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### Glossary

**Competitive Foods** – Foods that are sold at schools that compete with what is offered by the cafeteria foods. For example, vending machines, groups that sell items like pizza or candy bars during lunch. Anything that is someone else selling food on campus. Salisbury 04 and other others identify this as the main reason that kids don’t eat the meals that are provided.

**Farm to School** – a program for healthier and local foods being served at schools. Usually includes one or more of; Purchasing local food for service in the cafeteria, Education activities around healthy foods and nutrition, and School Gardens that students engage in gardening. <http://www.farmtoschool.org/> and https://youtu.be/bKW9L6lHKEE

**Food Justice** – The intersection between racism/inequality and food access. The phrase ‘Food Desert’ is used to describe communities that lack any access to fresh and valuable foods. There are many youtube videos talking about gardening in poor and minority communities as a means of combating health based diseases, check them out. The argument is based on the assumption that access to healthy foods is first step to healthy people and healthy neighborhoods. Starting the conversation through farms is important.

**Genetic Diversity** – having many kinds of plants and animals with different genes that makes it easier for them to survive in the case of diseases or other events.

**Industrialization** – change that transforms a group (in this case agriculture in the U.S.) from an agrarian society into an industrial one, involving the extensive re-organisation of an economy for the purpose of manufacturing. Small businesses die because big industries take over.

**Organic Foods** – food produced by methods that comply with the standards of organic farming. Standards vary worldwide, but organic farming in general features practices that strive to cycle resources, promote ecological balance, and conserve biodiversity. Organizations regulating organic products may restrict the use of certain pesticides and fertilizers in farming. In general, organic foods are also usually not processed using irradiation, industrial solvents or synthetic food additives.

**Small Farms Advantage** – Small and Organic farmers aren’t producing enough food because there isn’t enough demand (people purchasing those foods) to make it where they can make a living by doing so. The plan has all the countries schools start purchasing local and organic food. That creates a demand so that farms will switch to less industrialized growing practices. Small Farms are good because they grow more diverse crops, they combat global warming, and are generally better for the environment.

**Sustainable –** able to be maintained without doing damage to the environment around it.

## Solvency

### Solvency: Lunch Focus Key

#### Fixing lunches key – improves nutrition broadly – need to de-prioritize profit

Salisbury, civil litigation at the law firm of Berman, Thomsic & Savage in Salt Lake City, Utah, 04 (Clint G. Salisbury, Make an Investment in Our School Children: Increase the Nutritional Value of School Lunch Programs, Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal, 2004, 2004 BYU Educ. & L. J. 331)

VIII. Conclusion **Human nature is biased toward** rich **diets** that are **high in fat and sugar**. **Today's school children are the building blocks for shifting human nature towards the nutritious**. Accordingly, **school lunch plays a significant leadership role in this effort**. School lunch programs in public schools have generated concern amongst parents, health specialists, and educators, that school lunch programs are actually promoting obesity. School lunch **policymakers can no longer ignore the nutritional deficiencies** in their school lunches, nor can they justify the deficiencies by relying on substantial profit margins that result in new scoreboards. National Soft Drink illustrates **loopholes in current federal legislation** that **enable**s **competitive foods to undermine the nutrition in school lunches**. **The loopholes further create school district reliance on revenue** from competitive food sales. Showy ad campaigns and competitive food offerings of minimal nutritional value create a school lunch stigma. **USDA needs to reevaluate how it allocates funds; it needs to start spending a much higher portion of its money on leaner meats, grains, and fresh produce.** Recent federal and state legislative proposals could ensure that school lunch programs are no longer compromised by foods of minimal nutritional value. But more must be done. **Policymakers** at federal, state, and school district levels **must invest first in the nutritional needs of children and then in a need for profit, instead of the other way around**.

### Solvency: Lunch Focus Key

#### School lunches are influential – even if outside factors influence decisions

Brambila-Macias et al, University of Reading, 11 (Brambila-Macias, Jose, et al. "Policy interventions to promote healthy eating: a review of what works, what does not, and what is promising." Food and Nutrition Bulletin 32.4 (2011): 365-375)

**The school environment is thought to exert a significant influence on pupils’ dietary habits**. Most developed countries offer free or subsidized school meals, and food availability in schools is often complemented by vending machines offering a range of snacks and soft drinks high in sugar, fat, and calories. **The response by health authorities has varied** among countries, **including requiring improvements in the nutritional quality of school meals, increased offer of fruits and vegetables, banning vending machines**, and supplying healthier snacks\* . **De Sa and Lock** [44] **conducted a systematic review of the effectiveness of various interventions promoting fruit and vegetable consumption in schools. Their findings suggest that in most cases, such schemes are effective in increasing intake and awareness**, leading them to conclude that EU policy for school fruits and vegetables programs could be an effective approach, providing both public health and agricultural benefits. Focusing on adults, Sassi et al. [6] found evidence that workplace interventions (e.g., group sessions with a nutritionist every 2 weeks for 20 months reinforced by health-related activities and catering services offering healthy food) increase consumption of fruit and vegetables as well as physical activity, with corresponding decreases in fat intakes. Furthermore, those who were exposed to workplace interventions seemed to retain some of the benefits after retirement. Mazzocchi et al. [7] highlighted that the Government of Finland has influenced diets by providing healthy meals in the workplace; guidelines have been in place since the 1970s and are said to be closely followed, particularly in the public sector. Indeed, those who eat at staff canteens are said to eat more vegetables, fish, and boiled potatoes. **When dealing with provision of food to children** or adults **in the school** or workplace, **it is always difficult to isolate the influences of parents** or partners, colleagues, **the environment outside, and the environment inside schools** and workplaces. Therefore, evaluating the impact of a particular intervention is complicated. **Nevertheless**, in general, **the literature agrees that the school environment in particular matters and that efforts should be made to encourage pupils at an early age to adopt a healthy lifestyle that includes healthy eating**.

### Solvency: Regulations Solve

#### (\_\_)Fed action required – state patchworks don’t get enforced or set standards

Fried & Simon, Adjunct Assistant Clinical Professor, New York University Dep't of Nutrition, Food Studies & Public Health & Adjunct Assistant Professor, University of California, Hastings College of the Law. Research and Policy Director, Marin Institute. J.D., University of California, Hastings College of the Law, 07

(Ellen Fried & Michele Simon, THE COMPETITIVE FOOD CONUNDRUM: CAN GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS IMPROVE SCHOOL FOOD?, Duke Law Journal, April, 2007, 56 Duke L.J. 1491)

**Federal and local officials have grappled with the impact of competitive foods** on their children's health and school finances virtually **since** the inception of the **NSLP**. For forty years, **the USDA and local school officials, by congressional mandate, traded the authority to first define and then regulate the sale of competitive foods**. Table 1 outlines the evolution of NSLP laws and regulations. A broad pattern emerges: **grants of congressional power, intended to rein in unfettered sales of junk food, are diminished** either by compromise due to political pressure or regulations **that leave too much discretion to school districts. The districts in turn wind up beset by financial pressures and soon return to junk food sales**. The USDA then finds itself in the diminished role of information clearinghouse, rather than effective enforcer of NSLP regulations. **The obesity and diabetes epidemics are swinging the pendulum back toward federal control under which a mandate of congressional authority and effective USDA regulation could quickly be applied nationwide.** To understand whether federal efforts can improve school food, we analyze resulting federal legislation seeking to do just that. As of March 2007, federal efforts to establish consistent nationwide nutrition standards for all competitive foods and beverages sold in schools were embodied in the Child Nutrition [\*1511] Promotion and School Lunch Protection Act of 2007. First introduced in both houses in May 2006, n124 the bill was reintroduced in the 110th Congress and continued to enjoy bipartisan support from numerous cosponsors. n125 Although a plethora of bills have sought to improve school food over the years, none have been as specific: the bill targets gaps in NSLP statutory authority identified by the appellate court decision in National Soft Drink Association v. Block, and the USDA's failure to update the definition of FMNV. The secretary of agriculture as of 2007 cannot ban the sale of any food or drink, whether or not it fits within the definition of FMNV, outside the cafeteria or at any time other than mealtime. n127 Also, **many unhealthful competitive foods** (but not FMNV) **have been available** on a la carte lines in the cafeteria at mealtime ever since they were **approved by the USDA** when it first set nutritional guidelines for Type A lunch. n128 The secretary, however, has the authority to regulate nutritional standards of all school foods. Although the appellate court struck down the administrative attempt to put time and place restrictions on competitive food sales [\*1513] throughout the entire school day, it never questioned the USDA's authority to set competitive food guidelines. n129 The definition of FMNV must be updated; if the USDA will not exercise its authority, then **legislation must direct the agency to do so.** Also, **to exercise that authority meaningfully, the congressional mandate must clearly provide time and place regulatory powers to the USDA**. Nutritional standards must be applied in all school venues throughout the entire school day.

## Small Farms Advantage

### Answers To: Small/Organic Farms Increasing Now

#### Farm consolidation occurring now --- statistics are misleading because the count agricultural potential instead of output.

**Koerth-Baker**, Senior science writer for FiveThirtyEight, **16** [Maggie Koerth-Baker, 11/17/2016.. “Big Farms Are Getting Bigger And Most Small Farms Aren’t Really Farms At All,” Five Thirty Eight, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/big-farms-are-getting-bigger-and-most-small-farms-arent-really-farms-at-all/>)

But here’s the weird thing: The OTA’s prediction didn’t come true. There were about 2 million farms in 2002, according to the Agricultural Census. There are still about 2 million farms today. At the same time, though, the OTA was right: **Farm consolidation really did happen**. How can both be true? **The devil is in the methodology**. These numbers don’t represent a failure of the OTA’s predictive powers, but rather a great example of how the ways we measure things can stop being effective. More importantly, this trend shows how a combination of inertia and political interests can make it hard to change a methodology even after it is clearly outdated. Today, **agricultural experts track farm consolidation by looking at things like distributions comparing the size of farms, the number of farms in each size category and the share of available cropland being used by each category of farm**. A 2013 Department of Agriculture report, for instance, found that, **in 2001, farms of 1,000 acres or more accounted for 5.6 percent of all farms and controlled 46.8 percent of all cropland.3 In 2011, those large farms still represented 5.6 percent of all farms, but now they controlled 53.7 percent of cropland**. During that same time period, the number of very large farms — 2,000 acres or more — grew from 1.7 percent of all farms to 2.2 percent. In other words, a relative handful of big farms are getting even bigger, even though the amount of land being farmed stayed about the same. **But one of the most prominent measures of farm consolidation remains the number of farms** — it’s right there in the first sentence of the Agricultural Census report. **That figure has remained more or less flat through all the upheaval. That’s because the number of very small farms has been growing**: In 1982, there were about 637,000 farms of 49 acres or less. In 2012, there were more than 800,000, a 28 percent increase. So while there are more big and small farms, there are fewer farms in the middle. **But the increase in the number of small farms is misleading**. The phrase “small farm” probably calls to mind a world of produce stands, hayrides and artisanal goats. But that kind of operation isn’t what’s driving the growth of small farms. **Most small farms, in fact, aren’t really farms at all**, at least not in the sense that those Kansas billboards mean. **The Agricultural Census defines farms as “any place from which $1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sold, or normally would have been sold, during the reference year**.” That $1,000-a-year threshold was low when it was set in 1975; it’s even lower today because it was never adjusted for inflation, said Allan Gray, professor of agricultural economics at Purdue. If it had been, the cutoff would be closer to $5,000 today. What’s more, **the USDA interprets “normally would have been sold” broadly, so it includes land that could, theoretically, produce agricultural income — even if the owners never had any intention of donning a pair of overalls and a co-op hat**. “I own three acres where my house is built,” Gray said. “I’m right on the edge of being considered a farm because my yard would have almost the potential to create $1,000 in revenue. I’m not quite a small farmer, but I almost could be.” These little spreadsheet farms aren’t anyone’s primary source of income, Gray said. In fact, the people who own them tend to have incomes above the median for America as a whole. These aren’t the farms of the poor; they’re the yards of the upper-middle-class.

### Answers To: Small/Organic Farms Increasing Now

#### Organics are growing, but need policies throughout the supply chain to lock in demand.

Organicology, 2/2/2017. (“Transition and Growth in the Organic Sector,” <https://www.organicology.org/transition-and-growth-in-the-organic-market>)

**It has never been more important that we find and implement effective solutions that lead to the transition of more acreage from conventional to organic**. **While consumer demand for organic foods continues to grow in the US and worldwide, transition remains an insurmountable challenge for many growers and less than 5% of all agricultural acreage in the US is in organic production**. For the sake of farmer livelihoods, consumer preference, and the health of the environment, **stakeholders across the supply chain must do more to support growers and enable them to more profitably convert to organic**.

### School Lunches help Small Farms

#### Farm to school programs help sustain small farms

Joshi, Kalb, & Beery, Center for Food & Justice UEPI, Occidental College & Community Food Security Coalition, 06

(Anupama Joshi , Marion Kalb and Moira Beery, GOING LOCAL: Paths to Success For Farm to School Programs, [https://food-hub.org/files/resources/goinglocal[1].pdf](https://food-hub.org/files/resources/goinglocal%5b1%5d.pdf))

**Farm to school programs link local farmers with schools**. **This simple idea bears** great **potential as a solution to** two of the major challenges facing our society: concerns about the diet and health of children, and **the disappearance of small farms**. **By purchasing locally grown products**, **schools** have been able to serve fresher products to the students, **create new markets for local farmers, and incorporate innovative educational activities that meet state education standards**. **Farmers** participating in farm to school **gain a sense of community involvement** by impacting the lives of young children, and becoming involved in providing agricultural education, **while benefiting from increased sales to institutions.** Farm to school programs have been operational in the United States for nearly ten years. We estimate that as of 2006, there are over 950 farm to school programs in more than 35 states, and the numbers are growing rapidly. Over the past decade, major strides have been made in the knowledge and understanding about farm to school program models, implementation methods, evaluation, and policy development. **Farm to school programs** **have been** the focus of significant media attention in this period, **feeding a dynamic movement that is gaining momentum due to its benefits of improving students’ eating habits and farmers’ incomes**. This report showcases innovative farm to school programs from around the country. It draws upon the existing information as well as new research to present a compilation of eight case studies of farm to school programs operating in different regions of the country. Each case study profiles a program’s operations and accomplishments as well as the barriers that have been faced and the tactics used to overcome these challenges. With **case studies** from California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Oregon, the publication **provide**s **a snapshot of the diverse ways in which farm to school is making a difference nationwide** – from a local food-based curriculum in Chicago, to a focus on transportation and distribution in Massachusetts, to utilizing the Department of Defense produce buyers in Michigan, the report highlights strategies that can help farm to school practitioners and advocates of healthy kids and farms build successful programs in their home communities.

#### Farm to school program benefit local farmers – guaranteed market stream

Joshi, Kalb, & Beery, Center for Food & Justice UEPI, Occidental College & Community Food Security Coalition, 06

(Anupama Joshi , Marion Kalb and Moira Beery, GOING LOCAL: Paths to Success For Farm to School Programs, [https://food-hub.org/files/resources/goinglocal[1].pdf](https://food-hub.org/files/resources/goinglocal%5b1%5d.pdf))

How are farmers benefited by farm to school programs? **Farmers can diversify their markets by supplying to local schools. This is especially important when farmers are dependent on limited** commodity or wholesale **markets. Schools represent a steady, reliable demand that helps farmers plan their crop planting, harvesting and marketing more eff ectively**. Limited **research** on existing farm to school programs **has shown that school sales can comprise a signifi cant portion of sales for farmers** who supply to a farm to school program. **Besides direct revenues, farmers are motivated to participate in these programs as it provides an opportunity to contribute to the health and education of children.** The interaction with students, parents and the community often results in additional sales through farmers markets and other avenues.

### Plan Solves Warming

#### Organic agriculture key to solve warming --- takes carbon out of the air, and helps improve the environment

**Ho and Ching**, World renowned geneticist & biophysicist, Director of the Institute of Science in Society, she is co-founder of the International Science Panel on Genetic Modification. Researcher with Third World Network and the Institute of Science in Society (ISIS), **08**

(Dr. Mae-Wan Ho and Lim Li Ching, 2/1/2008.. “Mitigating Climate Change through Organic Agriculture and Localized Food Systems,” Prism Webcast News, http://prismwebcastnews.com/2008/02/01/mitigating-climate-change-through-organic-agriculture-and-localized-food-systems/)

**Sustainable agriculture helps to counteract climate change by restoring soil organic matter content as well as reducing soil erosion** and improving soil physical structure. **Organic soils also have better water-holding capacity, which explains why organic production is much more resistant to climate extremes such as droughts and floods** [31] (Organic Agriculture Enters Mainstream, Organic Yields on Par with Conventional & Ahead during Drought Years, SiS 28), and water conservation and management through agriculture will be an increasingly important part of mitigating climate change. **The evidence for increased carbon sequestration in organic soils seems clear. Organic matter is restored through the addition of manures, compost, mulches and cover crops**. **The Sustainable Agriculture Farming Systems (SAFS) Project at University of California Davis in the United States [32] found that organic carbon content of the soil increased in both organic and low-input systems compared with conventional systems**, with larger pools of stored nutrients. Similarly, a study of 20 commercial farms in California found that organic fields had 28 percent more organic carbon [33]. This was also true in the Rodale Institute trials, where soil carbon levels had increased in the two organic systems after 15 years, but not in the conventional system [34]. After 22 years, the organic farming systems averaged 30 percent higher in organic matter in the soil than the conventional systems [31]. In the longest running agricultural trials on record of more than 160 years, the Broadbalk experiment at Rothamsted Experimental Station, manure-fertilized farming systems were compared with chemical-fertilized farming systems [35]. The manure fertilized systems of oat and forage maize consistently out yielded all the chemically fertilized systems. Soil organic carbon showed an impressive increase from a baseline of just over 0.1 percent N (a marker for organic carbon) at the start of the experiment in 1843 to more than double at 0.28 percent in 2000; whereas those in the unfertilized or chemical-fertilized plots had hardly changed in the same period. There was also more than double the microbial biomass in the manure-fertilized soil compared with the chemical-fertilized soils. **It is estimated that up to 4 tonnes CO2 could be sequestered per hectare of organic soils each year** [36]. On this basis, a fully organic UK could save 68 Mt of CO2 or 10.35 percent of its ghg emissions each year. Similarly, if the United States were to convert all its 65 million hectares of crop lands to organic, it would save 260 Mt CO2 a year [37]. Globally, with 1.5335 billion hectares of crop land [38] fully organic, an estimated **6.134 Gt of CO2 could be sequestered each year, equivalent to more than 11 percent of the global emissions, or the entire share due to agriculture.**

### Climate Change leads to laundry list of impacts

#### Climate change increases all risks – we must mitigate to avoid biodiversity loss, marine collapse, resource wars, global food security, and extreme weather events

**Pachauri & Meyer**, Chair of the IPCC & Head, Technical Support Unit IPCC were the editors for this IPCC report, **15**

(Rajendra K. Pachauri, Leo Meyer, “Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report” <http://epic.awi.de/37530/1/IPCC_AR5_SYR_Final.pdf> IPCC, 2014: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp)

SPM 2.3 Future risks and impacts caused by a changing climate

Climate change willamplify existing risks **and** create new risks for natural and human systems. **Risks are unevenly distributed and are generally greater for disadvantaged people** and communities in countries **at all levels of development**. {2.3}

Risk of **climate-related impacts results from the** **interaction of climate-related hazards** (including hazardous events and trends) **with the vulnerability and exposure of human and natural systems**, **including their ability to adapt**. **Rising** rates and magnitudes of warming **and other changes** in the climate system, accompanied by ocean acidification, **increase the risk of severe,** pervasive and in some cases **irreversible** detrimental **impacts**. Some risks are particularly relevant for individual regions (Figure SPM.8), while others are global. **The overall risks** of future climate change impacts **can be reduced by** limiting the rate and magnitude of climate change, **including ocean acidification.** **The precise levels** of climate change sufficient **to trigger** abrupt and irre**versible change remain uncertain, but the risk associated with** crossing such thresholds increases with rising temperature (medium confidence). For risk assessment, **it is important to evaluate the** widest possible range of impacts, **including low-probability outcomes with large consequences**. {1.5, 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, Box Introduction.1, Box 2.3, Box 2.4}

**A large fraction of species faces** increased extinction risk **due to climate change** during and beyond the 21st century, especially **as climate change interacts with other stressors** (high confidence). Most **plant species cannot naturally shift their geographical ranges sufficiently fast to keep up with current and high projected rates of climate change** in most landscapes; most small mammals and freshwater molluscs will not be able to keep up at the rates projected under RCP4.5 and above in flat landscapes in this century (high confidence). Future risk is indicated to be high by the observation that **natural global climate change at rates lower than current anthropogenic climate change caused significant ecosystem shifts and species extinctions during the past millions of years**. Marine organisms will face progressively lower oxygen levels **and high rates and magnitudes of ocean acidification** (high confidence), **with associated risks exacerbated by rising ocean temperature extremes** (medium confidence). Coral reefs and polar ecosystems are highly vulnerable. Coastal systems and low-lying areas are at risk from sea level rise, which will continue for centuries even if the global mean temperature is stabilized (high confidence). {2.3, 2.4, Figure 2.5}

**Climate change is projected to undermine food security** (Figure SPM.9**). Due to** projected climate change by the mid-21st century and beyond, **global marine species redistribution and marine biodiversity reduction in sensitive regions will** challenge the sustained provision of fisheries **productivity and other ecosystem services** (high confidence). **For wheat, rice and** **maize in tropical and temperate regions**, **climate change without adaptation is projected to negatively impact production** for local temperature increases of 2°C or more above late 20th century levels, although individual locations may benefit (medium confidence). **Global temperature increases of ~4°C or more** 13 above late 20th century levels, **combined with increasing food demand, would pose large risks to** food security globally (high confidence). **Climate change is projected to reduce renewable** surface water and groundwater resources in most dry subtropical regions (robust evidence, high agreement), intensifying competition for water among sectors (limited evidence, medium agreement). {2.3.1, 2.3.2}

Until mid-century, projected **climate change will impact human health mainly by exacerbating health problems that already exist** (very high confidence). Throughout the 21st century, **climate change is expected to lead to** increases in ill-health **in many regions and especially in** developing **countries with low income**, as compared to a baseline without climate change (high confidence). By 2100 for RCP8.5, **the combination of high temperature and humidit**y in some areas for parts of the year **is expected to compromise common human activities**, **including growing food and working outdoors** (high confidence). {2.3.2}

**In urban areas climate change is projected to increase risks for people, assets, economies and ecosystems, including risks from heat stress, storms and extreme precipitation, inland and coastal flooding, landslides, air pollution, drought, water scarcity, sea level rise and storm surges** (very high confidence). **These risks are amplified for those lacking essential** **infrastructure and services** or living in exposed areas. {2.3.2}

**Rural areas are expected to experience major impacts on water availability and supply, food security, infrastructure and agricultural incomes**, including shifts in the production areas of food and non-food crops around the world (high confidence). {2.3.2}

Aggregate economic losses accelerate with increasing temperature (limited evidence, high agreement), but global economic impacts from climate change are currently difficult to estimate. **From a poverty perspective**, climate change impacts are projected to slow down economic growth, **make poverty reduction more difficult**, **further erode food security and prolong** existing and create new poverty traps, the latter particularly in urban areas and emerging hotspots of hunger (medium confidence). International dimensions such as trade and relations among states are also important for understanding the risks of climate change at regional scales. {2.3.2}

**Climate change is projected to increase displacement of people** (medium evidence, high agreement). **Populations that lack the resources for planned migration experience** higher exposure to extreme weather events, **particularly in developing countries with low income**. Climate change can indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts **by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts such as poverty and economic shocks** (medium confidence). {2.3.2}

## Food Injustice Advantage

### Plan needs to be the starting pointing

#### Food justice movements can include broader movements for access and social justice – insuring access to healthy food is a good starting point

Purifoy, J.D. Harvard Law School, Ph.D, Duke University, 14

(Purifoy, Danielle M. "Food policy councils: integrating food justice and environmental justice." Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 24 (2014): 375)

**Central to the purpose of** the environmental justice and **food justice movements** in the United States **is the conclusion, supported by empirical evidence**,96 **that specific populations** within the nation **suffer the brunt of the negative externalities of industry, economic development, and food production, while receiving the smallest share of the** economic, social, and political **benefits** of those activities.97 **Advocates** of both movements **view these results as unjust and anathema to principles of equality and democracy**, and set as their missions the eradication of such disparities.98

The goals of both movements, however, reach beyond their core missions. With regard to environmental justice, Gottlieb and Fisher highlight several so-called parallel movements with which advocates are concerned, including fair access to affordable housing and gainful employment.99 **Food justice activists are** also **affiliated with parallel movements to address immigration reform, labor, gender inequality, and cultural hegemony.**100 Accounting for these related causes, perhaps **the best interpretation** **of** both movements’ **goals is to achieve real improvements in the quality of** the social, economic, and political **lives of historically disenfranchised groups, including low-income and predominantly minority communities.** **Such improvements may be measured in various ways, such as the extent to which people are able to control what goes into their bodies through full disclosure of food inputs and industrial outputs**, maintaining authority over the cultivation and stewardship of ancestral and tribal lands, **or simply having access to** public transportation to reach **healthy food** markets. **Justice** in both movements, therefore, **is not only about equity and access, but also about sovereignty, the power to determine**, regardless of background, **the conditions under which a community lives and the range of healthy choices available** to its members.

To that end, both **movements demand meaningful public participation in policy decisions impacting the quality of life in all communities**.101 Beyond the standard notice and comment procedures common to most government bodies, environmental and **food justice advocates desire a place at the table for the full decision-making process**, from initial policy proposals to implementation.102 Possessing the same vision for how to achieve just policies**, food justice, and environmental justice operate within highly compatible frameworks, which can only be made stronger and more comprehensive if integrated.** As discussed in detail below, **food policy councils are ideal institutions in which to achieve such integration.**

### Plan leads to bigger conversation about the issues

#### Food access can spread to bigger conversations about social awareness

Purifoy, J.D. Harvard Law School, Ph.D, Duke University, 14

(Purifoy, Danielle M. "Food policy councils: integrating food justice and environmental justice." Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 24 (2014): 375)

CONCLUSION

**Food policy councils,** now spread throughout North America—193 councils at the state, local, and regional levels127—**are thriving institutions with collective potential to engender food democracy across the continent**. Further, **many FPCs have already made environmental protection a core part of their mission** and advocacy, making the critical connection between food and ecological sustainability. However, as illustrated by the history of social exclusion and elitism reflected in the mainstream environmental and food sustainability movements, **FPCs that do not also make social justice central to their mission risk reproducing the same race and class inequalities** in their advocacy and policy outcomes. This paper argues that in order **to accomplish** goals of **ecological sustainability, food sustainability, and community food access, FPCs should adopt the principles of the environmental justice and food justice movements.** These parallel movements intersect at three critical points— public health, ecological health, and social justice. **Environmental justice and food justice are perfect allies because their integration creates tremendous opportunities for more comprehensive approaches to structural social problems** in the physical environment and food system. Further, because the tenets of food justice are so dependent upon structural shifts in environmental stewardship in low-income and minority communities, **food justice is a critical component of environmental justice.** Utilizing FPCs as a democratic institutional framework, advocates from both movements can finally integrate at the grass-roots level—where people care most about their food and environment—**building upward towards a more sustainable and just national food system**.

### Racism Growing Now

#### Racial inequality is statistically real – impacts everyday lives

Matthew, Rodrigue, & Reeves, a. Nonresident Senior Fellow - Center for Health Policy – Brookings, b. Brookings Researcher, c. Senior Fellow - Economic Studies Co-Director - Center on Children and Families, 16

(Dayna Bowen Matthew, Edward Rodrigue, and Richard V. Reeves, Time for justice: Tackling race inequalities in health and housing, October 19, 2016, https://www.brookings.edu/research/time-for-justice-tackling-race-inequalities-in-health-and-housing/)

The first decades of the 21st century have, like the many that came before, been difficult for black America, despite the election and re-election of our first black President. There has been progress on some fronts, including narrower gaps in high school graduation rates, declining rates of teen pregnancy, and fewer suicides among black men. But **the median black American will be as just as far behind their white counterpart in 2017 as they were in 2000 in terms of income, wealth, unemployment, earnings, the risk of incarceration, and many measures of health**. In the last couple of decades, **progress toward broader equity for African-Americans has been halting.**

Compared to whites, black Americans face the same risk of unemployment today as in the 1960s. **Between 2007 and 2013, the net wealth of the median black household fell from 10 percent to 8 percent of median white household wealt**h, largely the result of the differential impact of the Great Recession. **In other words, the median white household now has a net wealth 13 times greater than the median black household**. In 2000 the median black household had an income that was 66 percent of the median white household income. In 2015 that figure was 59 percent.

**In terms of housing and health**, the two areas we focus on here, **the race gap** faced by black Americans **remains wide and stubborn**. It is perhaps no surprise that black and white Americans have starkly different views on progress toward racial justice. **Nine in ten blacks say African-Americans have not achieved equality** in this country. **Four in ten are skeptical that they ever will. Yet thirty-eight percent of white Americans think “our country has made the changes needed** to give blacks equal rights with whites.” Among the half of whites that think there is more to do to achieve equality, almost all think that it will be achieved. **The two groups are**, as the Pew Research Center puts it, “**worlds apart**.”

**Many of the barriers** blacks face **are the result of invisible, insidious force of unconscious bias.** **Whether it is water quality in Flint, school quality in Ferguson**, environmental hazards in Dickson, Tennessee, **or** the **inferior health care** that the majority of black patients receive nationwide, **the African-American experience is different, and is allowed to be different, more than would ever be accepted within white communities.** **Racial injustice and inequality is a problem** not just for poor and low-income blacks, but for moderate-income blacks as well, as we will show. **Racism, even if unintentional, determines where, how, and how well black people live, relative to other groups in America.** For most African-Americans, in addition to the tangible inequalities captured in statistics, the intangible experience of **being black in America is nothing like the experience of being a white person. Racial injustice lies not only in hard facts, but also in “the thick of everyday life**.”[1]

### Food Justice Solves Poverty

#### Food insecurity locks people into a cycle of poverty – conclusive studies that school food access can solve

Marcus, Reuters Health Reporter, 10 (Adam Marcus, School lunch programs might break poverty cycle, Nov 23, 2010, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-school-lunch-idUSTRE6AM5PE20101123>)

**Teens who live in households where food is scarce suffer academically**, **but a new study has found that government programs to provide meals** in schools **can reverse this effect**. According to the researchers, the findings suggest that school **programs aimed at reducing** so-called **food insecurity can break an insidious cycle of poverty**: **poor children go hungry, get bad grades, don't go on to college and fail** to rise out of their socioeconomic status -- raising children whose lives follow the same unfortunate narrative. "**Food insecurity is more problematic** in the long term **if it occurs prior to adolescence**, but it doesn't mean that adolescents are more resilient than younger children," **said** study leader Christelle **Roustit**, **of** the Research Group on **the Social Determinants of Health and Healthcare,** in Paris, France. The researchers reported their findings in the medical journal Pediatrics. **The severe recession has taken a toll on food security**. In the United States, a recent report by the Department of Agriculture found that **nearly 15% of American households faced food insecurity at some point in 2009, the highest level since officials began tracking the measure in 1995**. **Food insecurity in childhood is thought to undercut scholastic achievement** in at least two ways**. It deprives the body of nutrients necessary for proper mental and physical development**, **and it creates an atmosphere of stress and uncertainty that saps a kid's desire to attend school and to perform well.** In the new study, Roustit and her colleagues analyzed questionnaires given to 2,346 public high school students in Quebec, Canada, along with nearly 2,000 of their parents. The surveys asked about issues of school performance and socioeconomic status and included several questions addressing food security at home. These included whether a lack of money prevented the family from eating enough, or from buying a sufficient variety of foods. Just over 11 percent of teens in the study experienced food insecurity at home, according to the researchers. Of those, two-thirds attended schools that offered free or low-cost breakfast, lunch or snacks, allowing the researchers to look for an effect of the meals program on academic performance. The study revealed that **food insecurity was strongly associated with problems in school**. However, **children with food insecurity at home performed significantly better academically if their school offered meal assistance. They were much less likely to be held back** a year, **to score badly in language testing or to rate their overall academic performance as poor**. Although the data come from the 1990s, Roustit said a new survey of Quebec adolescents is now in progress. "We would be able to compare the results of 1999 to 2009 in few years," she said. Nicola **Edwards, a** dietician and **food policy expert at California Food Policy Advocates**, an Oakland-based nonprofit**, said the results of the study are unsurprising**. **If children are hungry they cannot learn,** Edwards said. "**There is a direct correlation between food insecurity and academic performance,"** she said. In the United States, teachers and school administrators report that **children who take advantage of food** **assistance programs** in schools **have improved behavior, fewer absences and better test scores**, Edwards added. Under the federal Child Nutrition Act, more than 31 million American school children receive free or inexpensive lunches through the National School Lunch Program. Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the poverty level ($28,665 for a family of four) are eligible for free meals. Those with incomes between 130 percent and 185 percent of the poverty level ($40,793 for a family of four) are eligible to receive lunch for a cost of no more than 40 cents. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National School Lunch Program cost $9.8 billion in 2009. A study of this program that was published earlier this year supports the Canadian findings. Dr. Peter **Hinrichs at Georgetown** University in Washington DC **reported** in the Journal of Policy Analysis and Management **that for children who participate** in the National School Lunch Program, "**the effects on educational attainment are sizable**."

### Food Justice Solves Poverty

#### Food access is key to broader questions of social justice – not acting maintains a system of economic inequality and exploitation

Purifoy, J.D. Harvard Law School, Ph.D, Duke University, 14

(Purifoy, Danielle M. "Food policy councils: integrating food justice and environmental justice." Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 24 (2014): 375)

“Food equity” and the food system

The food system is complex. In their book, Food Justice, Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi offer that “the food system is best described as the entire set of activities and relationships that make up the various food pathways from seed to table and influence the ‘how and why and what we eat,’” purposefully contemplating it broadly as to encompass its complexity.2 Fleshing out this definition, **the food system encompasses the social, economic, and political structures within which food is grown**, processed, distributed, marketed, retailed, consumed, and disposed.

The prevailing industrial food system perpetuates environmental degradation, implicates human health, and contributes to economic inequality. The troubling consequences of the dominant food system are thus wide-ranging. **Many current agricultural practices exploit natural resources like water, depend on pesticides and other petrochemical inputs, emit greenhouse gases, and** threaten biodiversity. Despite **the United States’** status as one of the wealthiest nations in the world, **nearly 50 million people live in households that face food insecurity or poor access to food**.3 **In line with the prevalence of hunger is the prevalence of diet-related diseases** such as diabetes and heart disease, as well as vast disparities in access to healthy food. Farm laborers and food chain workers are not only often food insecure, due to low wages and lack of labor protection, but also face occupational safety hazards. **Obstacles to full participation by marginalized communities in our nation’s massive food business sector also exist**, with a greater need for meaningful opportunities for people of color to own and operate businesses, from farms to food retail. Some have argued that these ill effects are undergirded by the institutions and policies that shape the food system.4

Over the past few decades, **social movements have galvanized in reaction to this dominant food regime**, recognizing the food-related challenges and harms faced by the world’s population as a whole as well as the inequities produced by the food system and the populations it has disproportionately burdened. The mainstream “food movement”—a hardto-define increase in awareness of the food system and its shortcomings—has pushed the notion of “good food” into the public sphere and popular discourse. (Building on this awareness, the Global Food Initiative launched the UC Food Observer, a blog that offers news, essays, and an interview series on food policy, nutrition, and agriculture topics.5 ) In the same way the environmental justice movement arose in reaction to mainstream environmentalism **to recognize the inequitable distribution of** both **environmental harms and** environmental **benefits, the food justice movement aims to recognize and shrink these disparities as they persist in the food system**. **Of particular interest are the food system’s effects on marginalized communities and the critical role for those communities in driving corrective policymaking**.6 Around the world, **the food sovereignty movement has focused on the role of self-determination**, especially for indigenous and peasant populations, in an increasingly global food system in which it is harder to realize their right to define their own food and agriculture systems.