

Can “enchantment” save the world?
(Is alternative consumption a social movement?)

Amory Starr
PO Box 1198
Venice CA 90294

starr@trabal.org

Abstract: This paper uses social movements literature to analyze 19 alternative consumption projects.

Biographical statement: Amory Starr is author of *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization* and *Global Revolt: A Guide to Alterglobalization* (2000 and 2005, Zed Books). Her articles appear in *Agriculture and Human Values*, *Journal of Social Movement Studies*, *Journal of World Systems Research*, *New Political Science*, *Social Justice*, *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *Socialist Register*, *Qualitative Sociology*, and *Journal of Developing Societies*. She holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from University of California, Santa Barbara and is currently on leave.

Introduction

“We’re pretty starved, as a country, for beauty and meaning in our lives, but we finally have an opening.” (Alice Waters in Hagberg 2008)

Sociology of consumption confronts theoretical cleavages in social science. Marxist positions view consumption as superstructural, reifying (Lukács 1923), desublimating (Marcuse 1965), seductive (Bauman 1992), or as a "class practice" which serves to reproduce class relations (Veblen 1899; Bourdieu 1984; Holt 1998; McCracken 1990). American exchange theories and symbolic interactionism attend to the use of consumption to convey a broader range of social meanings, and to construct the self. (Blau 1964; Blumer 1972) Postmodern theories consider events like consumption as new sites of power (Foucault's governmentality 1988), loss (Baudrillard's simulation 1972), and subjectivity (Beck's reflexivity 1992). Cultural studies constructs an anthropology of meaningful, agentic, and complex "material culture". (Slater & Miller 2007) Meanwhile, as we are becoming interdisciplinary, critical scholars from agronomy and business bring new theoretical perspectives to examine this same object. Scholars differ in their assessments of whether indeed postmodern society has become a different kind of society *defined by* consumption (rather than production) and, if so, what that might mean. (Baudrillard 1972; Campbell 1995; Holt 2002)¹

One of the major emerging questions is what kind of "opening" is it? (See Shah et al. 2007) Can alternative consumption –consumption for which ethical aspects of production and exchange are purportedly taken into account– contribute to significant social change?

Enthusiasts have emphasized the possibilities of alternative consumption to effect Polanyian "reembedding" (1944), to strengthen an already-existing "moral economy" (Morgan, Marsden & Murdoch 2006), or build "civic agriculture" (Lyson 2000), and enable politically marginalized people to express politics (Stolle & Micheletti 2003). Colin Campbell argues that “want-based consumerism extends rather than decreases the role that ethics play in the conduct of consumers”. Pressured to give voice to “quasi-divine” selves who are simultaneously intensely desirous, moral, and responsible for the effects of their actions, consumers must use their imagination to express their morals fully in their consumption acts. (2006, pp.223-4) Juliet Schor argues pragmatically that "given the increasing difficulty of organizing people as workers, the limited successes of the movement to organize shareholders, and declining engagement of citizens...and because consumption is such a dominant site of meaning, identity, passion, and activity...giving up on the consumer sphere is foolhardy." (2007) Holzer (2006) argues that the possibilities for new niche markets are “signaled” by political consumption far more agentially than other consumer information, thus

transforming the passive consumer of “limited choice” to an active communicator of “political objectives”. Michele Micheletti (Micheletti 2003) argues that political consumption “politicizes what we have traditionally conceived as private consumer choice and erases the division between the political and economic spheres”. And she very usefully articulates an analytic system for assessing its effectiveness. As a political scientist, she is helping to expand the boundaries of the discipline by including a broader range of political action. Political consumption, she writes, “challenges our traditional thinking about politics as centered in the political system of the nation-state and what we mean by political participation”. She also directs our attention to “responsibility-taking” and “virtue traditions”. Seeking to understand how sustainability could be achieved, scholars emphasize the shift from production-centered approaches to consumption-centered ones. (Martens & Spaargaren 2005; Spaargaren & Van Vliet 2000; Cohen, Comrov & Hoffner 2005)

Critics concerned with issues of power and justice worry that the “morality” being expressed through alternative consumption is inadequate. It is individualistic (Maniates 2001) and primarily expressive – perhaps accomplishing “incremental erosion”, but not “creating a new structural configuration”. Fair trade may provide some psychic payoff to moody shoppers (J. Johnston 2001) but it does not assertively change conditions for producers. (Shreck 2005) This kind of relationship is like “eating the other” (Hooks 1992) in that shoppers can consume the psychic pleasure of social justice (whether or not their purchases make a significant difference in it). (Allen et al. 2003). Individual economic choice as an expression of democracy (Friedman 1999) undermines the power of citizenship more than it enhances it. (Jubas 2007) Indeed, alternative consumption may serve only as a “class practice”, used to reproduce the class system through distinctions of taste. (J. Johnston & Baumann 2007) Ecological critics worry that we don’t need better forms of consumption, we need to challenge the concept of consumption altogether. (Hamilton 2007) Anti-corporate critics worry that greenwashing and justicewashing will ultimately empower corporations, just as anti-capitalists worry that any activity other than assaulting the system will just prolong its reign and our complicity. Alternative consumption may even encourage elitist and potentially fascist “defensive localism”. (DuPuis & D. Goodman 2005)

Schudson (2007) points out that equating consumption solely with individualism and politics solely with other-orientation sets up a misleading dichotomy, while in fact self and community concerns interpenetrate both political and consumer realms. The underlying question in this debate is whether alternative consumption can be a social movement. However, social movements theory has generally not been drawn upon for these analyses.² Not that doing so would be a straightforward matter. Even within the sub-discipline there are no clear guidelines on when we’ve got one, let alone how success ought to be evaluated.

But it is crucial to recognize that analyzing the *politics* of consumption is not the same thing as analyzing its collectivity. The work to date on the politics of

consumption has treated its collectivity only as the aggregate of individual acts. Social movements scholarship approaches an entirely different object, which is activity for social change which is, specifically, social and collective. But to be fair from the start, the corrective goes both ways. Social movements literature has paid little attention to the political content of social movements. At its best it shows us *how* social movements do what they do, but leaves aside the ideology and content of movements, paying little attention to *what* they are doing (let alone *why*) (Oliver & H. Johnston 2000) – matters of obviously crucial importance in understanding consumption as political.

Only a very few studies in the field of political consumption have identified distinctly social objects. Kirwan (Kirwan 2004; 2006) finds “relations of regard” (Offer 1997) emerging in alternative consumption. Addressing concerns that “trust” might just be romanticization or required emotional labor (Hochschild 1983), Kirwan finds that it is the producers who ascribe the most value to relations of regard; they gain significantly from the experience of their work being *valued*. Lee finds that “reciprocity” goes beyond the market exchange to include “enjoyment and fulfillment in the transmission and extension of knowledge as well as in the products to which the knowledge [was] attached”. (Lee 2000, pp.139-40) Moore emphasizes that while Maffesolian aspects (stated superior taste, pleasure of being at the market) are present and accounted for, committed relationships are a distinct dimension of the dynamic. (2006, p.424) Thompson & Coskuner-Balli (2007), drawing heavily on Ritzer (1999), argue that Community Supported Agriculture “glocalizes” through processes of “implosion” (urban/rural, producers/consumers, market/gift, risk/reward), manipulating time (romanticized agricultural time) and space (farms as irreplaceable ecological places). One of the most interesting findings of the empirical work done on these matters is that political consumption may be the wrong unit of analysis. A number of studies have found correlations between political consumption and civic activity, ecological citizenship and community building. (Forno & Ceccarini 2006; Seyfang 2006; Shah & et al 2007) Organizations designed to facilitate political consumption also expand their politics through their network activity. (Holzer 2006; Clarke et al. 2007)

This paper articulates and demonstrates a framework of analysis of political consumption based in social movements literature.

Traditional US social movements scholarship busies itself with instrumental analysis, identifying resources, political opportunities, and strategic framing of “contentious politics”. (McCarthy & Zald 1977; Eisinger 1973; Gamson, Fireman & Rytina 1982; Snow et al. 1986; Tilly 1995; Tilly & Tarrow 2006) “New social movements” scholarship, examining European post-60s movements (which followed a different trajectory than the US ones) emphasizes identity, culture, space, and the long-term nurturance of “social conflicts” in “submerged networks” (Melucci 1989) which may ultimately shift their society’s “cosmology”. (Eyerman & Jamison 1991) The newer social movements theory echoes newer social theory, which, in efforts to identify the infrastructure of oppression and tools of liberation, examines the power of discourse, the colocation of subjection and agentic subjectivity, the structuring and subversive pathways of feelings and desire, and

the phenomena of excess, identity, heterogeneity, information, and the body.

Burning questions about alternative consumption are classical questions in the social movements literature. How can a marginal activity grow and how can it maintain its challenging edge as it does? The question of growth is addressed in the instrumental approaches to social movements theory, which tracks the resources and other factors in movement growth. Assessing the dynamics and implications of cooptation is extremely difficult. Even activists debate extensively about whether cooptation is a mark of success or failure. Piven & Cloward (1977) argue that cooptation is part of the channeling of dissent into undisruptive and therefore ineffective forms while Eyerman & Jamison (1991) argue that the goal of movements' struggle is to incorporate new ideas widely throughout society, which is then transformed. But the issue of cooptation in some sense sidesteps the question of movement content and goals, which has been somewhat left out of the study of social movements. Although activists spend extensive energy working to articulate goals, their choices (and the implications of those choices for the future cooptation of their work) is treated, if at all, as a matter of strategic framing. If anything, social movements scholarship is overly influenced by an Alinskyist (1969) approach which suggests that the most important thing is getting the movement off the ground, regardless of which direction it is headed. But which direction it is headed is a matter of grave concern to observers of alternative consumption. Has the Fair Trade movement won or lost the battle with Starbucks? Has the organic movement won or lost when WalMart sells it?

Moreover, alternative consumption as potential social movement activity is a difficult object to study, since (unlike other social movement activity) the very same practice could be done by chance or with political intent. (Miele & Murdoch 2002 propose a method of distinguishing) As all social movements, it involves cultural elements, but like several other current social projects, alternative consumption may take a primarily "cultural" form, involving little to no explicit, formal political activity. The distinctions between cultural studies and social movements have always been difficult. Some cultural studies scholars find movement power and promise in marginal activities which may not be confrontational at all (barely recognizable as political), nurturing "conflict" deep within a counterculture, appearing publicly only to flash enigmatically challenging "signs" from within a subculture. (Hebdige 1979)

Consumption studies has expanded our conception of use-value beyond "need". Moreover, this activity is not merely defensive, it can also be expressive, through what Mike Featherstone calls "the aestheticization of everyday life" (1990), with the result that the body, a site of governmentality, becomes also an engine of "authenticity and sensuality against the coldness and instrumentality of commodity culture". (Featherstone 1982; Binkley 2007) Campbell (1995) argues that hedonism has some historical associations with ethical and spiritual values and that consumerism's pleasures include imaginative acts. (Regarding public goods see Soper 2007) But can the seemingly individualistic activities of avoiding risk, reflecting on the ethical dimensions of production and markets, and finding expressive pleasure through commodities create structural change? Well that

depends on our theory of how structure is made.

Marcuse (1965) argued that commodification had eliminated the range of the erotic from sensual engagement with the natural world to sexuality alone, meanwhile derailing critical and liberatory sublimation through art and other sensuous practices which are now being recovered by alternative consumption (growing food, baking bread, handcrafts...). Drawing on Foucaultian insights about subjectivity, Butler (1990) proposes that in the midst of mandatory daily repetitions of internalized social constructs we can repeat them differently, in ways that ultimately challenge their meanings and open fissures in the social constructs themselves. Although she is not specifically addressing consumerism, her work on gender constructs may be quite useful for theorizing consumer practices, in that identity construction relies heavily on commodities. (Alternatively, some might argue that gender identity practices' dependence on commodities undermines her proposal.) Personal practices become socially influential as public performances, which rupture and encourage. (Valdez 1966; Boal 1985) Similarly, Donna Haraway proposes that our pleasure in commodities (specifically she is considering technology) is an opening to grab them agentially. Through play and experimentation suffused with yearning, we can transform the meaning and final effects of consumption. We become cyborgs, but our deep liberatory agendas and a ferocious energetic spirit can triumph. (1991) Can human spirits triumph in deep psychic battles with seductive, disciplinary product engineering?

Melucci insists that movements' most important work is what could be called "subcultural", the "formation of a more or less stable 'we' from which they generate conflicts" and struggle for control over space and time, even if they inhabit only "submerged networks" and fail to mount contentious action. (1989, p.26) Eyerman & Jamison show that these networks may eventually, over decades, usher in a new "cosmology". But then can we –and how– distinguish between movements and fads? Melucci provides a scheme: Social projects' "antagonism" can be assessed according to three axes: solidarity (v. aggregation), conflict over resources (v. consensus about the distribution of resources), and breach of the limits of social order (v. cooptable demands). (1996) Those with solidarity, generating conflicts, and breaching, are social movements.

Investigation

As a demonstration project encouraging analyses drawing on the possibilities for agency reviewed above, this paper considers some alternative consumption projects in terms of 57 variables drawn from social movements and social theory. These "projects" are hybrid forms of economic development which also aim (to varying degrees) to be utopian/transformational social projects. Specifically, I am interested in determining whether these projects are indeed more than new market niches? Are they best understood as social entrepreneurship? Might they be social movements?

I consider nineteen alternative consumption "projects", each involving a mix of promoters, institutions, discourses, consumers, activists, and producers. To

answer my question I use four sets of variables examining, economic development, traditional social movements, and new social movements. Although social entrepreneurship may take the form of a nonprofit, notforprofit, or for profit and although it may provide service/charity or commodities, it relies on centralized leadership and its interactions are enumerable, comparable to a traditional Social Movement Organization.

I have focused on a couple of handfuls of alternative consumption projects, clustered in the arenas of food and household objects, and do not include services. Note that in using the word 'alternative' I am not speaking of an identity position, but acts distinct from hegemonic modes. While some of these projects, such as organic production, have recently been widely adopted and promoted, I still treat them as alternative. I list the projects below, giving a few examples and citations for those unfamiliar with the project. Keep in mind that the "case" is built from multiple organizations and events, not just the examples. I have also included references to important prior work on these projects.

- national origin [www.stillmadeinusa.com, www.americanapparel.net]
- local retail [www.danebuylocal.com, www.interraproject.org]
- Fair Trade [www.tenthousandvillages.com, www.ifat.org]
- Slow Food: artisanal, heirloom, convivial [www.slowfood.com, www.killtherestaurant.com, www.theghet.com (Petrini & McCuaig 2003; Parkins & Craig 2006; Lawrence 2005; Karp 2006)]
- organic [www.organicconsumers.org, www.soilassociation.org, see (DuPuis 2000; Reed 2002; Marsden & Everard Smith 2005; Moore 2006)]
- local food: includes farmers markets and locavorism [www.100milediet.org, www.locavores.com (Wilkins 1995; Hendrickson & Heffernan 2002; Schneider 2004; Kirwan 2004; Kirwan 2006; Smith & Mackinnon 2007)]
- Community Supported Agriculture [www.localharvest.org/csa]
- Community Food Security [www.foodsecurity.org]
- Vegan [www.goveg.com]
- green: including home products, energy, transportation, conferences and festivals [www.bioneers.org, www.greenfestivals.org, www.paenergyfest.com, (Connolly & Prothero 2008)]
- Indie [www.etsy.com, churchofcraft.org, www.supernaturale.com, www.handmaddenationmovie.com, www.buyhandmade.org, www.bazaarbizarre.org, www.craftywonderland.com]
- Martha Stewart Do-It-Yourself [www.marthastewart.com]
- Do-It-Yourself [www.instructables.com, *Make Magazine*, *Ready-Made Magazine*, www.readymademag.com, (not including Home Depot, but do see Watson & Shove 2008)]
- traditional crafts & fairs [www.craftcouncil.org]
- fine art [open studios, street art, www.bostonopenstudios.org, www.20x200.com]
- Voluntary Simplicity [www.catoregon.org, www.simpleliving.net, www.downshiftingweek.com]
- Slow Home, City, Life: [www.theslowhome.com,

- <http://www.cittaslow.net/>, (Japan for Sustainability n.d.; Green 2008)]
- flea market [www.themarketnyc.com, www.visitspitalfields.com, (Trebay 2008)]
- Freegan [www.freegan.info, (Kurutz 2007)]

The data used in this study are gathered in three ways. As a participant-observer of the alterglobalization movement, I have had the opportunity to learn about anti/consumption politics directly from hundreds of activists with whom I worked. I have been doing participant-observation in alternative food movements for 17 years, participating in consumer co-ops, Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs), and farmers markets in 5 cities in 3 states. I have also been studying the development of the organic, local food, and Community Food Security movements, through their texts and press, for more than 11 years. I have been consuming with an anti-corporate perspective for 13 years. The constant search for less-corporate products and local retailers has enabled me to observe the development of discourses of, spaces for, and participation in alternative consumption. For the last year, I have been gathering data about artisanal production. I have made observation visits to 8 non-food marketplaces, taking fieldnotes and talking with vendors. I have also been following discourses about alternative consumption in the *New York Times* and other publications. I have augmented this knowledge with purposive web-based research.

Analysis

The first section of the analysis examines the projects as traditional social movements and social entrepreneurship. The second analyzes them as new social movements. The third section, considers their goals.

Traditional social movements?

In order to assess the projects' politics, I first looked at them using the perspective of traditional social movements, looking for: a united front, action directed by national organizations, centralized leadership, membership, deliberative participatory democracy, community organizing practices (outreach/advocacy), formal popular education, solidarity, the use of unified action in the market to discipline companies (boycotts, etc.), and contentious action/disruption.

By far the most conventional project is Community Food Security, meeting 7 of these 10 criteria, followed by Fair Trade using 5, and trailed by the rest of the projects meeting 3 or fewer of these criteria. A quarter of the projects meet none of these criteria, although each criterion was met by at least one project. Only Martha Stewart DIY has centralized leadership, only two have any kind of membership that includes all participants (CSA and CFS) or a national policy-making organization (Fair Trade, CFS), and only two projects aim to unify action in the market to discipline companies (organic and green). Only three projects have united fronts (Fair Trade, CFS, Martha) and only three take contentious action (Slow Food challenges and defies regulation) and local food challenges

institutions (particularly the university students' Real Food Coalition).

Since none of the alternative consumption projects meet both the criteria of centralized leadership and membership, it seems that social entrepreneurship is not an accurate or adequate model.

If alternative consumption is a social movement, it is not the kind immersed in sloganeering and bogged down in meetings. These projects build new economic institutions. It's interesting to think about their relationships to economic development theories. I look at innovation in three areas: products and production, exchange, and consumer desire. I then use Gibson-Graham's schema for progressive economic development which remobilizes surplus, addresses needs, enhances consumption, or expands the commons. Finally, I draw on Michael Porter's "diamond theory" of sectoral economic development to add: shared infrastructure/ institutions, interfirm competition/collaboration, and supply chains.³ (1998) I also added two other criteria, increase of human "capability" (Sen 1999) and active work on ecological sustainability.

Eighty-four percent of the projects innovate in the arena of consumer desire, and more than half innovate in either production or exchange. Each project sports at least two arenas of innovation. CSAs and Community Food Security innovate in all three areas. Traditional crafts have failed to innovate in these areas, and fine art has innovated only with regard to exchange (Although that may be as it should be). Progressive forms of economic development are not as well developed, with only 5 projects remobilizing surplus and 5 expanding the commons.⁴ More than half of the projects do economic development based on meeting needs and 63% enhance consumption.

Nearly 60% of the projects rely on some kind of shared infrastructure or institutions but only four of the projects share their benefit with politically related supply chains. Competition and collaboration among participants in alternative consumption projects is very interesting. Farmers at the farmers market are quick to explain that while more vendors at a given market is obviously a form of competition, the size of and diversity of the market increases shopping and benefits all vendors. They welcome a larger and more inclusive market. Farmers, although in a situation of competition, are also quick to explain that they advise each other and have, almost always, mutually supportive relations. In 17 years of chatting, I've only heard 1 negative comment about a fellow farmer and the situation was that farmer had violated the market's rules and then sued the market. Close to half of the projects build human capacity and half are sustainable. Six do both.

New social movements?

In assessing alternative consumption projects as new social movements, I turn first to Melucci's "we", which generate "conflicts", making a crucial contribution to society by "asking questions about meaning" without which the larger society would not be able to escape "the apparently neutral logic of institutional procedures." (1989, pp.26, 11) Melucci also emphasizes the importance of

“spaces”, which support social experiments and of direct, personal involvement. Eyerman & Jamison, arguing that movements’ task is to introduce “new ideas” or “cosmologies” into society, emphasize movements’ creation of their own technologies, means of dissemination, and use of a variety of intellectual roles. I have included a criterion of new movement technology.

American social movements scholars seeking important aspects of the new social movements identify consciousness raising and use of an anti-oppression framework (addressing multiple forms of oppression at once). Two cornerstones of the recent alterglobalization movements are diversity and autonomous co-articulation. Queer and other movements have emphasized the importance of subversion/paradox, hybrids/performances, and appropriation/transformation (Butler 1990), pleasure and play (Shepard). Finally, I add two additional criteria, the presence of visible movement intellectuals who may have little directive authority, and a national or international discursive space.

Striking in comparison to the results regarding traditional social movement identifiers is that 7 of the projects meet 10-13 of the 13 new social movement criteria (Voluntary simplicity, slowhome/life, freegan, Slow food, local food, green, and Indie). The projects meet an average of 7.2 of the 13 criteria, while they only met an average of 1.8 of the 10 traditional criteria. Four of the movements meet fewer than 5 of the criteria (National origin, local retail, organic, Martha DIY, and traditional craft) Interestingly, the only strong performer in traditional social movements criteria, the Community Food Security Movement, also met half of the criteria for new social movements.

Regarding specific criteria and looking first to Melucci and Eyerman & Jamison’s criteria: 16 of the 19 projects have direct personal participation, 13 build a sense of “we”, 12 create new space, 9 are in conflict with their society, and 9 have generated their own technologies. Interestingly, any of the projects that fail to meet both the criteria of building a “we” and build new space end up with weak overall scores on new social movements criteria (≤ 7). 14 of the projects do consciousness-raising (compared with 6 doing formal popular education, one of the traditional social movement criteria). 16 do consciousness raising. Only 4 have an anti-oppression framework, but these 4 projects are also the highest scoring on all new social movements criteria. 12 of the projects use play or pleasure as part of their repertoire and 7 use some kind of subversion or performance. 9 are autonomously co-articulated and 9 also have a national or international discursive space. Only 6 have movement intellectuals. I was also interested to investigate how many of the movements propose an identity based on self-restriction (like vegan). Only 4 do, while 9 encourage an inclusive, expansive identity.

It seems that 16 of the 19 projects meet sufficient criteria to be considered as social movement activity, according to the criteria of new social movements.

Political goals

If some alternative consumption projects may be social movements, we might

want to investigate their goals. Some possible goals are: ecological materialism (internalizing costs, redesigning life and production to facilitate ecological society), socialism, anti-capitalism, challenging the mode of production of the system (whether that is defined as precarity, corporate rule, or placeless economic decisionmaking?), small-scale production, Polanyian “reembedding”, government regulation, reassertion of citizenship/the polis as a location of economic decisionmaking, anti-imperialism (including “taking the boot off the neck of the third world”), increasing control over space and time, rooted connections (sense of place).

In this part of the analysis, I excluded the four projects that seemed not likely to be social movements. The most popular goal among the remaining 15 projects was a “sense of place”, with 84% of the projects having this goal. The second most popular was increasing control over space and time, embraced by 74% of the projects. 63% the projects hold the goals of small scale production and reembedding. 47% have the goals of ecological materialism or in some way challenging the mode of production of the system. 37% are interested in government regulation and only 26% are interested in reasserting the polis. 25% are anti-imperialist, but only 16% (3 projects) are anti-capitalist and none express socialist goals.

That said, the projects being themselves diverse actions still developing, it’s useful to note that they had average of more than 4 goals each. Green has nine goals, Community Food Security has 8, slowhome and local food have 7 each, and Fair Trade and voluntary simplicity have 6 each.

A second kind of political effect may not be an articulated goal, but an interesting effect in the realm of what I have been encouraged to call “embodied materialism” – experience and relationships.⁵ Some of these possibilities include: innovative antagonistic/ethical aesthetics, “implosion”, “enchantment” (Ritzer 1999), “relations of regard” (Offer 1997), reflexive everyday democracy, and face-to-face conviviality (Petrini & McCuaig 2003; Parkins & Craig 2006). Again eliminating the four projects which seem not likely to be social movements these six possible effects were quite common among the projects. With an average of nearly 4 per project. The most popular was enchantment (used by 93% of projects), followed by implosion (87%). The least popular was conviviality, but even being at the low end of scores for this group, it was still present in 6 of 15 projects (40%). Half of the projects foster “relations of regard”. The projects weakest at generating these effects were vegan, with only one hit and organic, with only two. All the rest had 3 to 6 appearances in this set of variables. Local food and CSA hit on all six of these these variables, while Indie, voluntary simplicity, slow home, and flea markets hit 5 each.

Conclusion

This study has considered the work done by some alternative consumption projects. Like social entrepreneurship, these projects mix market participation with non-market values. Unlike social entrepreneurship which follows an

organization-based model similar to traditional social movements, alternative consumption projects show aspects of New Social Movements, such as cultural forms, decentralization, the development of new identities, and a focus on the creation of new social spaces and experimentation. Alternative consumption projects work at the edges of culture, build a sense of “we”, and introducing enchanting new ideas, even though their main function is production and consumption. One of their strengths is “pleasure”, which must be understood as more than luxury commodification. The kinds of pleasure recovered in some alternative consumption projects recovers the very “erotic” Marcuse and others found endangered by commodification. These pleasures, along with feelings of community, “regard”, and play, draw participants into experiences beyond the market’s reductionism.

Alternative consumption projects, particularly more developed ones like local food, mix new political strategies with traditional ones. But other highly developed projects, like Fair Trade and Community Food Security, although institutionally and ideologically sophisticated in a traditional social movements sense, are underdeveloped as New Social Movements. Interestingly, Fair Trade is also a centralized and controlled movement, sharply contrasting with Indie, which is totally grassroots, with strategies expanding according to the interests of consumer and producer participants. It would be interesting to correlate openness and access with the use of political strategies. Alternative consumption projects are strong innovators, particularly in forms of economic development focused on meeting needs and enhancing consumption. Other forms of economic development that could be integrated are remobilizing surplus and expanding the commons. (Gibson—Graham 2006)

While 68% of the movements build a sense of “we”, I was interested to consider what kind of identities are being developed by alternative consumption projects. Perhaps the most familiar identities to be found are based on a personal ethical stance, such as animal welfare, reduction of carbon footprint, sole purchasing from a particular source (locavores), or non-participation in exploitative production relations (voluntary simpliciterians who only own one pair of union-made pants or avoid using cars). However, among the sample of projects I considered, these identities were a minority. A much more common sense of “we” is “creative reflexivity”. These people cannot congratulate themselves on purity, but they find meaning through commitment to an increasingly sensitive decision-making (for example, moving from seeking organic to distinguishing between corporate organic and uncertified agroecological local producers). They take pride and pleasure in expanding their knowledge and ethical practices. This identity is still relatively individualistic; it involves abstract others with whom it accepts a relationship and responsibility. DIY imparts these same feelings of a growing capacity to take responsibility, and pleasure and pride through ethical production/consumption.

“human life cannot in any way be limited to the closed systems assigned to it by reasonable conceptions...life starts...from the moment when the ordered and reserved forces liberate and lose

themselves for ends that cannot be subordinated to anything one can account for. It is only by such insubordination – even if it is impoverished– that the human race ceases to be isolated in the unconditional splendor of material things.” (Bataille 1939, p.128)

These relationships become more embodied as they become more committed and direct. Here we find the “implosion” of distant social positions into celebratory, “enchanted” emotional bonds between farmers, artisans, entrepreneurs, advocates, and consumers. I can evoke this best by drawing on my fieldwork in the local food movement. *Full of joy, carrying novel perspectives on life, death, money, and a level of scientific knowledge that astonishes their “educated” customers, these iconoclasts seem whole even though they are out of fashion. These bodhisattvas are farmers.* In the local food movement, farmers are at the center of knowledge and authority. Consumers increasingly want direct relations with farmers rather than a “symbol scheme” to assure them of qualities of the produce, chefs look to farmers for the new information they want to deepen their food commitments and expressions. Ecologists look to them for sound science on ecological events and possibilities. This implosion is easy for the urbanite consumers and advocates. Does it exist too for those doing the work? (Recall Kirwan’s findings on the importance of Offer’s “regard” to the producers.) *Beaming at the encouraging reminder, a grizzled farmer from the Sierra foothills confirms his dinner reservation at one of Los Angeles’ most coveted new restaurants, while handing over an unwieldy bundle of garbanzo beans (still on the stalk) to an effusive member of the kitchen staff.*

As consumers and producers find enrichment and community through direct relations, they invest more time and energy in these markets, and they actively honor one another’s commitments, through patience, reliability (attending the farmers market even in the rain), and a relaxation of market pecuniarity. These imploded identities and embodied, if still in part imagined, communities, provide sources of pleasure not only through but also beyond the high-quality commodities themselves. But this pleasure is not free of the restrictions of the identities discovered earlier. In fact they are made more meaningful by the limitations they accept, such as seasonality, limited production, and unpredictability. Also, these experiences, identities, and experiments seem to be increasingly popular across formerly distinct and individualistic social sectors: [green] homeowners, hysterical parents, [abstract] international solidarity activists, [self-absorbed] indie urban youth, [elitist] cosmopolitan gourmets. As consumers seek to change more and more of their world, they seem to link their home consumption preferences with their institutional entanglements, creatively working to expand the scope of their solidarities and ethics in the institutions they interact with. (See Schor et. al. forthcoming)

This study has not mapped the networks between movements. Such a mapping could help us understand how political ideas and strategies connect projects (through political logic or shared cultural space), or where there are impenetrable cultural and ideological barriers. (I would like to see a market analysis of readership overlap between *Martha Stewart Magazine*, *Make*

Magazine, instructables.com, and Indie blogs.) In analyzing the economics and social justice dimensions of alternative consumption, it is, of course, important to distinguish between producers and consumers. However, in building new markets, both producers and consumers need to be recruited, and that is done around new ideas, spaces, and social technologies.

Imperfections in movements

Years ago, my colleague Aimee Shreck and I wondered if at best, Fair Trade might be "a gateway drug to political economy". I'm beginning to think we were on to something. Most discussion of social movements presumes *either* that they cannot be built at all but must be anxiously awaited like forces of nature or that they are a rational process which emerges in each participant and group as a fully formed ideology, a whole sentence, neatly capturing structure and agency and, of course, recognizing history. Social movement participants tend to be conceptualized as people signing up for gym memberships, fully cognizant of what needs done. Movement critics (academic and activist) tend to write like restaurant reviewers, assessing the worth of the movement's "product" (always expected already to be running at peak performance).

But studying alternative consumption has expanded my conception of social movements. Consumers join box schemes for a variety of reasons, which we might judge to be politically inadequate. But through participation their politics expand to embrace more issues promoted by the CSA framework.

Eyerman & Jamison and Melucci suggest that movement ideology and movement culture are one and the same. Resistive culture confronts something in its society. It reacts. It forms a "conflict" and a "cosmological" alternative. This is easy to recognize from an academic perspective, but its implications for organizing and activism (and criticism of activism) are momentous. If we think about culture this way, we recognize that it is not a negative, not an absence and emptiness, and it is not a blithe collage. It is a complex system, which requires work to learn, which has an introduction, and many layers of sophistication, which takes years to become fully formed in *each* participant while it also develops. And movement culture begins with something simple and ideologically incomplete, like "hello". From there, it must entice new participants to want to learn. It must understand that beginners will be very limited and if it is to succeed its adherents must find a way to make it accessible. In other words it needs a pedagogy.

In analyzing my long observation of the development of alternative consumption projects, I see that they do develop, as do the participants. Long a picky critic of social movements, I have recently come to see social movements are long, stuttering conversations in which conversants do not begin with the same mother tongue but over time develop both linguistic and cultural literacy. I see social movement culture functioning as a process of recognition, query, and expansion, repeated, slow, but growing bigger in each conversation. What this means is that rather than looking for correct analyses when we look at events-

we-think-or-hope-might-be-or-become-social-movements, we should look for trajectories and expansions. The question for a social movement is not "what is it doing?" but "where is it going?" If we presume that alternative consumption is growing and changing, its cosmology and practice is open to ongoing development and dialogue. The task of scholars then becomes praxis, rather than condemnation and dismissal.

Postscript: Applying the model of local/slow food to local/slow objects

In this spirit, I dare to contribute. The local food movement (see Author XXXX) has already conceptualized the social and economic architecture for a sustainable, secure, just, and delicious new food economy. New institutions are proliferating, along with skills development. The 2002 Census of Agriculture showed an *increase* in the number of farms between 10 and 49 acres, up from 530 to 563 thousand. This is the first reversal in a decades of farm consolidation. Recent magazine spreads hint at a similar shift in the arena of consumer objects – a shift from consumption measured by exchange value of high tech gadgets to one measured by products of use-values and market relationships in which specific people, and relationships, matter, products which affirm green, Bauhaus, or DIY values. (Furio 2008; Khemsurov 2007; Tarashka et al. 2008) . Young fine artists are making a living again. (Eastman 2008) Campbell argues that in the context of overwhelming commodification, people “might come to desire some small corner of their everyday existence to be a place where objects and activities possess significance because they are regarded as unique, singular or even sacred.” (Campbell 2005, p.37)

This is not to propose that we can knit ourselves to egalitarianism (although keeping artists in rent and food and space is worthwhile in any society). Nor is the point that enlightened consumerism will rebuild a reasonable economy. What I want to suggest is that these projects are points of observation and discourse on a lurching process of re-thinking and rebuilding life and work that is ecologically limited, solidary, and self-governed (through reflexive and participatory democracy) – excavating desire, pleasure, happiness, place, and human connection (including the joys to be had through work/self-creation). And that this is to be accomplished by making objects and consumption more, not less, meaningful.

In Eyerman & Jamison’s terms, the emergent idea of “local objects” modeled on “local food” would be something like this: We develop a relationship to objects that engages our intuition and energy and values in a way that is more like making art than acquisitiveness. (Campbell proposes personalization and customization as the beginning of this trajectory.) Along the continuum of modes of production from DIY to art object we imagine a series of possibilities of collaboration between consumer and producer. The early organic movement seemed to face an uphill battle to convince consumers used to aesthetically perfect produce to settle for less; but the outcome of the ecological food movement is that consumers get *more* flavor, variety, community, and sense of place. "Organic" food is no longer seen as a forfeit of quality. In an artisanal

economy of objects, we will buy just one dishdrainer in a lifetime, instead of 20. This "less" may become "more". As Thomas Kuhn writes about scientific paradigms, consumption paradigms may introduce new questions, new kinds answers, and new forms of admissible evidence. (1970)

One innovation would be Artisan Department Stores, with rules comparable to those at farmers market about production methods and ownership scale. But today, such a market would draw more consumers than producers. Currently, artisans tend to cluster in jewelry, accessories (scarves, hats) and gifts. In recent visits to 3 craft fairs, I found useful household objects at just over 10% of the stalls at each market. (Also see Weitz 2005) It's hard to think about committing to solidarity relations with local artisans when they don't make anything useful. We don't just need a market for local objects, we need to support the development of production. But that's not as hard as it sounds. Once farmers found out that people wanted to buy heirloom veggies in person, they started producing and marketing that way. How can we support existing and aspiring craftspeople in producing useful objects, learning about sustainable materials, and designing with a wider range of aesthetics (some modernism, please!)? Some aspects of this project are easier than local food. While aspiring young farmers can't afford land, collective workshops would be relatively affordable to support artisans. And, produce spoils, dishdrainers don't.

Small and mid-size farmers who monocropped and sold everything wholesale were in bad shape a few years ago. Outreach and training by agricultural agencies and organizations have helped these farmers diversify and get into direct marketing. Public or private programs could offer grants, loans, help with materials (free advice on sourcing and coop buying, transport), workshop and retail space for artisans, providing special incentives for producing everyday goods with sustainable materials and production processes. Artisans could cluster in Style Guilds which would provide a range of products in a similar style, using comparable materials and level of workmanship. Directories, similar to CSA and farm directories,⁶ could help people find artisanal producers.

Looking at the lessons of the local food movement, we see that meat producers had a more difficult time than produce producers getting their goods to market due to processing requirements. New institutions (some funded as public-private collaborations) were necessary to build boutique (smaller scale) slaughterhouses and to educate chefs (indeed to re-train a new generation of butchers who can fabricate a whole animal). Similar middle-market functions are needed to rebuild an economy of local objects. For example, it might be helpful to build coop factories where artisans can arrange production of larger runs and get advice on how best to maintain quality. Such a factory could provide training and incubation. Public schools might re-think both arts and trades education to include artisanal production and craftsmanship. Perhaps initially as after school programs, school workshops could be kept open to the community to draw on the knowledge and skills of elders and immigrant craftspeople. Community institutions which provide craft education, such as the Elliot School (<http://www.eliotschool.org/>) could be supported with state job training funds.

Finally, the local food movement benefited from conceptual and political work done by non-commercial organizations, such as Food First, the Organic Consumers Association, the Community Food Security Coalition, and many more. We need such organizations to help ethical consumers think through and connect issues of work, relationship, so they will then want to connect with artisans as they want to connect with farmers.

References

- Alinsky, S.D., 1969. *Reveille for radicals*, Vintage Books.
- Allen, P. et al., 2003. Shifting plates in the agrifood landscape: the tectonics of alternative agrifood initiatives in California. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1), 61—75.
- Bataille, G., 1939. *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings, 1927-1939*, University of Minnesota Press.
- Baudrillard, J., 1972. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* ,
- Bauman, Z., 1992. *Intimations of Postmodernity*, New York : Routledge.
- Beck, U., 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity (Theory, Culture and Society Series)*, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Binkley, S., 2007. *Getting Loose: Lifestyle Consumption in the 1970s*, Duke University Press.
- Blau, P.M., 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: John Wiley.
- Blumer, H., 1972. Society as Symbolic Interaction. In J. G. Manis & B. N. Meltzer, eds. *Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, p. 452.
- Boal, A., 1985. *Theatre of the Oppressed*, Theatre Communications Group.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: a Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butler, J., 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* , Routledge.
- Campbell, C., 2006. Considering Others and Satisfying the Self: The Moral and Ethical Dimension of Modern Consumption. In N. Stehr, C. Henning, & B. Weiler, eds. *The Moralization of the Markets*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 213-226.
- Campbell, C., 2005. The Craft Consumer: Culture, Craft and Consumption in a Postmodern Society. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(1), 23-42.
- Campbell, C., 1995. The Sociology of Consumption. In D. Miller, ed. *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 96-126.
- Clarke, N. et al., 2007. The Political Rationalities of Fair-Trade Consumption in the United Kingdom. *Politics and Society*, 35(4), 583-607.
- Cohen, M.J., Comrov, A. & Hoffner, B., 2005. The New Politics of Consumption: Promoting Sustainability in the American Marketplace. *Sustainability: Science*, 1(1), 58-76.
- Connolly, J. & Prothero, A., 2008. Green Consumption: Life-politics, risk and contradictions.

- Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8(1), 117-145.
- DuPuis, E.M., 2000. Not in my body: BGH and the rise of organic milk. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 17(3), 285—295.
- DuPuis, E.M. & Goodman, D., 2005. Should we go "home" to eat?: toward a reflexive politics of localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21(3), 359—371.
- Eastman, D., 2008. A collector's guide to the exploding art market. *San Francisco*, 94-119.
- Eisinger, P.K., 1973. The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities. *The American Political Science Review*, 67(1), 11-28.
- Eyerman, R. & Jamison, A., 1991. *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*, Penn State Press.
- Featherstone, M., 1990. *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, Sage.
- Featherstone, M., 1982. The body in consumer culture. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 1(3).
- Forno, F. & Ceccarini, L., 2006. From the Street to the Shops: The Rise of New Forms of Political Actions in Italy. *South European Society & Politics*, 11(2), 197-222.
- Foucault, M., 1988. *Technologies of the Self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* L. H. Martin & P. H. Hutton, eds., Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Friedman, T.L., 1999. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* 1st ed., New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Furio, J., 2008. Stylecounsel: Making Clutter Count. *San Francisco*, 72,74.
- Gamson, W.A., Fireman, B. & Rytina, S., 1982. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*, Dorsey Press.
- Gibson—Graham, J.K., 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*, Univ Of Minnesota Press.
- Green, P., 2008. The Slow Life Picks Up Speed. *The New York Times*.
- Hamilton, C., 2007. Self—creation under consumerism and the transition to an ecological consciousness. In Yale school of Forestry & Environmental Studies.
- Haraway, D.J., 1991. A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist—Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century. In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Free Association Books / Routledge. Available at: <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/HPS/Haraway/CyborgManifesto.html>.
- Hebdige, D., 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, London: Routledge.
- Hendrickson, M.K. & Heffernan, W.D., 2002. Opening Spaces through Relocalization: Locating Potential Resistance in the Weaknesses of the Global Food System. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42(4), 347—369.
- Hochschild, A.R., 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*, University of California Press.
- Holt, D.B., 1998. Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption? *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), 1—25.
- Holt, D.B.1., 2002. Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and

- branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol 29(1), (2002), 70-90.
- Holzer, B., 2006. Political consumerism between individual choice and collective action: Social movements, role mobilization and signalling. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. Vol 30(5), 405-415.
- Hooks, B., 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*, South End Press.
- Japan for Sustainability, Kakegawa Declares Itself a "Slow Life City". Available at: http://www.japanfs.org/db/database.cgi?cmd=dp&num=202&dp=data_e.html [Accessed February 20, 2008].
- Johnston, J., 2001. Consuming Social Justice. *Arena Magazine*, 51, 42-47.
- Johnston, J. & Baumann, S., 2007. Democracy versus Distinction: A Study of Omnivorousness in Gourmet Food Writing. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 165-204.
- Jubas, K., 2007. Conceptual confusion in democratic societies: Understandings and limitations of consumer-citizenship. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7(2), 231-254.
- Karp, H., 2006. Kitchen not so confidential: Underground restaurants go public lose cachet. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Khemsurov, M., 2007. THE REMIX; You From Around Here? .
- Kirwan, J., 2004. Alternative Strategies in the UK Agro—Food System: Interrogating the Alterity of Farmers Markets. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(4), 395-415.
- Kirwan, J., 2006. The interpersonal world of direct marketing: Examining conventions of quality at UK farmers' markets. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22(3), 301—312.
- Kuhn, T.S., 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press.
- Kurutz, S., 2007. Not Buying It. *The New York Times*.
- Lawrence, E., 2005. Bistro Incognito Underground restaurants serve up a slice of speakeasy—if you know where to find them. *North Bay Bohemian*.
- Lee, R., 2000. Shelter from the storm? Geographies of regard in the worlds of horticultural consumption and production. *Geoforum*, 31(2), 137—157.
- Lukács, G., 1923. *History & Class Consciousness*, Merlin Press.
- Lyson, T.A., 2000. Moving Toward Civic Agriculture. *Choices*, 15(3), 42—45.
- Maniates, M.F., 2001. Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World? *Global Environmental Politics*, 1(3), 31-52.
- Marcuse, H., 1965. Repressive Tolerance. In R. P. Wolff, B. Commune, & Marcuse, Herbert, eds. *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*. Beacon Press.
- Marsden, T. & Everard Smith, 2005. Ecological entrepreneurship: sustainable development in local communities through quality food production and local branding. *Geoforum*, 36(4), 440-451.
- Martens, S. & Spaargaren, G., 2005. The Politics of Sustainable Consumption: The Case of the

- Netherlands. *Sustainability: Science*, 1(1), 29-42.
- McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N., 1977. Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212-1241.
- McCracken, G., 1990. *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of*, Indiana University Press.
- Melucci, A., 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melucci, A., 1989. *Nomads of the Present: social movements & Individual needs in contemporary society*, London: Hutchinson.
- Micheletti, M., 2003. *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miele, M. & Murdoch, J., 2002. The Practical Aesthetics of Traditional Cuisines: Slow Food in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42(4), 312—328.
- Moore, O., 2006. Understanding postorganic fresh fruit and vegetable consumers at participatory farmers markets in Ireland: reflexivity, trust and social movements. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(5), 416—426.
- Morgan, K., Marsden, T. & Murdoch, J., 2006. *Worlds of Food Place, Power, and Provenance in the Food Chain*, Oxford University Press.
- Offer, A., 1997. Between the Gift and the Market: The Economy of Regard. *Economic History Review*, 50(3), 450-76.
- Oliver, P.E. & Johnston, H., 2000. What a Good Idea! Ideologies and Frames in Social Movement Research. *Mobilization*, 5(1), 37-54.
- Parkins, W. & Craig, G., 2006. *Slow Living*, Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Petrini, C. & McCuaig, W., 2003. *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Piven, F.F. & Cloward, R.A., 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*, Vintage books.
- Polanyi, K., 1944. *The Great Transformation*, Beacon Press.
- Porter, M.E., 1998. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, Free Press.
- Reed, M., 2002. Rebels From the Crown Down: The Organic Movements Revolt against Agricultural Biotechnology. *Science as Culture*, 11(4), 481—504.
- Ritzer, G., 1999. *Enchanting a Disenchanted World : Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption*, Pine Forge Press.
- Schneider, K., 2004. Sell in Bulk, Lose Farm. Sell Locally, and Watch Revenues Grow. *The New York Times*, G7.
- Schor, J., 2007. Consumer-Topia: Envisioning a New Consumer Culture. In *American Sociological Association*. New York City.

- Schudson, M., 2007. Citizens, Consumers, and the Good Society. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611(1), 236-249.
- Sen, A., 1999. *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seyfang, G., 2006. Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: Examining local organic food networks. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22(4), 383-395.
- Shah, D.V. & et al, 2007. Political Consumerism: How Communication and Consumption Orientations Drive 'Lifestyle Politics'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611, 217-35.
- Shah, D.V. et al., 2007. The Politics of Consumption/The Consumption of Politics: Introduction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611, 6-15.
- Shepard, B., *Queer Political Performance and Protest: Play, Pleasure, and Social Movement*, Routledge.
- Shreck, A., 2005. Resistance, distribution, and Power in the Fair Trade Banana Initiative. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 22, 17-29.
- Slater, D. & Miller, D., 2007. Moments and Movements in the Study of Consumer Culture: A discussion between Daniel Miller and Don Slater . *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7(1), 5-23.
- Smith, A. & Mackinnon, J.B., 2007. *The 100–Mile Diet: A Year of Local Eating*, Vintage Canada.
- Snow, D.A. et al., 1986. Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464-481.
- Soper, K., 2007. Re-thinking the `Good Life`: The citizenship dimension of consumer disaffection with consumerism. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7(2), 205-229.
- Spaargaren, G. & Van Vliet, B., 2000. Lifestyles, consumption and the environment: The ecological modernization of domestic consumption. *Environmental Politics*, 9(1), 50.
- Stolle, D. & Micheletti, M., 2003. The Gender Gap Reversed: Political Consumerism as a Women—Friendly Form of Civic and Political Engagement: An Exploratory Study in Canada, Belgium and Sweden. In St. John's College, University of Manitoba.
- Tarashka, J. et al., 2008. Bringing it Home. *Metropolis*, 157-204.
- Thompson, C.J. & Coskuner–Balli, G., 2007. Enchanting Ethical Consumerism: The case of Community Supported Agriculture. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7(3), 275—303.
- Tilly, C., 1995. *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834*, Harvard University Press.
- Tilly, C. & Tarrow, S., 2006. *Contentious Politics*, Paradigm Publishers.
- Trebay, G., 2008. Scavengers on the Urban Savannah. *The New York Times*.
- Valdez, L., 1966. Theatre: El Teatro Campesino. *Ramparts*.
- Veblen, T., 1899. *Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study in the Evolution of Institutions*, New York: Macmillan.

Watson, M. & Shove, E., 2008. Product, Competence, Project and Practice: DIY and the dynamics of craft consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8(1), 69-89.

Weitz , B., 2005. *Craft Retailer Survey*

, David F. Miller Center for Retailing Education and Retailing, Warrington College of Business Administration at the University of Florida.

Wilkins, J., 1995. Seasonal and local diets: consumers' role in achieving a sustainable food system. (SA Summer, 1996 (v8n3)). *Research in Rural Sociology and Development*, 6, 149—166.

Notes

¹ My evolving perspective on consumption has been immeasurably expanded by conversations with Juliet Schor.

I hesitate to address the one exception, because the authors, while attempting to wield social movements theory, have such a poor grasp of their topic that they interpret activist ideology as akin to fundamentalist religion (needless to say, they do not construct an empirical comparison).

³ His other point is choosy consumers, which I already included as consumer desire.

⁴I did not include the knowledge commons here, since education is addressed in another section of the analysis.

⁵ I owe Stephen Pfohl and Ross Glover for their advice and brilliance in helping me better conceptualize these divisions.

⁶ <http://www.localharvest.org/csa/>