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This paper examines how two sites of adult learning in the food movement create educational alternatives to the dominant U.S. food system. It further examines how these pedagogies challenge racialised, classed and gendered ideologies and practices in their aims, curricular content, and publically documented educational processes. The first case is Growing Power, an urban farm which embraces small scale capitalism and vocational education as an end toward community food security, social and ecological justice, and anti-racist education. The second case, Tsyunhehkwa^n, is the ‘integrated community food system’ of the Oneida Nation in rural Wisconsin, centred on cultural decolonisation through the growing and eating of traditional Oneida foods. In both these projects, there are strong possibilities to teach a critical, social justice alternative to white, middle class norms and practices of food production and consumption.
Introduction

This study contributes to an emerging and vibrant scholarship on the forms, processes and sites of public pedagogy (Sandlin, Wright & Clark 2011). This body of work intersects with a longer tradition of research on adult learning in social movements, including the environmental movement (Clover 2004; Foley 1999; Flowers & Chodkiewicz 2009; Ollis 2008; Walter 2007). In general, public pedagogy scholarship has tended to focus on critiques of hegemonic structures of informal education and learning in popular culture, following traditions of critical pedagogy (Sandlin, O’Malley & Burdick 2011). However, research on disruptions of dominant state and corporate ideologies through public pedagogies such as culture jamming (Sandlin 2010), voluntary simplicity (Sandlin & Walther 2009) and critical shopping (Jubas 2011) is also a part of this scholarship. Research in social movement learning, although necessarily including a critique of dominant ideologies and social structures, has focused more on the potential of adult learning and education for social change. To date, however, public pedagogy and social movement learning in the food movement has received relatively little attention, with notable exceptions (Flowers & Swan 2011; Sumner 2008).

The environmental movement, and more recently, the food movement, have been criticised in feminist scholarship as repositories of male, middle class norms, practices and oppressive gender relations. In the food movement, calls to return to more holistic, organic and local food production, for example, may simply mean additional labour for women, and family meals may be sites of violence against women, both symbolically and materially (DeVault 1991; Lupton 1996). More recently, scholars in the food movement have also begun to critique the structures and relations of social class, whiteness and power expressed in alternative food practices, pedagogies, spaces and community institutions in the food movement.
(Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006, 2007). Among others, Rachel Slocum (2006: 337) argues for the importance of understanding and acknowledging the history of racism, colonialism, and class and gender oppression underlying the food system in attempts to enact local alternatives to it:

It may be useful for community food advocates to actively consider that the US food system was built on a foundation of genocide, slavery and layers of racist institutions that have dispossessed racialized groups of cultural pride, land and wealth, in gender- and class-specific ways. It survives, for instance, through the work of people of color who serve, disproportionately, in the hazardous work of farm labor and food processing. Institutionalized racism intersecting with processes of colonialism, welfare ideology and gender and class oppression is also visible in the areas of food insecurity, disease and excess death.

In the politics and activism of Indigenous scholars in North America and beyond, strong themes of decolonisation, land sovereignty, self-determination, cultural revival and indigenous pedagogies in relation to food are also strongly voiced (Grande 2004; LaDuke 2005). Recently, Indigenous scholars have begun to take up the thorny political question of feminisms and Indigenous thought, activism and culture as well (Green 2007; Suzak et. al. 2010), with strong implications for the study of colonialism, gender oppression, class and race in the food movement.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how in two sites of public pedagogy in the U.S. food movement there are possibilities for ‘activists’ to disrupt, contest and create alternatives to dominant ideologies and practices in the food system, and to examine how these pedagogies do or do not address racialised, classed and gendered ideologies and practices in the food movement. The paper describes the aims, curricular content, and their publically documented educational processes. Other research on public pedagogy in social movement sites suggests that adults may ‘engage
in critically transformative learning on their own’, focusing more on ‘noncognitive and embodied relations of learning...without the help of an intervening adult educator and without critical, rational dialogue’ (Sandlin, Wright & Clark 2011: 11). Thus, the paper looks for evidence of a public pedagogy promoting transformative learning in the two sites under study as well.

Methodology

The study sites, located in the state of Wisconsin, U.S., illustrate diverse public pedagogies embracing alternative ideologies and material practices of food production and consumption, social justice, cultural revival, and human health. The first case, that of Growing Power, is an urban farm in an impoverished African American neighborhood in the city of Milwaukee. This case embraces small-scale capitalism and vocational education as an end toward food security, multicultural leadership, social and ecological justice and anti-racist pedagogy. The second case, Tsyunhekw^, is the ‘integrated community food system’ of the Oneida Nation in rural northeastern Wisconsin. It centres on recovering, producing, processing and promoting healthy, traditional Oneida foods; that is, on decolonising local food and life systems.

Data for the study was collected in brief site visits, documents (including newsletters, annual reports, conference programs, and brochures) and an exhaustive internet search using Google -Web, -Video and -News search engines. This form of digital research is increasingly prevalent in adult education research (e.g. Irving & English 2011; McGregor & Price 2010). Data were analysed using ethnographic content analysis (Altheide et. al. 2008) in a two-stage process for analysing digital websites and media as public pedagogy (Kelly 2011). In the first phase, all data were reviewed for each case, and a composite case ‘portrait’ developed; in the second phase, characteristic elements for each case were identified, and findings
solidified in a second review of data for each case. Internet sites used for the study included each initiative’s webpages (for Growing Power almost 50; for Oneida over 150), social media (both have Facebook and Twitter sites), blogs, independent news media accounts (67 articles for Growing Power, 28 for Oneida), and in the case of Growing Power, 54 videos.

The study examines only the claims made by each case in their publically available documents, and thus does not reveal how and what learners in these sites actually experience and learn, except anecdotally. The study likewise does not directly address how educators in these settings, as ‘the critical link between hegemonic popular culture and critical awareness of that culture as hegemonic’, might help to ‘foster critical dialogue and help adult learners understand the power and politics at work within popular culture’ (Sandlin, Wright & Clark 2011: 10). Thus, in one sense, this study, like many others preceding it (Sandlin, O’Malley & Burdick 2011: 359), is an analysis of an ‘imagined public pedagogy’, as this pedagogy is evident in the documents of each case. In this regard, the study provides a good starting point for further empirical field research on adult learners and learning in these and other informal pedagogical sites within the food movement.

Community-based capitalism, food production and social justice

The city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin’s claim to fame has been its German immigrant breweries (Miller, Schlitz, Pabst), industrial manufacturing, and a radical political history in which ‘Sewer Socialists’ elected three Socialist mayors from 1910 to 1960. Today, Milwaukee is a city of about 600,000 people surrounded by another 1 million people in its suburbs, which have grown dramatically since the 1960s, in part as a consequence of ‘white flight’ from the city proper. Like other cities in the Midwestern Rust Belt, Milwaukee suffered from a downturn in manufacturing in the late 1960s,
in which thousands of once well-paid industrial workers found themselves slipping out of the middle class and into the low wage service and healthcare sectors. Endemic poverty began to characterise many neighbourhoods of the urban core, including those which were predominantly African American (City of Milwaukee 2012a). The city is today deeply divided by race and class both geographically and economically: according to one recent study, Milwaukee is in fact the most racially segregated city in the U.S., with urban blacks disproportionately suffering the ill effects of job and tax base losses to the prosperous white suburbs (Denvir 2011).

Together with an enduring legacy of racial inequality, Milwaukee has also historically been the site of grassroots movements for peace and social justice, environmentalism, and civil rights, of innovations in community development, and of numerous attempts to bridge its economic and racial divides. In the last decade, a food and sustainability movement in the city has grown in leaps and bounds, with strong roots in impoverished African American communities, among others (Broadway 2009; City of Milwaukee 2012b). One of the most long-standing and well-known of these local food security initiatives is *Growing Power*, an integrated urban farm and non-profit training centre established by African America entrepreneur, farmer and community leader, Will Allen.

A former professional basketball player and corporate businessman, Allen has for the last twenty years built a community-based urban farming system on two acres of land situated directly in the midst of one of Milwaukee’s poorest African American neighbourhoods, close by to the city’s largest public housing project. As a non-profit organization and land trust, the mission of *Growing Power* (2012a) is ‘supporting people from diverse backgrounds, and the environments in which they live, by helping to provide equal access to healthy, high-quality, safe and affordable food for people in all communities’. The *Growing Power* (2012b) farm site houses
20,000 plants and vegetables, 100,000 fish (tilapia, perch, blue gill), chickens, goats, ducks, rabbits and bees, and supplies cheap organic food to some 10,000 people. Growing Power makes 400 ‘mobile grocery store’ deliveries of ‘safe, healthy and affordable produce’ to local pick-up points, manages a cooperative network of small family farmers practicing sustainable farming, supplies fresh produce to some 25-40,000 Milwaukee Public School students, is involved in numerous community and school garden initiatives, donates produce to local food pantries, and operates two farmers markets in poor neighborhoods which otherwise have difficult access to healthy food. The organization has taught and employed hundreds of local African American youth and others in urban agriculture, building their professional skills and food knowledge, and enabling them to pursue new ways of attaining good health.

Growing Power’s educational aims are enacted in part in its focus on developing community capacity for sustainable urban agriculture. The farm is envisioned as an ‘educational lab’ and ‘Community Food Center and Training Facility’; it is a ‘place to try new things, learn what we do not know, and improve on what we do. We believe that farming should be simple and accessible to all people, so we create methods for growing and livestock management that can be replicated in every neighborhood, from Detroit, Michigan to Ghana, Africa’ (Growing Power 2012c). To this end, the farm offers daily tours, numerous hands-on workshops on composting, aquaponics, solar energy and animal husbandry, long-term (five month) training programs on community food systems, 3-month and year-long apprenticeships, one year vocational training for ‘Food Systems Specialists’, service learning and community volunteer opportunities, accredited in-service training for school teachers, and year-round youth leadership training. Regular community feasts and celebrations at the farm are a critical part of food education and community building as well. Off-site, Growing Power teaches about community food systems within a network of school and community gardens,
urban farms and some 16 ‘Regional Outreach Training Centers’ around the U.S. (Growing Power 2012d).

As part of its mission to promote progressive social change in the food movement, and racial and economic equality for poor people of colour, in particular, Growing Power has established the Growing Food and Justice for All Initiative (GFJI). As leader Will Allen notes:

‘The people hit hardest by the current food system are usually people of color – but even a decade ago, farming carried a stigma in these communities. There were memories of sharecropping, like in my own family. Today, folks are jumping onto the “good food” revolution, and it’s crucial they see faces that look like their own’ (quoted in Kaufman 2010: 17). The mission of GFJI is thus both to encourage the participation of people of colour in the food movement and to address racism and social injustice on a broad scale: GFJI is ‘an initiative aimed at dismantling racism and empowering low-income and communities of color through sustainable and local agriculture’ (Growing Power 2012e).

GFJI’s aims are accomplished in the building of a national anti-racism network through a blog, newsletter, website, and social networking, provision of financial and educational support for community initiatives to dismantle racism, policy activism, and training of community-based anti-racism trainers (Growing Power 2012e). Above all else, however, is GFJI’s annual conference, and strong presence at Growing Power’s (2012f) urban farming conferences. The ‘Intensive Leadership Facilitation Training’ (ILFT) immediately before the 4th annual GFJI Conference in 2011, for example, was ‘designed to build a community of leaders and provide intensive training and dialogue for participants to facilitate anti-racist food justice trainings in their own regions/communities’ (GFJI 2011: 7). During the ILFT training, participants engaged in ‘farming activities (at Growing Power’s farm site) that explore how to build a just food system, identify barriers to achieving justice and equity, historical challenges and community building’ (ibid: 7). They further
discussed ‘examples of institutional and structural racism and how it operates..., practical applications of facilitating change and becoming a change agent’, and individual roles and processes of anti-racism work, including strategies and action plans (ibid: 7). In general, GFJI educational initiatives address the intersectionality of various oppressions, including racism, class, homophobia and sexism. At the September 2012 Growing Power Conference (upward of 3,000 participants expected), for instance, the GFJI (2012) Track includes topics such as Race and Food; LGBTQ People in the Food Movement; Environmental Injustice; Indigenous Rights: Global Movement, Survival and Cultural Preservation; Occupy the Food System: Action, Organize and Protest; Practical Food Justice with Hands on Tools and Activities to Take to Your Community; and Community Based Policy.

No. 1: Milwaukee
Food production and the recovery of Indigenous knowledge and identity

Formerly occupying some 6 million acres of land in New York State, the Oneida People now living in Wisconsin were, before they were dispossessed of their lands, slash and burn agriculturalists, who rotated crops of corn, squash and beans through swidden fields, hunted and ‘farmed’ deer, caught fish and collected wild foods (Loew 2001: 100-102). In the late 1800s, the Oneida were forced off their New York lands by hostile white settlers and unscrupulous land speculators. In the early 1800s, they migrated to Green Bay, Wisconsin and purchased a small strip of land from the Menominee Nation, settling along the Fox River to practice sedentary agriculture (Oneida Tribe 2012a). In 1838, the Nation was allotted 65,430 acres (263 km2) of land, but in a familiar history of dispossession, by 1999, most of this land was in private hands (Loew 2001). However, by 2009, with buy-back of traditional lands by tribal government, the Oneida Nation regained sovereignty over 22,398 acres (90 km2) of their original reserved lands (Griffin 2009). Today, there are 16,567
Oneida people in Wisconsin, about 6,000 of whom live on or near the Oneida reservation (WSTI 2011).

From 1893 to 1920, Oneida children, like many other Native Americans, were subject to forced assimilation policies in Indian boarding schools. In these schools (some as far away as Pennsylvania and Virginia), Oneida children were punished if they spoke their native language or practiced cultural rituals, were clad in drab and proper Victorian era clothes, had their hair cut short, were assigned foreign names, fed foreign foods, and taught a curriculum comprised of half academic training and half menial, and often gruelling, manual labour (Loew 2001). The ‘de-culturalising’ aim of these schools, whereby native children were forcibly removed from their homes to rid them of their Indigenous culture, was similar to assimilationist policies across the U.S., Canada, Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand (Smith 2009). For the Oneida people, a cultural renaissance of sorts began in the Red Power movement of the 1960s and 1970s in urban Milwaukee (Loew 2001). By the 1980s, the Oneida were among the first Indian tribes to sign a gambling agreement with the State of Wisconsin, and subsequently opened a thriving casino, hotel, restaurant and convention centre complex. Funds generated were then invested on Oneida lands in a ‘textbook example’ of community development and cultural revival: this included land buy-backs, establishment of a healthcare clinic, housing, a court and police system, social welfare programs, a library, an early childhood program, elder care, higher education scholarships, a tribal school system, and an integrated community food system (Loew 2001; Oneida Tribe 2012b).

As one strand of Oneida cultural revival and education, the Oneida Nation elementary school was established in 1994. Together with the Oneida secondary school, the school system now enrolls over 400 students (WSTI 2011), and offers a bilingual and bicultural curriculum based on traditional Oneida culture, comprising Oneida
language, music, history, Indigenous knowledge and customary traditions. Included in this education is the elementary school’s Three Sisters Garden (corn, squash, beans), and medicinal and herb gardens. Here, children grow Indigenous foods, learn Oneida food stories and dances, harvest crops and learn to cook and present a community feast of traditional foods (Griffin 2009; Vasquez 2011). As a second major strand in recovering and promoting traditional culture, since 1994, the Oneida Nation has developed the ‘Oneida Community Integrated Food Systems’ comprised of an 83 acre certified organic farm, a 40 acre apple orchard (4,000 trees), a cannery, greenhouses, small-scale aquaponics, a food pantry, health centre, farmers market, a museum, a retail store selling traditional foods, and a youth program (Oneida Tribe 2012c). Within this food system, the Tsyunhehk^w^ ‘life sustenance’) program is a ‘culturally and community based agricultural program for the Oneida Nation’ whose aim is to play ‘a pivotal role in the reintroduction of high quality, organically grown foods that will ensure a healthier and more fulfilling life for the On^yote?aka (Oneida), and (be) the facilitator of positive dietary and nutritional change’ (Ibid.). The three major components of the system are agriculture, the cannery and retail sales.

Jeff Metoxen (2005), manager of Tsyunhehk^w^, writes about the reason why traditional agricultural and food processing are being recovered, adapted and taught to community members and others:

It is our On^yote?aka (Oneida) Cultural Belief that when the humans were created, shukwaya?tisu (Creator) instructed them that all that was needed for a good life was readily available to them. They would want for nothing; there was water, food, medicines – everything needed to sustain them. All that was asked of the humans was to gather what was provided and give thanks... Over time, we failed to provide this recognition and ignored our responsibilities...the Three Sisters were going to leave this world if the people continued in this way. The people recognized they had failed and began again to honor the Three Sisters in their
cere monies...We continue today in honoring all of creation, and we recognize the Three Sisters in our ceremonies...As we care for the Three Sisters, we continue to learn how to accomplish this, and share that knowledge. Caring for the White Corn goes hand in hand with caring for and respecting our natural environment and all that it provides in return. It is our job to respect all that the Creator has offered, and we look at food as the natural medicines and health provided for us by the Creator.

Central to these teachings is the recovery of Indigenous knowledge of the Three Sisters (corn, squash, beans), and in particular, the revival of Oneida varieties of White Corn, a traditional protein-rich variety of corn at the heart of the Oneida diet, culture, cosmology, health and agriculture. Teachings in the agricultural component of Tsyunhehw^ are offered to the community in hands-on workshops on growing of organic heirloom White Corn, creating a Three Sisters Garden, and growing traditional herbs, berries and vegetables. In the revival of traditional agricultural knowledge, visits back to Oneida relations living in New York and Canada are also important (Vasquez 2011). In fact, the original White Corn seeds now planted on-site in Wisconsin were obtained from the Oneida Nation in New York in 1992 (Metoxen 2005).

Another source of traditional knowledge and education is The Oneida Museum: it explains the history of White Corn, the Three Sisters, the Green Corn Story, cycle of ceremonies, the Thanksgiving Address, women and men’s traditional roles, the longhouse, and Oneida language, music, symbolism, history and art. In the fall of the year, the annual Tsyunhehw^ Harvest and Husking Bee serves as a further pedagogical site where Oneida people ‘share the knowledge of snapping, husking and braiding our White Corn. With community support the corn is hand harvested and braided to dry in the Oneida tradition’ (p. 4). Elders and historical records are consulted to learn more about ‘traditional ways to care for the crops, land, and the animals’ and much knowledge is gained as well
through trial and error (Metoxen 2005: 4; Vasquez 2011). At the Tsyunhehkwa Cannery, workshops are regularly presented on how to make culturally significant White Corn foods like corn soup, corn bread, corn meal, flour and dehydrated corn as well as canning and preservation of locally grown fruits and vegetables (Oneida Tribe 2012d). Finally, educational aims of Tsyunhehkwa are put into practice in the Oneida Tsyunhehkwa Retail Store, which sells and teaches about a wide range of traditional medicinal herbs and oils, White Corn products (from the Cannery), wild rice and herbal teas (Oneida Tribe 2012e). In this effort, the store runs an interactive Facebook information and advice blog, holds an annual open house, and offers a Brown Bag lunch series, with regular workshops on holistic and traditional Oneida medicine.

Discussion

Both of the community initiatives presented above appear to be rich pedagogical sites in the food movement. Each aims to convey a particular oppositional knowledge, practice, ideology and ethic of local, sustainable food production and consumption. In examining their public pedagogy (i.e., the documentation found in their websites, reports, newsletters, blogs and other public media such as videos and news accounts), it is evident that these sites provide an educational curriculum which could be used to foster grassroots, oppositional adult learning – in workshops, demonstrations, hands-on experience, cultural rituals, ceremonies and feasts, experimentation, and the sharing of local and indigenous knowledge in stories and community dialogue.

The two cases present an educational curriculum which is in part about learning, re-learning and re-valuing traditional foodwork – including growing, preparing, processing and harvesting food, but also eating food: as re-envisioned practices, these are in fact pedagogical acts. This pedagogy then helps not only to undo the
legacies of racism, colonialism and dispossession and the whiteness’ upon which the US food system is built (Slocum 2006), but also to establish a more just system of food security, cultural identity and health for racialised groups such the Oneida and marginalised African American urban youth. Part of the intent of organizing the many shared meals, rituals and food ceremonies in the life of Tsyunhehkw (e.g. the Oneida Harvest and Husking Bee), for example, is to teach a common Oneida identity through the act of preparing and eating traditional foods. This sort of learning, as it is described by the Oneida organizers and public descriptions of Tsyunhehkw, is partly about the recovery of lost knowledge and cultural practices, but is also about embodied, relational and spiritual learning alongside others in the community; it is means of reviving collective Oneida identity through food.

The teaching and learning which takes place through Tsyunhehkw might thus be understood as a decolonising, political act of popular education, in which not only cultural revival, but also food and land sovereignty, social justice, and critical place-based education meet at a particular juncture of adult learning the food movement. The connection of food and land as a source of identity, sustenance and collective history is particularly important in the larger project of re-possessing dispossessed territories, place and culture. Part of the history of colonisation of Native American peoples was to take away both native lands and the native foods which flourished upon these lands. As close as a century ago, most American Indian Nations produced almost all their own food; today they typically produce less than 20% (HTE 2009: 19). Native American reservations, like the urban inner city, are often food deserts, a long car ride from the nearest supermarkets and sources of healthy food. Partly as a result of their reliance on imported, highly processed industrial foods, many Native communities suffer high rates of diabetes, heart disease and obesity. These diseases are enduring legacies of land dispossession, de-culturalisation through boarding schools, and the concomitant
loss of cultural, agricultural, spiritual and ancestral knowledge (LaDuke 2005; McGregor 2004). In overcoming the ill effects of colonialism through *Tsyunhehkw*, Oneida youth and adults may discover their history and culture, for example, in the act of gardening the Three Sisters, learning to braid and hang White Corn for drying, participating in Oneida rituals and ceremonies of planting, growth and thanksgiving, or simply listening as community elders recount the Oneida Creation Story or equally, the traumas and violence of boarding schools. This learning in *Tsyunhehkw* clearly involves more than just cultural learning: it is also political education, and potentially transformative.

In *Growing Power*, like Oneida’s *Tsyunhehkw*, there are numerous community meals and events as part of the public pedagogy; however, unlike *Tsyunhehkw*, these farm meals often bring together people of different class, racial and ethnic backgrounds to prepare, eat and celebrate the farm’s food, which they have collectively helped to grow. In the racially and class-divided City of Milwaukee, these meals can represent a political act: when local African American people in a poor ‘black’ neighbourhood work alongside, sit down to eat a meal, and talk together with middle class people from the city’s nearby ‘white’ Eastside neighbourhood, the process can be transformative for both. That is, it may involve a realisation of shared humanity, but also better understandings of relations of power, white privilege and difference across race, class and culture, and perhaps even promote a shared commitment to political activism for change. On the other hand, there is also the possibility that ‘white’ people dining with ‘black’ people may be (unwittingly) engaging in the cultural politics of ‘eating the other’, in an act of cultural commodification and appropriation (hooks 1992). As bell hooks (1992: 21) tells us, in this form of cross-cultural consumption, ‘ethnicity becomes spice, seasoning that can liven up the dull dish that is mainstream white culture’. Along these lines, Wisconsin native Lisa Heldke (2001: 78), for example, writes of her ‘adventures’ in ‘cultural food colonialism’ as
she sampled a diversity of foods at the ‘ethnic’ restaurants of Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul: ‘I was motivated by a deep desire to have contact with and somehow to own an experience of an Exotic Other to make myself more interesting’. The political economy of urban space, food, race and poverty is likewise an important consideration in understanding the potential for cross-cultural learning in Growing Power. Sharon Zukin (2005), for instance, examines how a history of ‘shopping for ethnicity’ across spatial barriers of class and ethnicity in New York City has led to urban gentrification, forcing African American, Latino, Caribbean and other minority and working class residents out of their own neighbourhoods. Thus the very revival of a neighbourhood through the efforts of organizations like Growing Power might in fact sow the seeds of its later spatial consumption by wealthier, ‘whiter’ outsiders. How these issues are addressed in the public pedagogy of social justice and anti-racism in Growing Power is an important question for further research.

Since Growing Power’s educational practices are centred symbolically and materially on empowering marginalised people of colour, and not primarily in the (‘white’) alternative food movement, they are, however, well-positioned to address the racist and class foundations of the U.S. food system, and the likelihood of further ‘colonial’ abuse. To this end, Growing Power offers a curriculum of safe, skilled, and productive agricultural labour and education for African American and other youth, promotes food security, sustainability and social justice in the poor, racialised communities in which it operates, and directly addresses sustainability, racism and social justice in its public pedagogy. Unlike much of the north American food movement, Growing Power is not centred on the norms, people and food practices of middle class ‘whiteness’ (Guthman 2008; Slocum 2006); but instead proposes educational alternatives to these. In this, Growing Power, and above all, its Growing Food and Justice for All Initiative, join other efforts attesting to the power of anti-racist educative activism in the food movement, such as Mo’ Betta Foods
in Oakland, California, Food from the Hood in Los Angeles, and Just Foods in New York (Guthman 2008: 394). As such, *Growing Power* and these other social justice initiatives appear to embody a space and pedagogy of hope rather than white, middle class privilege in the food movement.

From this study, it is not clear how gender roles and relations play out in the public pedagogy of either *Growing Power* or *Tsyunhehkʷ*, although these are important questions for research on public pedagogy in the food movement. What, for example, is gender division of labour in the growing of food, the processing, preparation and serving of food, the organizational and productive decisions, the distribution of income and benefits? How might these two cases of public pedagogy be oppressive to women, or alternately, a source of increased capabilities and freedom? Does a return to traditional food cropping, harvest and preparation in *Tsyunhehkʷ* mean an intensification of gender roles, an increase in women’s work and a decrease in power, for example? Or is the very shape of this feminist analysis of foodwork simply a further expression of ‘whitestream’ Western colonialism; a misunderstanding of the many complex and diverse relations of gender in indigenous societies, some of which hold women and two-spirited people in positions of great reverence and power (Grande 2004; St. Denis 2007)? These are also excellent questions for further research.

**Conclusion**

It is evident from this study that *Tsyunhehkʷ* and *Growing Power* act as sites of public pedagogy which disrupt and create educational alternatives to dominant racialised and classed ideologies and practices in the U.S. food system. As such, they contribute to more critical, socially aware conceptualizations and practices of production, distribution and consumption in the food movement, as it moves away from its white, middle class foundations toward more broadly inclusive incarnations. These pedagogies are cognizant
of historical legacies of racism, colonialism and class oppression and work to overcome them. By contrast, it is not clear how they take up an understanding of gender oppression in their educational work. In both cases, the importance of informal and transformative adult learning is evident in their aims, curriculum and educational processes. How and where this learning occurs in practice, and how it might be encouraged by adult educators; that is, how these sites mobilise people to social action, who is mobilised, and with what results, is fertile ground for further research, both in these and other sites of public pedagogy in the food movement.

Note: Many thanks to anonymous reviewers and to editors Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan for their critical comments and suggestions on several drafts of this paper, particularly in relation to theorising sexism and racism in the food movement.
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