

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Sites of learning: Exploring political ecologies and visceral pedagogies of surplus food redistribution in the UK
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/25754/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318819249
Date	2019
Citation	Spring, Charlotte, Adams, Mags and Hardman, Michael (2019) Sites of learning: Exploring political ecologies and visceral pedagogies of surplus food redistribution in the UK. <i>Policy Futures in Education</i> , 17 (7). pp. 844-861. ISSN 1478-2103
Creators	Spring, Charlotte, Adams, Mags and Hardman, Michael

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318819249>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>



Sites of learning: exploring political ecologies and visceral pedagogies of surplus food redistribution in the UK

Journal:	<i>Policy Futures in Education</i>
Manuscript ID	PFIE-17-0160.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue: Eating in the anthropocene: Learning the practice and ethics of food politics
Keywords:	food waste, food insecurity, food access, surplus food redistribution, visceral pedagogies, political ecology of the body
Abstract:	<p>Drawing on ethnographic research with organisations redistributing food waste, this paper explores potentials for political and ethical learning by comparing different approaches to food handling and teaching. Food acts as instigator and tool for learning about ecological impacts, wellbeing, food journeys, health, and pleasure. Re-learning wasted food challenges accusations of its stigmatising potential while attempting to address serious material issues of food insecurity and community food access. Taking seriously the charge that 'community-level' approaches might depoliticise and individualise food distribution at the expense of structural critique and action, these pragmatic and polysemic enrolments of food waste can nevertheless embody a teleology of change, through changing practices of food handling and fostering critical understandings of food system issues. While acknowledging the spatial, temporal and technological mediators of foodstuff's journey between bin and mouth, attention is paid to the sensorial, embodied, and affective means by which the food/waste distinction is known and taught/learned. A 'political ecology of the body' framework is used to explore the 'visceral realm' of food access as always situated in learners' diverse former experiences. These visceral pedagogies of knowing food sit alongside the power dynamics of regulatory food governance in the form of, for example, expiry-date labels. In short, these practices, albeit rooted in environmentally damaging and unequally-distributed foodscapes requiring systemic transformation, can nevertheless foster more vibrant sympathies between people and food, more care-ful connections between learners and their food futures.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 **Title: Sites of learning: exploring political ecologies and visceral pedagogies of**
3 **surplus food redistribution in the UK**

4
5 **Abstract**

6 Drawing on ethnographic research with organisations redistributing wasted food, this
7 paper explores potentials for political and ethical learning by comparing different
8 approaches to food handling and teaching. Food acts as instigator and tool for
9 learning about ecological impacts, wellbeing, provenance, health, and pleasure. Re-
10 learning wasted food challenges accusations of its stigmatising potential while
11 attempting to address serious material issues of food insecurity and community food
12 access. Taking seriously the charge that ‘community-level’ approaches might
13 depoliticise and individualise food distribution at the expense of structural critique
14 and action, these pragmatic and polysemic enrolments of food waste can nevertheless
15 embody a teleology of change, through changing practices of food handling and
16 fostering critical understandings of food system issues. While acknowledging the
17 spatial, temporal and technological mediators of food’s journey from bin towards
18 mouth, attention is paid to the sensorial, embodied, and affective means by which the
19 food/waste distinction is known and taught/learned. A ‘political ecology of the body’
20 framework is used to explore the ‘visceral realm’ of food access as always part-
21 situated in learners’ diverse foodscapes. These visceral pedagogies of knowing food
22 sit alongside the power dynamics of regulatory food governance in the form of, for
23 example, expiry-date labels. In short, these practices, albeit rooted in environmentally
24 damaging and unequally-distributed foodscapes requiring systemic transformation,
25 can nevertheless foster more vibrant sympathies between people and food, more care-
26 ful connections between learners and their food futures.

27 **Keywords: food waste; food insecurity; food access; surplus food redistribution;**
28 **visceral pedagogies; political ecology of the body**

29
30
31 The growing prevalence of schemes to intercept and redistribute food wasted by
32 producers and retailers has responded to, and further problematised, not only the
33 extent of food wastage in wealthy food economies, but also the uneven distribution of

1
2
3 34 wealth and food access manifest in growing evidence of ‘household food insecurity’
4 (Midgley, 2013). Attention to food insecurity in UK media, civil society organisation
5 (CSO) and policy discourse has renewed concerns over its prevalence in schools e.g.
6
7 36
8 37 All-Party Parliamentary Group on School Food (2015). As charitable food banking in
9 the UK has expanded, CSOs and community groups have increased provision of
10 38
11 39 holiday-period food assistance. Additionally, the growth of school breakfast provision
12 suggests schools’ widening role in children’s foodways. This paper highlights
13 40
14 41 ambiguous implications of a food waste activism network’s school food programme.
15
16 42 Its pedagogical practices raise questions around a two-fold concern. Firstly, the role
17 43
18 44 of community organisations in responding to systemic problems; namely food
19 insecurity and food wastage. Do locally-grounded charitable and activist responses to
20 45
21 46 food inequalities risk depoliticising or deflecting structural causes and solutions?
22
23 47 Secondly, ‘surplus food redistribution’ in schools raises questions about children’s
24 responsibilities over their own food choices. How does the summoning and
25 48
26 49 cultivation of childrens’ embodied and sensory capacities to know food differently
27 affect, on the one hand, their health and food access and, on the other, their
28 50
29 51 responsabilisation for systemic issues lying beyond their control? Through the
30 framework of a ‘political ecology of the body’ (Hayes-Conroy, 2015), and
31 52
32 53 specifically the notion of ‘visceral access’, binary notions assumed by these questions
33 will be challenged: ‘charity v activist’ frames of surplus food redistribution, and
34 54
35 55 ‘agency v structure’ binaries assumed by the question of whether food waste
36 pedagogies empower or responsabilise young people (the verbal form ‘wasted’ rather
37 56
38 57 than ‘surplus’ food is adopted, conveying human-induced processes by which food is
39 rendered waste). These questions will be explored through two empirical cases;
40 58
41 59 primarily, a school programme using wasted food intercepted by a network of
42 redistribution activists, and a charity that redistributes food similarly to a US-style
43 60
44 61 foodbank. First, literature considering the political implications of food provision and
45 pedagogies in schools are explored.

62 **Knowing food as more-than-food**

63 Food is an ontologically-multiple medium for learning about the politics and ethics of
64 64 food systems. Biltekoff (2016) analyses ‘framing contests’ at play in the design of
65 65 school curricula by food activist and food industry bodies. These aim to shape
66 66 “different kinds of consumers” but also to “stabilize different versions of what food

1
2
3 67 is” (2016:55). Biltekoff compares polarised articulations of processed food, where
4
5 68 ‘Real Food’ (a discussion guide by sustainable food activists) frames food as
6
7 69 “connections across natural and social systems” (2016:53), while ‘Real Facts’ (a food
8
9 70 trade association’s education materials) frames food not as systemic and political but
10
11 71 ontologically ‘singular’: a commodity delivering consumer needs and producer
12
13 72 profits. Biltekoff distinguishes ontologies of health inhering in the curricula: Real
14
15 73 Food “decentres the individual” and highlights issues of “access and policy”
16
17 74 (2016:52-3), while Real Facts’ “anti-politics of health...frames and enables health as
18
19 75 the result of individual biology, personal responsibility, and information” (2016:54).
20
21 76 Advocating dialogic research that recognises food system problems and solutions as
22
23 77 technical *and* social, her analysis reveals how food pedagogies differently construe,
24
25 78 responsabilise and/or empower children and their foodscapes. The following section
26
27 79 introduces another approach to understanding foodscapes as ontologically multiple.

80 **Political ecology of the body**

81 Hayes-Conroy’s (2015) political ecology of the body (PEB) framework encompasses
82
83 analytical attention to structural, discursive and material dimensions of health and
84
85 wellbeing. Its hybrid foci mirror shifts in political ecological thought from situating
86
87 ecological struggle within political economic constraints towards embracing post-
88
89 humanism (Heynen, 2013). PEB builds on feminist critiques of social constructivism
90
91 in highlighting affect, materiality, embodiment, emotion, performativity and non-
92
93 representational methodologies for grasping life-as-lived. Bodies and eating offer
94
95 vantage points for understanding food as the material grounds of survival, structural
96
97 enabler and constraints of this, and discursive practices mediating food access at
98
99 multiple scales. Considered through a PEB lens, everyday work of food redistribution
100
101 involves agentic encounters with food items, ideas about that food and more or less
102
103 explicit engagement with structures that both enable and constrain practices.

104 **Visceral food access**

105 Hayes-Conroy (2017:51) writes that theoretical attention to ‘the visceral realm’ seeks
106
107 to understand political agency “from the body out”. By ‘visceral’ she denotes the
108
109 “state/feeling of bodies in interrelation with environments/space”. As a specifically
110
111 political pursuit, we must not only ‘follow’ bodies but also “experiences of social
112
113 position(ing), norms and difference”. This includes methodological reflexivity in
114
115

1
2
3 99 research praxis, including attending to race, class and gender. Hayes-Conroy &
4
5 100 Hayes-Conroy (2013) apply the framework to school cooking-and-gardening
6
7 101 programmes. They acknowledge diverse “visceral topographies” that individual
8
9 102 learners bring to learning encounters. Bringing students into relation with new foods
10
11 103 and ideas can “widen the scope of emotional possibilities” (2013:84) and (re)shape
12
13 104 material sensitivities, identities and relationships available to them. However,
14
15 105 learners’ different backgrounds and experiences may engender frustration or
16
17 106 resentment towards programme interventions: hoped-for outcomes depend on
18
19 107 contingent and haphazard encounters between teachers, learners and more-than-
20
21 108 human mediators. The authors’ notion of ‘visceral access’ acknowledges bodily
22
23 109 senses and motivations as micro-spaces of encounter. Children’s “specific bodily
24
25 110 histories and prior and current affective/emotional relations with alternative foods”
26
27 111 (2013:82) comingle with embodied sensations of food handling and eating to
28
29 112 (re)shape visceral access, body-food relationships and encounters whose
30
31 113 consequences can stretch beyond the classroom.

32
33 114 PEB’s attention to children’s life-assemblages highlights school as just one node in
34
35 115 ‘foodscapes’ (Brembeck et al., 2013) and the importance of recognising food choice
36
37 116 as a more-than-individual matter comprising families, homes, shops and sensory
38
39 117 experience. This takes us beyond the precepts of ‘sensory education’, which aims to
40
41 118 teach children to eat healthily through making novel/healthy foods sensorily familiar
42
43 119 e.g. Reverdy (2011). By critiquing socio-environmental change premised solely on
44
45 120 ‘attitudes, behaviours and choices’ of individuals (Shove, 2010), PEB can attend to
46
47 121 micro-level food-body assemblages as well as how food redistribution organisations
48
49 122 address, or neglect, broader issues of political responsibility for hunger and waste. I
50
51 123 now turn to consider political modalities of such redistribution.

52 124 **Community feeding programmes: revolutionary possibilities?**

53 125 Ethnographies of wasted food redistribution, and community feeding programmes
54
55 126 more broadly, reveal its complex ethico-political implications, often relying upon a
56
57 127 binary distinction between activism and charity. Heynen (2010) contrasts the political
58
59 128 containment functions of charitable food with radical forms of food redistribution
60
129 that, historically, have contested uneven “geographies of survival”.

1
2
3 130 Patel (2011) analyses conditions transforming food assistance from ‘pacifying to
4
5 131 revolutionary’ in the Black Panther Party (BPP)’s politics of the everyday. The BPP
6
7 132 exemplifies political possibilities in everyday, material mechanisms of social
8
9 133 reproduction, including community food programmes. Its ‘Free Breakfast for
10
11 134 Schoolchildren’ programme was launched in 1968, feeding thousands of children
12
13 135 across America at its peak (Heynen, 2009). It addressed corporeal realities of uneven
14
15 136 urban food access given state failures to meet basic biophysical needs of African-
16
17 137 Americans. Importantly, such ‘survival programmes’ were explicitly recognised as
18
19 138 “not solutions to our problems”, but to nourish “survival pending revolution” (Huey
20
21 139 P. Newton Foundation, 2008:4). Grounding politics in everyday bodily survival and
22
23 140 creating spaces/relationships of mutual aid, Heynen argues, was necessary for broader
24
25 141 solidarities to emerge. Neighbourhood care networks could extend to national-global
26
27 142 assemblages of solidarity, stretching the concept of ‘community’. This challenges
28
29 143 binary interpretations of whether ‘community-level’ praxis enables or constrains
30
31 144 systemic political change at multiple scales.

32
33 145 Patel (2011:122-3) distinguishes the BPP’s “vision for social change” from charity:

34
35 146 By bursting the idea of food as...charity bestowed by rich to poor, setting in its
36
37 147 place the notion that food is a right- and...that an order might be composed
38
39 148 without private property- the act of feeding children was transformed from
40
41 149 pacifying to revolutionary (p.25)

42
43 150 This transformation is rooted in nurturing material geographies of everyday survival
44
45 151 and, Heynen (2009) argues, challenging the patriarchal dissociation of revolutionary
46
47 152 praxis from domesticity and care. The BPP’s breakfast programme appears in
48
49 153 dialectical light, where food nurtured bodies, ideas and communal spaces as a
50
51 154 necessary (if insufficient) vehicle of broader systemic transformation that nevertheless
52
53 155 instigated considerable structural change. Pressure on Hoover’s government as a
54
55 156 result of BPP activism led to the breakfast programme’s co-optation in the rollout of
56
57 157 federally-funded school breakfast programmes (Patel 2011). Such articulations of
58
59 158 practical action and political organising suggest counter-possibilities for community
60
159 food programmes to engender multi-level change, for bottom-up organising to foster
160 systemic change, albeit in unpredictable ways. While operating in a different context,
161 UK schools are increasingly recognising impacts of food insecurity among families
162 on young peoples’ learning (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2017). Where state
163 entitlements have declined, living costs have risen and employment does not

1
2
3 164 necessarily protect against poverty. In this context, can wasted food redistribution,
4
5 165 and the politics it generates, foster systemic change while addressing bodily needs?
6
7 166 Debates are underway in the UK as to the kind of solution ‘surplus food
8
9 167 redistribution’ offers as a response to hunger and/or food waste, and its distribution of
10
11 168 benefits (Caraher & Furey, 2017). The following section explores redistribution as
12
13 169 contesting commodification as a vector of edible food’s unnecessary wastage.

14 170 **Eating waste as affective activism**

15
16
17 171 Critical food waste scholarship analyses the commodification of food’s cosmetic
18
19 172 qualities as an aspect of systematic wastage. Commodification facilitates wastage if
20
21 173 foodstuffs’ exchange value is not realised. Giles (2016) analyses “postcard-perfect”
22
23 174 rows of produce in Seattle’s Pike Place market as “meta-signifiers” of world-class
24
25 175 consumption, exuding an “anthropocentric cosmopolitanism, diametrically opposed to
26
27 176 the contingency of a natural world which resists the ontological standardisation of
28
29 177 form and function inherent in the commodity” (Giles 2016:84). Theories of affective
30
31 178 politics, such as Thrift (2004) on “the manipulation of affect for political ends”, can
32
33 179 help to account for wasted food’s materiality, including the moral discomfort and
34
35 180 visceral feelings its presence often prompts. What matters in food’s aesthetic
36
37 181 fetishisation is not the capacity of food-commodities to nourish bodies and uphold
38
39 182 subsistence rights, but the logics of capital accumulation, premised on the routine
40
41 183 expulsion of ‘ex-commodities’ (Barnard, 2016). Understanding food’s wastage for
42
43 184 commercial reasons regardless of its edibility leads social movement activists to
44
45 185 acknowledge, articulate, and challenge this logic, demonstrating use values by eating
46
47 186 recovered food and bequeathing it an alternative biopolitical trajectory from its
48
49 187 commodity form.

50
51 188 Barnard notes the conflation between waste’s symbolism and its visceral capacities,
52
53 189 arguing that “we are now frequently disgusted by anything labelled ‘waste’”
54
55 190 (2016:129). For ‘freegans’ in his study, eating ‘polluted’ food attempts to
56
57 191 symbolically “flip the object of disgust onto the companies that created ex-
58
59 192 commodities in the first place” (ibid.). Freegans refracted the ‘dirt’ of wasted food by
60
193 visually displaying ‘dumpster-dived’ foods on sidewalks with speeches decrying the
194 capitalist logics and socio-ecological harm represented by food wastage to passers-by.
195 Patel (2011) notes how the BPP obtained breakfast programme foods from the San

1
2
3 196 Francisco Diggers, whose redistribution of wasted food as free public meals
4
5 197 constituted a prefigurative politics of demonstrating alternatives to capitalism. The
6
7 198 BPP framed their reliance on donated food as a way for businesses to express
8
9 199 community care. They envisaged businesses lowering their prices given their analysis
10
11 200 of capitalist “robbery”, the “ridiculously high prices that we must pay for food, which
12
13 201 is necessary for our daily sustenance” (Huey P. Newton Foundation, 2008:39).
14
15 202 Contrastingly, Barnard and Mourad (2014) explore how superficially similar acts of
16
17 203 redistributing surplus food can enact divergent political repertoires that may or may
18
19 204 not be understood/shared by eaters. Food’s politicised redistribution bears a long
20
21 205 history; activists’ analyses of its commodification and material possibilities suggest
22
23 206 discursive repertoires that can be compared with the empirical cases explored in this
24
25 207 paper.

208 **Reconfiguring the senses**

209 Theorising the activism of Food Not Bombs, Giles argues that food commodities’
210
211 “material agency” as ripening or bruising amounts to corrupting trajectories towards
212
213 “matter out of place” that renders food (commercially) waste (2016:84). Barnard
214
215 notes the dominance of the visual in determining food’s status:

213 The fetishism of waste partly comes through our overreliance on sight and
214 misconceptions about hygiene; by adopting new practices and norms, freegans
215 were prefiguring a “post-fetish” world (2016:130)

216 For activists, food recovery means more than material survival, enacting “direct
217
218 action that challenged the power of retailers to determine what was, and was not,
219
220 good to eat” (Barnard 2016:127). This prompts us to consider *who and what else*
221
222 might have the power to determine what is good to eat, and how. Wasted food’s
223
224 structural, representational and material qualities can be re-configured through
225
226 practice, and it is practices of food acquisition, handling and teaching that will be
227
228 considered in relation to the school programme’s politics.

223 Here we see opportunities for a PEB analysis of food redistribution practices,
224
225 considering multi-bodied affect as well as the politics of representation and
226
227 knowledge-production around food/eating. Structural forces of different natures and
228
229 scales are acknowledged, for example the role of regulation. US reluctance to
230
231 legislate for standardised expiry-dates, Barnard argues (2016:127), reflects corporate
232
233 interests, which “make more money when consumers don’t trust their senses and

1
2
3 229 throw out food that has passed a conservative sell-by date”. For freegans, challenging
4
5 230 expiry-dates and commercial cosmetic standards to distinguish food from waste
6
7 231 involves the cultivation of embodied discernment of food via the senses. The
8
9 232 embodied knowledge politics through which edibility is conferred by engaging
10
11 233 sensorily with food thus serve as a means to critique government inaction and
12
13 234 corporate greed.

14 235 **Food safety as praxis**

16 236 Barnard notes that freegans, ironically, actually know little about where their food
17
18 237 comes from and that food may have been wasted because it is unsafe, such as product
19
20 238 recalls (Barnard, 2016:128). Food’s potential to make people ill constitutes valid
21
22 239 anxiety that can hasten food’s categorisation as waste in homes (Evans, 2014:47).
23
24 240 Freegans’ risk-minimisation strategies included careful procedures for washing,
25
26 241 preparing and cooking food. One way to compare the politics of food redistribution is
27
28 242 thus to examine how different redistributors negotiate ideas, devices and practices for
29
30 243 determining wasted food’s suitability for feeding to people. Rather than objectively
31
32 244 judge food as ‘safe’ and ‘edible’, the task here is to analyse redistributors’ mediations
33
34 245 for knowing good food, and for teaching this to others, which will be later analysed in
35
36 246 challenging binary distinctions between redistribution-as-activism and redistribution-
37
38 247 as-charity. The next section examines literature critiquing the latter.

38 248 **Charitable food redistribution**

40 249 Unlike activists’ de-fetishisation efforts, wasted food provides a vehicle for ‘doing
41
42 250 good’ by charitable organisations, not primarily to critique causes of food wastage,
43
44 251 but to feed food-insecure people. North American literature suggests important
45
46 252 distinctions between transient, subcultural redistribution by social movements as
47
48 253 described above, and institutionalised charitable redistribution. Poppendieck (1998)
49
50 254 roots the latter in chaotic origins of utilising food surpluses to provide a temporary
51
52 255 solution to the poverty wrought by Reaganomics. This expanded to become highly-
53
54 256 resourced, integrated and professionalised foodbanking networks. These, she argues,
55
56 257 oversimplify and depoliticise poverty through “cosmetic solutions”, redefining the
57
58 258 retrenchment of public entitlement as individualised hunger that can be solved by
59
60 259 gifts of food (1998:315).

1
2
3 260 UK debates around responsibilities of government, charity and corporations in
4
5 261 addressing poverty through food redistribution have intensified since the onset of
6
7 262 post-recessionary austerity Conservative Party policy-making in 2010 (Midgley,
8
9 263 2013). Critics have questioned the quality and appropriateness of charitable food
10
11 264 (Caraher & Furey, 2017). Power imbalances implied by Patel's description of charity
12
13 265 as 'pacification' have been analysed in terms of stigma, shame and powerlessness
14
15 266 (van der Horst et al., 2014). While uneven emotional and affective dynamics of food
16
17 267 aid encounters have been explored (Williams et al., 2016), less attention has been paid
18
19 268 to the visceral realm of wasted charitable food. Critics have, however, shed light on
20
21 269 the qualities of donated and wasted food; Tarasuk and Eakin (2005) noted the "limited
22
23 270 and highly variable supply of food donations" as a limiting factor of foodbank
24
25 271 provision. Van der Horst et al. (2014:1512) note that for some recipients the
26
27 272 "experience of poverty is heightened by the content of the food parcels", including
28
29 273 regular inclusion of "spoiled food" where expiration dates prompted emotional
30
31 274 responses to "embodied taboos" around eating 'waste'. Recipients were expected to
32
33 275 "overcome...inhibitions" (ibid.) through volunteers educating them about the
34
35 276 relevance of expiration dates. This contrasts with the discursive refraction by which
36
37 277 freegan activists re-framed food as edible and desirable by challenging 'embodied
38
39 278 taboos' around expiry-dates as regulatory constructions, not as flawed individual
40
41 279 knowledge.

280 **Political food ecologies: challenging the activist/charity binary**

42
43 281 Before turning to our methodology, we bring together some of the strands laid out in
44
45 282 identifying a nexus of food politics, ethics and pedagogy that blur the distinction
46
47 283 between pacifying and revolutionary. The PEB framework critiques efforts to teach
48
49 284 'ethical' food to students whose classed, racialised and gendered 'visceral
50
51 285 topographies' may be obscured by pedagogical programmes that aim to broaden
52
53 286 learners' foodscapes without acknowledging the structural, representational and
54
55 287 material constraints affecting all teaching and learning (Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-
56
57 288 Conroy, 2013). Critiques of the individualising propensities of charitable
58
59 289 redistribution (Poppendieck 1998) can nevertheless be applied to more radical
60
290 redistribution practices. While 'dumpster diving' for some provides a means to
291 disavow waste resulting from strict cosmetic standards, conservative expiry dates and
292 abundantly-stocked shop shelves, its positing of individual practice in pursuit of more

1
2
3 293 ethical forms of consumption arguably misses the “extent to which these practices are
4 294 constrained by the existing organization of food production, distribution and
5 295 consumption” (Mourad & Barnard, 2016).
6
7
8

9 296 The PEB framework, however, embraces the interactions of the structural, discursive
10 297 and material operations of power and we consider political activity at multiple levels,
11 298 rather than analyse all consumption-focussed activity as embodying neoliberal
12 299 strategy. We will thus explore different ways that redistribution organisations
13 300 configure food qualities, especially safety and edibility, and their political
14 301 implications. Exploring differences between organisations’ more-than-human
15 302 assembling of food ethics is an attempt to identify spaces for debate around a key
16 303 question for food justice: how should we regard/utilise wasted food?
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 304 As suggested, actors utilise wasted food for different ends, using diverse practical and
24 305 discursive means for representing and handling food/waste, which translate into
25 306 distinctive pedagogies of ‘knowing food’ that can then be taught to others. These
26 307 range from activists’ performances revealing the extent and mundane capitalist logics
27 308 of food wastage to expanding charitable movements framing wasted food as a
28 309 resource for addressing poverty. While reflecting distinct political repertoires, they do
29 310 however overlap and converge in important ways: their reliance on donated food, and
30 311 their enabling of food access through re-diverting flows of decommodified food. The
31 312 everyday work of redistribution involves agentic encounters with food items, ideas
32 313 about that food and more or less explicit engagement with structures that both enable
33 314 and constrain practices. Patel (2011:129), however, argues that the difference between
34 315 ‘pacification’ and ‘revolution’ lies in the recognition that food provision is not enough
35 316 to transform food injustices, which requires envisaging and acting upon the scale of
36 317 injustice through “political education and effective action”. He also notes the
37 318 importance of grappling with gender, race and other intersectional vectors of
38 319 inequality in the pursuit of radical change. Might UK food redistribution offer a
39 320 politics of empowerment, solidarity and critique rather than pacification, the
40 321 disciplinary function served by charities in the neoliberal rollback of redistributive
41 322 policy (Poppendieck, 1998)?
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 323 In conjunction with theory laid out, our empirics will challenge the activist/charity
58 324 binary by highlighting differing redistribution organisations’ mutual concerns,
59
60

1
2
3 325 challenges and role in an expanding field of food aid. A focus on sensory praxis will
4 326 draw out this challenged binary by examining pedagogies of teaching food/waste
5 327 distinctions by two organisations, and by considering how organisations attempted to
6 328 provide food that was appropriate, desirable, and safe.
7
8
9

10 329 **Methodology**

11
12
13
14 330 Having situated our study in analyses of wasted food redistribution for diverse ends,
15 331 we introduce the redistribution projects studied. The main focus is the school-
16 332 educational programme of a network of pay-as-you-feel cafes serving wasted food. Its
17 333 initial aim was to protest food waste's environmental hazards by demonstrating its
18 334 extent and needlessness, but several participants also highlighted the network's role in
19 335 bolstering food access in deprived neighbourhoods. Food is generally acquired
20 336 through local businesses donating surplus food rather than bin-diving, though activists
21 337 describe donations as 'interceptions' in a politics of refusal to acknowledge the
22 338 beneficence of the food industry whose profit-motivated excess, they argue, *causes*
23 339 wastage. Receiving donations also minimises risks of redistributing unsafe food,
24 340 which Barnard (2016) notes is a risk of freegan practice.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 341 The programme delivers wasted food to schools, which is subsequently redistributed
34 342 to families through pay-as-you-feel market stalls manned by parents, teachers and/or
35 343 children. It aims to alleviate school hunger (e.g. providing morning toast in
36 344 classrooms) while raising awareness of food wastage. It was co-founded by a school
37 345 in an area of high deprivation in a city in the north of England, described by the co-
38 346 ordinator as a "desert" of access to both food and service provision. Organisers lead
39 347 assemblies and classes to teach children about health, sustainability and
40 348 entrepreneurship through handling wasted food. The programme also aims to
41 349 contribute to the network's campaign strategy, "empowering" children to "feel like
42 350 they have the power to be an activist", as one organiser described. Its aims thus go
43 351 beyond providing inexpensive foods to families. Further, it hopes to instil changes in
44 352 children's attitudes and skills around food that it is hoped will help them prevent food
45 353 waste in their own and others' lives. Research, undertaken from 2015-2016, included
46 354 a year of participant observation and semi-structured interviews with ten members of
47 355 the pay-as-you-feel cafe network, including school programme organisers (referred to
48 356 as 'activist-educators' below). Ethical and time considerations precluded interviewing
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 357 children/parents, so interviews aimed to capture organisers' experiences in relatively
4 358 early stages of the programme.

7 359 The school programme's approach is compared with a national charity redistributing
8 360 wasted food with the explicit aim of alleviating 'food poverty'. It redistributes food
9 361 from major industry partner-donors to local charities through an expanding
10 362 infrastructure of warehousing and transportation. It must adhere to the national
11 363 charity's food-safety guidelines. Fieldwork took place over one year from November
12 364 2015, with one regional depot.

18 365 Ethics approval for the research was granted by the university and informed consent
19 366 granted by organisers and participants in all locations. Interviews were recorded,
20 367 transcribed and analysed, drawing on tools of Critical Grounded Theory (Belfrage &
21 368 Hauf, 2017) which facilitates attention to structural, discursive and relational/material
22 369 dimensions. The two organisations' distinct origins, relationships with donors and
23 370 modes of redistributing food offer ways to consider the political import of differing
24 371 approaches to distinguishing food from waste through embodied praxis.

30 372 **School-based redistribution: depoliticising or meeting immediate needs?**

33 373 The first question to be addressed empirically is whether community-level food
34 374 assistance depoliticises structural issues of poverty and waste. Heynen's (2009:408)
35 375 reminder of the under-theorised mundane, "horrifying reality of hunger" situates
36 376 urban hunger "within the context of political economy, social reproduction, and
37 377 poverty". Projects attending to this can thus provide not just vital sustenance but a
38 378 window onto spatial and structural determinants of hunger. The activist network
39 379 expressed attention to these, as shown below. Most pay-as-you-feel café network
40 380 members differentiated themselves from charitable food aid providers, highlighting
41 381 their primary purpose as campaigning against food waste. One characterised the
42 382 redistribution charity's donor relationships as "so far up Tesco's arses that they'll
43 383 never campaign to end food waste" (interview, café organiser, 19/1/16). She
44 384 nevertheless described differences between cafés' emphases on addressing hunger
45 385 locally, a point verified by other interviews, suggesting a mutual concern with the
46 386 charity.

57 387 While the wider network tended to downplay its hunger relief role, the school
58 388 programme (just one of the network's multiple conduits for redistributing surplus

1
2
3 389 food) cites alleviating in-school hunger as a primary aim. The founding school is
4 390 located in area categorised as in the "bottom 2% of deprivation nationally" (Joe,
5 391 school staff, interview 25/10/16). Joe described it as a "food desert", with the local
6 392 supermarket 2.5 miles away. With most parents lacking a car, the £5 cost of taxis and
7 393 buses to the shops meant less money to spend on healthier foods. The "medium of
8 394 food", Joe suggested, was a means to engage parents in the school community,
9 395 including its provision of English lessons, housing and welfare services. With over
10 396 forty languages spoken by the school's families, he acknowledged multiple forms of
11 397 deprivation affecting the school's refugee and asylum-seeking families. Joe's analyses
12 398 reflect sensitivity of school staff to the structural determinants of hunger affecting
13 399 pupils in their familial and geographical contexts. Staff have, alongside the activist
14 400 network, advocated for income-based solutions by participating in national campaigns
15 401 to address school-related hunger.

16
17 402 However, everyday activities raise questions about the appropriateness of surplus
18 403 food market stalls, even if situated in broader political discourse. Food deliveries to
19 404 schools are pre-sorted by volunteers of the café/activist network to ensure no high-
20 405 risk food (bearing a 'use-by' date or needing refrigeration) is included. Schools
21 406 receive a mixture of fruits/vegetables, bread/"cereal-type items" and "treats". While
22 407 the network has secured enough donors to allow some predictability, and families are
23 408 able to choose what to take, supplies are still dependent on available surpluses and
24 409 can reflect the highly-processed, highly-packaged products one often encountered in
25 410 redistribution spaces throughout the research. The 'market' is not intended to meet
26 411 families' full food needs, and schools may use food internally for classroom learning
27 412 or morning toast. While boosting food access, the stall nevertheless offers a partial
28 413 and contingent source of food rather than fulfilling the human right to food, a
29 414 challenge similarly levelled at charitable foodbanking (Tarasuk & Eakin, 2005).

30
31 415 The pay-as-you-feel model of accessing food was noted in some interviews to be
32 416 confusing and even frustrating for certain 'shoppers', prompting questions around the
33 417 nuances of re-marketing food in school settings. Intended as a redistribution model
34 418 that does not require referrals to foodbanks and is thus available to anybody, it
35 419 nevertheless re-confers an exchange value onto food where the normative mode of
36 420 paying is with money (rather than 'skills or time', which the organisation also invites
37 421 as means of paying). In line with Barnard and Mourad's (2014) argument that food

1
2
3 422 waste activists' political repertoires may not be apparent to those receiving the food,
4 423 the market stall could become seen as just one more node in an expanding network of
5 424 charitable feeding. These points suggest the capacity of schools to bolster
6 425 communities' access to food and other services, but also the latent disciplinarity of
7 426 this extension of pastoral care to parents and the wider community. Engaging parents
8 427 in the job-searching, financial literacy and upskilling techniques of austerity
9 428 Workfare-style contemporary welfare through the 'medium of food' suggests a need
10 429 for critical attention to responsibilities of the state, through schools, in providing
11 430 welfare services. Little evidence appeared from initial interviews of a coordinated
12 431 political strategy that engaged families, schools and activists, without which Patel
13 432 (2011) suggests food distribution can remain 'pacifying', leaving structural
14 433 determinants of hunger/waste largely unchallenged.

15 434 How does the redistribution charity's model compare? First, it delivers food to a range
16 435 of organisations whose varied political work can be seeing as "flying in under the
17 436 cover" of the charity, as Henderson (2004) skilfully argued of the articulations
18 437 between depoliticised charities and those they serve. Interviews revealed a diversity
19 438 of workers' beliefs about structural causes of hunger/waste, and motivations to
20 439 address these. Fundamentally, however, the charity's key priorities were upholding
21 440 donor relations, expanding infrastructure and regulatory compliance priorities, not
22 441 campaigning. While workers learned about problems including school hunger and
23 442 geographical deprivation through their articulations and engagements with recipients,
24 443 the charity's key remit remains alleviating need through food provision, not structural
25 444 change.

26 445 We now turn to examine the visceral pedagogies through which wasted food was
27 446 (re)configured through experiential learning, using the PEB framework to consider
28 447 such learning on the de/politicisation spectrum outlined in Biltekoff's (2016) analysis
29 448 of curricular design.

30 449 **Viscerally learning food**

31 450 As noted, the 'curation' of schools' food deliveries at the redistribution network's
32 451 warehouses yields some consistency in type/quality and may prompt questioning
33 452 among children as to why visibly-edible food has been thrown away, and what might
34 453 be done with it. Pupils' receiving and re-sorting food for their market stall entails

1
2
3 454 visceral engagement with food. By handling and exploring its affective qualities,
4
5 455 food's designation as 'waste' can thus be reconfigured. Food thus arrives at the school
6
7 456 as ontologically plural, as not simply a commodity or nourishment, but the result of a
8
9 457 systemic journey of wastage and recovery, as explained in tailored classes.

10
11 458 Activist-educator Tim designed lessons to challenge 'embodied taboos' around, for
12
13 459 example, past-dated food. He described a pupil complaining that the food was "just
14
15 460 manky bananas", so planned an initial lesson to

16
17 461 ...remove anything that children would have already thought...like for example
18 462 the manky banana comment; they think that it's just gonna be out-of-date food.
19 463 (Tim, activist-educator, interview 26/10/17)

20
21 464 Playful tactility prompted disgust reactions:

22
23 465 I take a squishy banana, one that's slightly bruised...and get them to pass it
24 466 around...it's like a hot potato, like urgh, urgh, and they want to pass it on as
25 467 quickly as possible (Tim)

26
27 468 Disgust was then challenged through preparation practices, re-tooling the 'manky'
28
29 469 banana by blending it into a smoothie for everyone to taste. Such touch-sight-taste
30
31 470 reconfigurations provided visceral opportunities to (potentially) counter pre-
32
33 471 conceptions. Contrasting effects of food on visual and gustatory receptors provide
34
35 472 potential openings/blockages in the holistic assemblage that is motivation to try foods.
36
37 473 These learning encounters create shared spaces for children's diverse 'visceral
38
39 474 topographies' to be re-traced, perhaps challenging visual and haptic food judgements
40
41 475 through food practices and tasting.

42 43 476 **Fostering 'healthy' connections with food**

44
45 477 Handling less-than-perfect foods was thus intended to widen children's affective
46
47 478 repertoires with food. Educators aimed to foster bodily habits of engaging with food
48
49 479 to be better able to discern, sense, and appreciate food's qualities: as edible, healthy,
50
51 480 desirable. Fruits and vegetables were frequently mentioned as suited to sensory
52
53 481 learning, suggesting the programme's alignment with dominant curricular concerns
54
55 482 around 'healthy' eating. However, foods were re-contextualised as connective actants
56
57 483 in food systems where 'health' emerges relationally rather than residing in individuals
58
59 484 (Biltekoff, 2016). During an activity where children tried to place food in familiar
60
485 categories, Nik re-positioned children's surprise at learning cucumbers as fruit within
486 a narrative of food-plants' teleologies:

1
2
3 487 We talk about...actually what's a fruit for...if you understand [that] then you'll
4 488 understand why it's very nutritious 'cause the whole point of the fruit is to feed
5 489 the little seedling and so it's all about making those connections about actually,
6 490 this is not just something that you put in your mouth and it tastes a certain way,
7 491 it might grow a bit or whatever else; there's a whole lot more to it...(Nik)
8
9 492 Nik thus reframed fruit as more-than-food: a relational "material-semiotic actor"
10
11 493 (Haraway, 1988) whose 'job' is to do more than feed humans. Here, multi-sensory
12
13 494 engagement implied more than intensified sensory receptivity, by layering cognitive
14
15 495 knowledge *about* food with immediate sensation.

16 496 **Co-creating knowledge?**

17
18
19 497 Biltekoff notes how the 'Real Food' curriculum cast pupils not as passive recipients of
20
21 498 knowledge but as co-creators of learning rooted in their broader foodscapes. While
22
23 499 Tim acknowledged children's preconceptions, activist-educator Nik framed children's
24
25 500 prior food knowledge as lacking: "before I go into the classroom, if you ask someone
26
27 501 where food comes from, it comes from a shelf in a shop and before that it becomes a
28
29 502 bit of a...dark grey hole". Learner-subject's 'grey holes' suggest blank slates for the
30
31 503 inscription of food systems knowledge. This masks somewhat the complexities of
32
33 504 children's prior ways of knowing food, perhaps the materiality of past shopping trips,
34
35 505 and partially obscures the co-constructive, contestable nature of learning given
36
37 506 children's diverse 'visceral topographies'. However, one organiser mentioned parents
38
39 507 being invited to food waste assemblies, suggesting attention to children's wider
40
41 508 foodscapes, and the relationships that populate them.

42 509 **Sensing food/waste**

43 510 Foods' changing qualities as they degrade were instrumentalised to reconfigure
44
45 511 assumptions about food-as-waste using visual, olfactory and even auditory cues.
46
47 512 Children were encouraged to suggest how they might use different sense modalities to
48
49 513 determine whether food is "good to eat":

50 514 There'll usually be one person who knows about tapping a melon...every sense
51 515 will have a...relevant application to understanding whether the food is ripe or
52 516 rotten (Nik)

53
54 517 Mushrooms' "stink" prompted giggles, prompting Nik to recast disgust reactions
55
56 518 through re-framing the mushroom as a "fungal fruit". Yellowing broccoli was re-
57
58 519 framed as a "bunch of flowers" opening up. New ways of seeing, handling and
59
60

1
2
3 520 describing food were thus presented, aiming to widen children's acceptance of
4
5 521 imperfect food as potential nourishment but also ecologically conscious consumption.

6
7 522 **Situating food safety**

8
9
10 523 Activist-educators aimed to teach food safety as a contextual matter of interpreting
11 524 regulatory determinants of waste. Improving expiry-date literacy has been an aim of
12
13 525 government research and behaviour-change programmes around food waste
14
15 526 (Lyndhurst, 2008). One organiser asked children to discuss their understanding of
16
17 527 different expiry-dates:

18
19 528 What it does is create confusion, and that's probably the best word to describe
20 529 how dates work on food in this country, confusion...(Tim, 26/10/2016)

21
22 530 After explaining differences between 'use-by' and 'best-before' expiry-dates (Milne
23
24 531 2012), children were encouraged to consider them in context:

25
26 532 We use the example...if there's two pieces of meat...one's been stored in the
27 533 fridge, one's been out in the sun- they're both still within the use-by date- can
28 534 you eat them both? (Tim)

29
30 535 He reported that most children would reply "yes", suggesting primacy of the expiry-
31 536 date as a mode for interpreting edibility. He would tell them:

32
33 537 ... 'no, you can't, because it hasn't been stored correctly, and actually you don't
34 538 know how your food's been stored up to the point you get it'...we're really
35 539 pushing that confidence and use of their senses as much as they can...(Tim)

36
37 540 Contextual re-presentation aimed to destabilise the expiry-date's authority and 'push'
38
39 541 different kinds of confidence, by enacting sensorial, emotional and situated
40
41 542 knowledge (Haraway, 1988).

42
43 543 Food regulation has often followed crises of public trust in food systems following
44
45 544 'scandals' rooted in intensive production (Milne, 2012). Contra the scientific
46
47 545 expertise congealed in expiry-dates, activists' beliefs that such technologies arbitrarily
48
49 546 contribute to unnecessary waste prompted other kinds of knowing to take precedence
50
51 547 in their pedagogies of knowing food:

52
53 548 ...[sensory engagement]'s also an alternative way to understand when
54 549 something's still good to eat- that if you don't want to look at that stupid date
55 550 then what do you do then? (Nik)

56
57 551 Activist-educators did account for children's diverse prior knowledge. Nik suspected
58
59 552 that children knowing precisely what different dates mean was "informed by a family
60
553 having to do that [eat past-date foods] rather than having made the ethical choice but

1
2
3 554 informed by not really having that much money to spend”, while other children
4
5 555 expressed “overly strict behaviour around dates”. While describing expiry-dates as
6
7 556 ‘stupid’ expresses frustrated belief that they cause unnecessary waste, educators thus
8
9 557 recognised the limitations of individualising children’s behaviour given its rootedness
10
11 558 in their variable foodscapes and the ways thriftiness may well already figure highly in
12
13 559 families' strategies to cope with food insecurity.

14 560 **Charitable food: date-adherence as preserving dignity?**

15
16 561 How does the redistribution charity position food safety? It does not distribute past-
17
18 562 date food, reflecting concerns around donor compliance but also about the quality and
19
20 563 reputational implications of redistributed food. Following a briefing paper suggesting
21
22 564 the “inferior choice, accessibility and (nutritional) quality” of redistributed surplus
23
24 565 food (Caraher & Furey, 2017:13), the charity communicated via social media that it
25
26 566 distributes nutritious, in-date, desirable food. Staff frequently emphasised that it
27
28 567 delivered food to organisations cooking meals rather than giving food bags,
29
30 568 emphasising provision of commensal, familial, ‘proper’ food. Redistributing fresh
31
32 569 produce was described as a way to provide healthy-yet-compliant food, with loose
33
34 570 produce not requiring an expiry-date. This non-requirement lends space for more
35
36 571 contextual practice; warehouse manager Graham maximised the opportunities it
37
38 572 afforded for removing packaging. He argued that much produce comes in “its own
39
40 573 packaging” and can be sorted by its sensory qualities. He combined concern for
41
42 574 preserving recipients’ dignity by providing fresh, high-quality food with skills to
43
44 575 predict temporalities of fresh produce’s capacity to degrade:

43 576 [charity clients] don’t want fruit and veg sorted to a low standard...four days
44 577 later we finally get it to the customer and the next day...they open the
45 578 cupboard...and go “why have they given me a bag of mush?” It’s gotta be good
46 579 standards from the start, and it’s respect as well. You’re feeding people in need-
47 580 oh, here’s some rotten old crap for you...(Graham, interview, 14/11/2016)

48
49 581 The inferred ‘neediness’ of eventual food recipients was thus invoked in justifying
50
51 582 sorting practices that required volunteers to follow expiry-dates but also their
52
53 583 embodied skill in knowing food in its present and predicted future state. Unlike the
54
55 584 school programme, the charity model does not permit such close engagement
56
57 585 between redistributors, eventual eaters and the visceral affordances of food. However,
58
59 586 Graham and other food sorters' care-ful praxis suggests that eventual eaters' sensory
60

1
2
3 587 experiences were indeed a concern that commanded volunteers' own embodied and
4
5 588 sensory labours.

6
7 589 **Affective assemblages as politics?**
8

9
10 590 How might we analyse these multiple positionings of food and children politically?
11 591 The activist network taught food materialities as contextual and systemic, involving
12 592 visceral contact with food items and cognitive learning about food systems, safety and
13 593 health. Classroom sessions constituted amalgams of images, imaginings, narratives,
14 594 and tactilities, glued together by the intimate group setting and atmosphere of
15 595 excitement. This recalls Bennett's conceptualisation of 'vibrant matter' as 'conative
16 596 bodies', from whose mutually "confederate agency" new sympathies between bodies
17 597 might arise (Bennett, 2010). Bennett locates political action in the emergence of
18 598 publics, "groups of bodies with the capacity to affect and be affected", whose
19 599 experience/articulation of shared harms prompts engagement in "new acts that will
20 600 restore their power", albeit with unpredictable consequences (2010:101). Similarly,
21 601 volunteers sorting food in charitable spaces expressed affective and discursive re-
22 602 learnings of food with potential consequences both for eventual eaters and their own
23 603 foodscapes. Politics viewed thus is immanent in the micro-encounter of intimate
24 604 person-food relating as well as systemic knowledge and policy change. Crafting close
25 605 encounters for children and food lends space for a processual, more distributed kind
26 606 of ethics than the charitable ethic of giving/receiving based on a narrow
27 607 conceptualisation of 'need', recalling a Foucauldian distinction between ethics and
28 608 morality (Foucault, 1997).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 609 While inferring potential for 'vibrant encounters' to transform children's intimate
44 610 relationships with food, different children may not experience the same 'participatory'
45 611 space in the same way (Kraftl, 2013:15). Activist-educators tended to problematise
46 612 children's/families food choices and behaviours as sites for transformation, hoping
47 613 that this might galvanise future activism towards eliminating food waste. Meanwhile,
48 614 however, structural limitations upon foodscapes persist: neighbourhood deprivation,
49 615 food access and immigration status among others. Families' capacities to join/form
50 616 'groups of bodies' united against the 'shared harms' of wasted food and hunger require,
51 617 first and foremost, their acquiring adequate food and other resources to metabolise
52 618 social reproduction. Bennett's theorisation of the political promise of more-than-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 619 human confederacies challenges the instrumentalising of matter (including food) that
4
5 620 “feeds human hubris and our earth-destroying fantasies of conquest and consumption”
6
7 621 (2010:ix). This injects ecological hope into efforts to nurture more vibrant person-
8
9 622 food relationships through food redistribution. However, it obscures humans' different
10
11 623 propensities for hubris, where such 'fantasies of...consumption' may emerge from
12
13 624 experiencing prolonged deprivation. PEB's attention to political-economic structures
14
15 625 is here recalled, in recognition of the ever-urgent task of countering welfare
16
17 626 retrenchment and systemic inequality. The distinctive political ontology of Bennett
18
19 627 and others' materialism is hard to reconcile with a Marxist critique. However,
20
21 628 embracing both, we can see wasted food redistribution as meeting bodily needs *and*
22
23 629 potentially instigating political action at unexpected sites, shedding light on diverse
24
25 630 forms of uneven urban development whose transformation might prevent growing
26
27 631 reliance on food charity and projects dependent on unsustainable supplies of surplus
28
29 632 food.

633 **Conclusion**

634 Our analysis suggests that activist-educators *and* charity redistributors drew upon
635 both visceral and regulatory techniques for distinguishing food from waste. Haptic,
636 gustatory, olfactory, visual and even auditory engagements with food allowed both
637 activist and charity volunteers to separate food from the beyond-the-pale in an effort
638 to redistribute ‘good’ food. Wasted food’s journey is mediated by complexes of
639 bodies, infrastructures, regulations, practices and discourses that escape the
640 activist/charity binary. The PEB framework acknowledges structural, discursive and
641 material factors not as separate but interacting. Expiry-dates are determined by law
642 and corporate production processes, but learners and educators’ knowledge and
643 attitudes towards their relevance vary for diverse reasons. Sensual engagement with
644 food may accompany attention to expiry-dates, while embodied practices of cutting,
645 cooking and storing food interact with such cognitive attention and regulatory
646 rendering of responsibility for food management.

647 We have presented tensions between ethical possibilities opened up by close
648 engagement with wasted foods and the risks of prioritising individual food choices as
649 a means to address hunger/waste. While activists sought to redefine ex-commodified
650 food as vibrant matter through which to kindle new, potentially-transgressive kinds of

1
2
3 651 food-body knowing, the charity's purpose in handling food was not only based on
4 652 engagement with recipients but also to maintain donor compliance and justify a
5 653 reputation as providing adequate food. On the other hand, the diverse organisations
6 654 receiving the charity's food could be using it for radical community work, from
7 655 feeding unmet needs for food to fostering networks of solidarity at different
8 656 'community' scales including national and global campaigns.

9
10 657 Food not only *is* connection, but *does* connecting, and both activist and charitable
11 658 redistribution makes such connections possible. However, the charity's public-facing
12 659 emphasis on growing quantities redistributed or people fed suggests its lack of
13 660 engagement with food's resonant qualities and affordances for critiquing/transforming
14 661 food systems. The school programme, while it risks being perceived as another form
15 662 of charitable food assistance, created collective spaces for reflecting upon food and its
16 663 systemic transformations and possibilities. Food waste pedagogies could potentially
17 664 go beyond de-fetishising food, towards interrogating human fascinations with food
18 665 commodities and their consumption (Bennett, 2001) and recognising 'reflexive
19 666 consciousness' of the ethical food consumer as a classed modality (Guthman, 2003).
20 667 Ultimately, wasted food redistribution reflects and responds to deep economic
21 668 imbalances. Redistribution actors' knowledge of injustices affecting the communities
22 669 they feed constitutes vital grounds for redistribution practices that nourish minded-
23 670 bodies, public critique and, through reflexive alliance-building, transform food
24 671 (re)distribution structures.

25 672 References

- 26 673 APPG on School Food. (2015). *Filling The Holiday Gap: Update Report 2015*.
27 674 Available at:
28 675 http://www.fillingtheholidaygap.org/APPG_Holiday_Hunger_Report_2015.pdf
29 676 Barnard, A., & Mourad, M. (2014). What's So "Contentious" About Free Food?
30 677 Tactical Repertoires and Food Waste Activism in the U.S. and France. Available
31 678 at: [https://oxthepunx.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/barnard-mourad-whats-so-](https://oxthepunx.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/barnard-mourad-whats-so-contentious-about-free-food-asa-submission.pdf)
32 679 [contentious-about-free-food-asa-submission.pdf](https://oxthepunx.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/barnard-mourad-whats-so-contentious-about-free-food-asa-submission.pdf)
33 680 Barnard, A. (2016). *Freegans: Diving into the wealth of food waste in America*.
34 681 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- 1
2
3 682 Belfrage, C., & Hauf, F. (2017). The Gentle Art of Retroduction: Critical Realism,
4 683 Cultural Political Economy and Critical Grounded Theory. *Organization Studies*,
5 684 38(2), 251–271.
- 6
7
8
9 685 Bennett, J. (2001). *The Enchantment of Modern Life*. Princeton University Press.
- 10
11 686 Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A political ecology of things*. Duke University
12 687 Press.
- 13
14
15 688 Biltekoff, C. (2016). The Politics of Food Anti-Politics. *Gastronomica*, (Winter).
- 16
17
18 689 Brembeck, H., et al. (2013). Exploring children’s foodscapes. *Children’s*
19 690 *Geographies*, 11(1), 74–88.
- 20
21
22 691 Caraher, M., & Furey, S. (2017). *Is it appropriate to use surplus food to feed people*
23 692 *in hunger? Short-term Band-Aid to more deep-rooted problems of poverty*. Food
24 693 Research Collaboration.
- 25
26
27
28 694 Evans, D. (2014). *Food Waste: Home Consumption, Material Culture and Everyday*
29 695 *Life*. London: Bloomsbury.
- 30
31
32 696 Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. In
33 697 P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Penguin.
- 34
35
36 698 Giles, D.B. (2016). The work of waste-making: biopolitical labour and the myth of
37 699 the global city. In Marshall & Connor (Eds.), *Environmental change and the*
38 700 *world’s futures: ecologies, ontologies and mythologies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 39
40
41
42 701 Guthman, J. (2003). Fast food/organic food: Reflexive tastes and the making of
43 702 ‘yuppie chow’. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 4(1), 45–58.
- 44
45
46 703 Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and
47 704 the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575.
- 48
49
50 705 Hayes-Conroy, A. (2017). Better than text? Critical reflections on the practices of
51 706 visceral methodologies in human geography. *Geoforum*, 82(April), 51–52.
- 52
53
54 707 Hayes-Conroy, A. & J. (2015). Political ecology of the body: a visceral approach. In
55 708 R. L. Bryant (Ed.), *The International Handbook of Political Ecology* (pp. 650–
56 709 672). Cheltenham: Elgar.
- 57
58
59
60 710 Hayes-Conroy, J., & Hayes-Conroy, A. (2013). Veggies and visceralities: A political

- 1
2
3 711 ecology of food and feeling. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 6(1), 81–90.
- 4
5 712 Henderson, G. (2004). “Free” food, the local production of worth, and the circuit of
6
7 713 decommodification: A value theory of the surplus. *Environment and Planning D:*
8
9 714 *Society and Space*, 22(1), 485–512.
- 10
11 715 Heynen, N. (2009). Bending the Bars of Empire from Every Ghetto for Survival: The
12
13 716 Black Panther Party’s Radical Antihunger Politics of Social Reproduction and
14
15 717 Scale. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(2), 406–422.
- 16
17 718 Heynen, N. (2010). Cooking up Non-violent Civil-disobedient Direct Action for the
18
19 719 Hungry: “Food Not Bombs” and the Resurgence of Radical Democracy in the
20
21 720 US. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1225–1240
- 22
23 721 Heynen, N. (2013). Urban political ecology I: The urban century. *Progress in Human*
24
25 722 *Geography*, 38(4), 598–604.
- 26
27 723 Huey P. Newton Foundation. (2008). *The Black Panther Party: Service to the People*
28
29 724 *Programs*. (Hilliard, Ed.). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- 30
31 725 Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2017). *UK Poverty 2017*. Available at:
32
33 726 <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/uk-poverty-2017>
- 34
35 727 Kraftl, P. (2013). Beyond “voice”, beyond “agency”, beyond “politics”? Hybrid
36
37 728 childhoods and some critical reflections on children’s emotional geographies.
38
39 729 *Emotion, Space and Society*, 9, 13–23.
- 40
41 730 Lyndhurst, B. (2008). *Research into consumer behaviour in relation to food dates and*
42
43 731 *portion sizes*. Banbury: WRAP. Available at:
44
45 732 [http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Consumer behaviour food dates, portion](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Consumer%20behaviour%20food%20dates,%20portion%20sizes%20report%20july%202008.pdf)
46
47 733 [sizes report july 2008.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Consumer behaviour food dates, portion sizes report july 2008.pdf)
- 48
49 734 Midgley, J. (2013). The logics of surplus food redistribution. *Journal of*
50
51 735 *Environmental Planning and Management*, 57(12), 1872–1892.
- 52
53 736 Milne, R. (2012). Arbiters of waste: date labels, the consumer and knowing good, safe
54
55 737 food. *The Sociological Review*, 60, 84–101.
- 56
57 738 Mourad, M., & Barnard, A. (2016). Fighting food waste with dumpster dinners.
58
59 739 *Discover Society*, (36). Available at: <https://discoversociety.org/2016/09/06/on->
60

- 1
2
3 740 the-frontline-fighting-food-waste-with-dumpster-dinners/
4
5
6 741 Patel, R. (2011). What the Black Panthers can teach the US food movement. In S.
7 742 Amin (Ed.), *Food Movements Unite! Strategies to Transform Our Food System*.
8 743 Food First Books.
- 9
10
11 744 Poppendieck, J. (1998). *Sweet Charity? Emergency Food and the End of Entitlement*.
12 745 New York: Viking.
- 13
14
15 746 Reverdy, C. (2011). Sensory Education: French Perspectives. In Preedy, Watson, &
16 747 Martin (Eds.), *Handbook of Behavior, Food and Nutrition* (pp. 143–157). New
17 748 York: Seven Stories Press.
- 19
20
21 749 Shove, E. (2010). Beyond the ABC: Climate change policy and theories of social
22 750 change. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(6), 1273–1285.
- 23
24
25 751 Tarasuk, V., & Eakin, J. (2005). Food assistance through “surplus” food: Insights
26 752 from an ethnographic study of food bank work. *Agriculture and Human Values*,
27 753 22(2), 177–186.
- 28
29
30
31 754 Thrift, N. (2004). Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect.
32 755 *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography*, 86(1), 57–78.
- 33
34
35 756 Van der Horst, H., Pascucci, S., & Bol, W. (2014). The “dark side” of food banks?
36 757 Exploring emotional responses of food bank receivers in the Netherlands. *British*
37 758 *Food Journal*, 116(9), 1506–1520.

41 759

43 760

45 761

47 762

49

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60