. (2002) have examined in some detail the consequences of foot and mouth for the rural economy in the northeast, with a particular emphasis on the vertical and horizontal linkages across different sectors of the economy. Ilbery (2002) examines the geographical aspects of the spread of the disease. Some of the policy and political consequences have been examined by Donaldson et al. (2002), Poortinga et al. (2003) and Winter (2003b). The epidemic also helped to direct academic attention to particular parts of the food chain, perhaps not routinely inspected in any great detail by geographers. For
example, Broadway (2002) analyses the British slaughtering industry, emphasizing the decline in the number of slaughterhouses and the emergence of a small number of highly specialized companies to dominate the sector. Wright et al. (2002) consider the issue of the viability of livestock markets.

III Reconnecting food and politics

Following an address to an audience of farmers in 2002, in which I set out some of the policy issues facing the agricultural industry, a Dartmoor hill farmer summarized my talk succinctly as an account of the shift from ‘the politics of scarcity to the politics of prosperity’. It was a political shift he had lived through during a 40-year farming career and it was one he did not expect his business to survive. The period between these two points is also of significance for, between the rationing and food shortages of the 1950s and the surpluses of the 1980s and 1990s, there was an era in which food was not a public issue, at least in the affluent west. To label the 1960s and 1970s a time of food depoliticization is somewhat misleading, for hidden away behind the complexities of agricultural support policies were the politics of corporatism. In addition, food-safety regulation was inexorably creating a new micropolitics of bureaucratic administration. Nonetheless, as Buttell (1998) argues, the invisibility of late twentieth-century commodity chains, together with the advantages they brought to the consumer, served to legitimate (make ‘natural’ or commonplace) the systems in the eyes of most consumers. For the modern food consumer, the processes of supply were ‘out of sight, out of mind’.

The repoliticization of food, in terms of an open and conflictual politics, went hand in hand with the gathering critique of the Common Agricultural Policy and the impact of farming on the countryside in the 1980s. Thus, alongside the many criticisms of the CAP from either an economic or an environmental perspective was a smaller number of critiques built around a food agenda (e.g., Clutterbuck and Lang, 1982). It was not a massive step to move from attacking agricultural policy to an assault on systems of food retailing (Raven et al., 1995). The emergence of countervailing processes, of resistance to the agro-food distantiation highlighted by Buttell (1998), has been manifested in the rise of ‘ethical consumption’, the desire to ‘make visible’ and achieve a more complete knowledge of production realities enabling consumers to ‘eat with a clear conscience’. Ethical consumers may seek to buy fairly traded food products directly and through boycotting food from particular multinational companies. They may seek to consume only locally produced or organic food or animal welfare-friendly meat. They may become involved in ‘community supported agriculture’. The politics of ethical consumerism does not go unchallenged. Within the retail marketplace, there are attempts to resist, subvert and/or subsume these new concerns as seen, for example, in the activities of national governments and major retailers in the organic sector (Allen and Kovach, 2000; Goodman and Haynes, 2000).

How these trends and countertexts translate into the mechanisms and structures of food governance has been illuminated by Marsden et al. (2000) who show ‘through the haze of food scares, the emergence of alternative food networks, and the public anxieties surrounding GMOs, that there is a significant shift in those agencies and actors who wish to have a say and stake in the new food politics and governance
systems’ (Marsden, 2000: 27). Notwithstanding the rise of ethical consumerism, consumer groups remain marginalized within an increasingly privately regulated system dominated by retailers (Marsden et al., 2000; see also Poole et al., 2002). For agro-food researchers, one of the implications of this is that the terrain in which they research is changing, with a shift from the traditional territory of farms and agriculture departments to a broader set of actors, including a wide range of government departments (health, trade, economic development, etc.) and agencies including those involved in regional regeneration.

IV Reconnecting food and nature

Arguably, one of the liveliest debates in agro-food research in recent years has revolved around the need for a more adequate conceptualization of ‘nature’, which emerged as a major project in the social sciences as scholars began to engage with the implications of environmentalism. For some the historic neglect of nature in Marxism (Benton, 1996; Fitzsimmons, 1989; Smith, 1990; Redclift and Benton, 1994) provided the main point of departure, while others sought to develop a more eclectic sociology of nature-society relations (Macnaughten and Urry, 1998). Recently proponents of ANT have sought to provide a methodology which rejects the fetishized categories of ‘nature’ and ‘society’ and analyses, instead, the seamless fabric of interwoven worlds (Goodman, 2001). Goodman (1999) attacks ‘modernist’ agro-food studies for ignoring ‘nature’ as an active agent in developing social explanations. Marsden (2000) suggests that Goodman’s critique is too far-reaching and ignores important attempts within agricultural political economy to incorporate natural processes (citing inter alia Buttel, 1998; Marsden, 1997; Murdoch and Marsden, 1995; Ward et al., 1998).

In particular, Marsden (2000) questions the acceptability of some symmetry and hybridity arguments about nature-society relations, not because agro-food researchers are ‘necessarily socially reductionist in a modernist/ontological sense, but because they recognize that the intricate balances between the actor-status of natural and social objects are highly variable, and that the power to socially define the natural lies with humans, and particularly their organizational and social practices rather than nature itself’. (Marsden, 2000: 23, original emphasis). Marsden appeals for detailed empirical work at the micro level that will assist in the abandonment of aggregated conceptions of ‘nature’ and ‘society’, emphasizing instead the construction of variable hybrid categories. The recent text by Whatmore (2002) offers a number of conceptual and empirical lines of inquiry that should be picked up by agro-food scholars anxious to grapple with the debate opened up by Marsden and Goodman.

V Reconnecting farmers and agency

It would be an exaggeration to say that the agency of farmers was totally ignored during the political economy of the 1980s and early 1990s. However, in recent years it is clear that a combination of circumstances has re-invigorated the tradition of studying farmers, not only as recipients of policy and market signals but as actors within policy and market networks, as members too of rural communities, and as occupants of roles
within households. One stimulus to this revival has been the emergence of policies, particularly in the agri-environment sector, which differentiate between farmers. The specific circumstances and responses of farmers become crucial to the uptake of policy, and this has undoubtedly stimulated the greatest volume of work focusing on farmers as social actors as academics have sought to understand patterns of response to agri-environment schemes (Morris and Potter, 1995; Wilson, 1997a; 1997b; Wilson and Hart, 2000; 2001).

Another stimulus, at present somewhat underdeveloped, has come through sustainability discourses. The emphasis these place on social outcomes of human-nature interactions, as well as economic and environmental outcomes, are beginning to prompt some researchers to revisit the social characteristics of agriculture in terms of the knowledge requirements of sustainable agriculture (Morris and Winter, 1999; Roling and Wagemakers, 1998; Tsouvalis et al., 2000). Rather fewer attempts have been made to define social objectives of policies to promote sustainability in farming, although some basic thinking is provided by Bowler (2002), who suggests that the social dimension of sustainable development in agriculture should include ‘the retention of an optimum level of farm population, the maintenance of an acceptable quality of farm life, the equitable distribution of material benefits from economic growth, and the building of “capacity” in the farm community to participate in the development process, including the use of knowledge to create new choices and options over time’ (p. 205).

Beyond these two broad, arguably policy-led, themes has been an important strand of work that can be loosely characterized as ‘cultural’. Work by Gray (1996; 1998; 2000) has provided an important corrective to those inclined to conceptualize farmers’ behaviour and actions from large-scale empirical surveys (still the preferred method in much of agricultural geography). By contrast, Gray investigated 15 farm households in Teviothead for more than a decade and his findings provide a rich ethnography with insights sometimes at odds with the orthodoxies of other approaches. Ethnographic work on three farmers’ identities and moralities has been undertaken by Holloway (2002). The cultural reconnection of farmers and agency need not necessarily rest on work with farmers themselves. Morris and Evans (2001) consider the representation of gender identities in farming through an examination of the pages of the Farmers Weekly, a leading agricultural news magazine. Their case studies reveal how hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity are perpetuated through the farming media but in increasingly subtle and fragmented ways.

VI Conclusions

This brief review has covered a wide ground in very general terms. It has demonstrated that a great deal of research effort is now taking place within the geography of agro-food systems in each of the four sets of reconnections covered (farming and food, food and politics, food and nature, and farmers and agency). The first two of these will be examined in more detail in a year’s time and the final two a year later. The geographical focus of this paper has been largely European, and more particularly British. Examples from elsewhere will be given in the subsequent papers.
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