

Pathways for advancing good work in food systems: Reflecting on the international Good Work for Good Food Forum

Susanna Klassen^a
University of British Columbia

Lydia Medland^b
University of Bristol

Poppy Nicol^c and Hannah Pitt^{d*}
Cardiff University

Submitted April 29, 2022 / Revised October 7 and November 7, 2022 / Accepted November 8, 2022 /
Published online February 20, 2023

Citation: Klassen, S., Medland, L., Nicol, P., & Pitt, H. (2023). Pathways for advancing good work in food systems: Reflecting on the international Good Work for Good Food Forum. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 12(2), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2023.122.004>

Copyright © 2023 by the Authors. Published by the Lyson Center for Civic Agriculture and Food Systems. Open access under CC BY license.

Abstract

The crucial roles that workers, especially seasonal and migrant workers, play in our food systems have come under renewed attention in recent years.

^a Susanna Klassen, PhD Candidate, Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Susanna Klassen is now Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Sociology, University of Victoria; Cornett Building, A333; Victoria, BC, Canada; sklassen@uvic.ca

^b Lydia Medland, Senior Research Associate, School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies, University of Bristol; Bristol BS8 1TU UK; lydia.medland@bristol.ac.uk

^c Poppy Nicol, Research Associate, Sustainable Places Research Institute, Cardiff University.

Poppy Nicol is now a research affiliate at WISERD sbarc | spark; Maindy Road; Cardiff CF24 4HQ Wales UK; nicolp@cardiff.ac.uk

^{d*} *Corresponding author:* Hannah Pitt, Lecturer, School of Geography and Planning, Cardiff University; Glamorgan Building; Cardiff CF10 3WA Wales UK; +44 2920 879 632; pitth2@cardiff.ac.uk

The coronavirus pandemic resulted in food workers being recognized as critical or essential workers in many countries. In 2021, this coincided with the UN International Year of Fruits and Vegetables (IYFV), highlighting the importance of horticultural crops to healthy lives globally. Yet, workers' quality of life in this most labor-intensive form of food production is often disregarded, or in the case of the UN IYFV, misconstrued. The agriculture-

Authors Note

This paper builds on insights from the Good Work for Good Food Forum, which was organized and facilitated by the author team. See the Acknowledgments section at the end of the paper to for the participants in the Good Work for Good Food Forum.

Funding Disclosure

This research was supported primarily by a Sêr Cymru II Fellowship part-funded by Cardiff University and the European Regional Development Fund through the Welsh Government, as well as by a Social Sciences and Humanities Doctoral Fellowship, and a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship.

migration nexus—on which food systems depend—remains recognized as a challenge, yet there is limited debate about how it could be ameliorated and a lack of articulation of desirable alternatives. While alternative food and peasant movements propose food system transformation and alternative labor futures based on *agroecology*, labor lawyers and other advocates propose *regulation and formalization* of workplace regimes to ensure fair working conditions. Most recently, a third possibility has emerged from agri-tech innovators: a *techno-centric* future with far fewer agricultural workers. These three archetypes of agricultural labor futures (agroecological, formally regulated, and techno-centric) have the potential to leave food scholars and activists without a unified, coherent vision to advance. Addressing this gap, this paper reports and builds on insights harvested from the international Good Work for Good Food Forum, organized by the authors with the aim of shaping consensus on positive visions for work in food systems. About 40 scholar-activists across three continents discussed the current challenges facing food workers and crafted a collective vision for good food work. This vision is documented in the form of nine principles supported by a framework of seven enabling pathways. We conclude by emphasizing the need for a people-centered incorporation of technology and a re-valuation of food workers' contributions to global food systems. We offer the vision as a collective platform for action to advocate for and organize with workers in food systems.

Keywords

Labor, Food Workers, Good Food, Good Work, Decent Work, Migrant Workers, Agri-tech, Food Justice, Horticulture

Introduction

For those concerned with the nature and justice of food work, the year 2021 presented a plenitude of cautionary tales for reflection. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic brought public attention to the vital role of food producers and others who work in the supply chain to keep food available and moving. Recognition of the essential nature of food workers brought new public and political

appreciation of their value to society, in stark contrast to how hidden food work typically remains. Coronavirus outbreaks at food production and processing facilities (Douglas, 2020) highlight the extent to which food workers have been vulnerable to the virus and its impacts (Klassen & Murphy, 2020). Conditions at many farms and food processing facilities make it difficult to control such risks, and workers' frequently precarious, unfree or undocumented status makes it difficult for them to speak up about their concerns (Wozniacka, 2020). In some European countries, the domestic population responded to calls to work in the fields, creating an unprecedented surge in interest in seasonal horticultural work (Wax, 2020). Ongoing and overlapping crises caused by war, conflict, and climate change have further underscored the vulnerability of global agri-food supply chains (Clapp, 2022) and the essential roles that workers play in keeping them functioning. Could this be a moment of change—an opportunity to seize on new awareness of what (and who) it takes to produce, process, transport, and make good food available to eaters?

The year 2021 was also declared the International Year of Fruits and Vegetables (IYFV) by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly. Led by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the aim of this initiative was to “raise awareness on the important role of fruits and vegetables in human nutrition, food security and health and as well in achieving UN Sustainable Development Goals” (FAO, 2021). Workers crucial to these horticultural supply chains were strangely absent from this celebration. Where the people behind the produce are acknowledged—including in many photos of them smiling—it is the positive impacts that are highlighted: “Cultivating fruits and vegetables can contribute to a better quality of life for family farmers and their communities” (FAO, 2021, *Key messages: Growing prosperity*). The “can” in that sentence is doing some heavy lifting, given what is known about the work conditions that are characteristic of horticultural work globally. Far from the decent work agenda envisioned by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and laid out in the UN Sustainable Development goals, workers involved in fruit and vegetable production are particularly vulnerable to exploita-

tion, unsafe work conditions, and terms representing modern slavery (Gertel & Sippel, 2017; Gray, 2014; Holmes, 2013; Howard & Forin, 2019). The FAO's expectation is that such problems be resolved through due diligence by businesses (FAO, 2020, pp. 43–44), but the long history and extent of poor work in the fresh produce industry suggests that this approach is woefully insufficient.

As one of the most labor-intensive modes of food production, horticulture has often been where pressures on work and workers emerge, but patterns of disempowerment stretch across food sectors. Academics and scholar-activists have explored the injustices faced by food workers from many perspectives, backgrounds, and countries. They have shown that even producers meeting ecological standards do not necessarily provide better working conditions (Dumont & Baret, 2017; Harrison & Getz, 2015; Soper, 2019; Weiler et al., 2016). Many minority world countries struggle to balance reliance on migrant food workers with a desire to limit immigration (Rye & Scott, 2018). Labor-related inequities disproportionately affect people of color (Freshour, 2017; Liu & Apollon, 2011; Sachs et al., 2014; Weiler, 2022), and both the legacies and contemporary forces of colonialism and racism limit access to becoming a food producer (Levkoe & Offeh-Gyimah, 2020). While technological solutions to labor shortages have gained further support in light of the pandemic, they are far from a panacea (Reisman, 2021) and risk exacerbating injustices within food systems, for example, as increased automation of tasks perceived to be highly skilled may result in more farmers relying on racialized migrant workers (Rotz et al., 2019). Current scientific paradigms upon which much of industrial agriculture depends create a divide between those who “know” agriculture and those who “do” agriculture (Coolsaet, 2016). Despite systemic inequities and disempowerment, food workers find ways of taking action and asserting control, through mutual aid, collective action, and consumer campaigns (Gottlieb & Joshi, 2010; Minkoff-Zern, 2014; Sbicca, 2017).

While the contemporary challenges of food production work are well documented and articulated, this can result in a sense of intractable problems, lacking identified pathways forward toward

more just futures. In this context, and at a moment ripe with opportunities for change, we the authors convened the Good Work for Good Food Forum (hereafter the Forum) in May 2021. As organizers, we were brought together by our shared interests and expertise in jobs, work, labor, and training in food production; early discussions revealed a common appetite for fostering international exchange and embracing diverse perspectives. Based on these shared interests and goals, the authors conceived and planned the Forum. Our aim for this was to go beyond detailing what is wrong with work in food systems and begin shaping a collective vision for what good food work can and should be. By convening discussion among this group of international experts on the topic, we aspired to build consensus on this and pathways toward it.

Building on the insights that emerged from the Forum, this article summarizes current challenges to good food work as highlighted by its participants, describing three archetypes for labor futures. It outlines a collective vision for good food work that goes beyond these archetypes, including pathways and priority actions to advance the vision. The next section provides more background on the Forum itself, followed by a summary of current challenges to good food work, drawing from the presenters' contributions and work accordingly. The description of the archetypes and vision that follow are the result of the author's analysis of insights and discussion from the Forum, and thus represent synthesis compiled by the authors. While the focus of the authors' and many Forum participants' research is labor in food production, we intentionally frame our vision and recommendations in terms of food work more broadly, as the structural inequities and barriers to improvements impact workers across the food chain.

Background: The Good Work for Good Food Forum

The Good Work for Good Food Forum, a one-day online gathering for researchers and scholar-activists to explore together what good food work is and can be, took place in May 2021. In light of the UN IYFV, we chose to highlight work centered on fruits and vegetables, while recognizing connec-

tions across the food system and common struggles and structural inequities facing all food workers. As the organizers, we initially defined good food as healthy, culturally appropriate, accessible for all, and produced in ways that are ecologically sustainable and socially just. We also proposed a working definition of “good food work” to be expanded and refined through the Forum: decent jobs producing, processing, and distributing food, which are fairly rewarded and personally rewarding, with jobs and training accessible to all, in safety and with dignity.

Registration was open, with participants invited through our professional networks and based on our knowledge of current scholarship exploring labor, work, and jobs in the food system. The program was designed to foster interactive discussions toward shared priorities for future action, and to establish global connections. Four speakers were invited to offer provocations on the topic drawing on their expertise and country contexts: Dr. Lucila Granada, Prof. Julie Guthman, Dr. Joanna Howe and Dr. Laura-Anne Minkoff-Zern. Granada is the chief executive of the Focus on Labour Exploitation (FLEX), a UK-based research and policy organization, and has extensive experience with feminist and labor organizations in Latin America. Guthman is a geographer, professor of social sciences at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and an award-winning scholar on agri-food capitalism, alternative food systems, labor, and agricultural technologies. Howe is an associate professor at the Adelaide School of Law and a leading expert on the legal regulation of temporary labor migration. Minkoff-Zern is an associate professor of food studies at Syracuse University whose research explores the interactions between food and racial justice, labor movements, and transnational environmental and agricultural policy. Administrative and facilitation assistance for the Forum was provided by Cardiff University, supported by funding from a Sêr Cymru II Research Fellowship held by one of the organizers.

On the day of the Forum, over 40 participants from North America, Europe, and Australia joined in, with the make-up of the live audience changing

as the working day shifted around global time zones. Recognizing that much is already known about “bad food work,” we sought to develop a collective framework for understanding the barriers to and constraints on good food work prior to the Forum. Participants were invited at event registration to articulate what they see as the biggest challenge in relation to good food work. The organizers analyzed 61 responses¹ to generate an overview of the key issues. A synthesis of these responses—a list of six key challenges and associated needs—was shared in advance with Forum participants and then used as a basis for discussions. Groups were guided through a discussion of what good food work is and what needs to change in relation to current challenges, before prioritizing actions required across different domains of action (e.g., government or civil society). The Forum ended with an open space for all to reflect on priorities and aspirations. Recordings of the presentations and discussions were shared with all who expressed interest in attending. All who registered remain able to access the online notes of discussions created by participants, organizers, and the facilitation team.

It is important to note that although the Forum was open to all, its reach was limited by the organizers’ networks and resources, resulting in participation skewed to the UK and North America. Although some participants brought insight from work in global majority countries, representation from these countries was limited. This was also partially due to a lack of capacity for quality translation, meaning that discussions were limited to English. Furthermore, in planning the Forum we considered whether and how to actively involve food workers, but felt our chosen format was not best suited to seeking their direct participation and would not offer a sufficiently rewarding experience to justify asking for their time. Instead, we sought to involve scholar-activists and organizations who work alongside workers and worker-led movements to reflect their interests in discussions. We recognize this as inadequate to the task of hearing workers’ voices, and suggest attention to how researchers can meaningfully and equitably

¹ Not all of the 61 who submitted comments were able to attend the workshop synchronously.

support worker participation in scholar activism as an area for future action and continued attention.

Following the Forum, the organizers worked to digest and reflect on the discussions. We have sought to summarize the consensus that developed and highlight key issues that emerged. While we draw on contributions made during the Forum, including the speakers' presentations, it remains our perspective on them. A draft of the vision for good food work was shared with speakers and participants for comment and input. This culminated in an open letter addressed to the FAO and other UN agencies connected with food work and workers that called on them to promote a vision for good food work and action toward food systems which better enable it (Good Work for Good Food Forum, 2021). This was signed by Forum participants, then opened to wider support, resulting in more than 100 signatories. Before outlining the content of the vision and enabling pathways for good food work, we outline why it is necessary to address current challenges and inspire coordinated collective action. The following sections share key insights from the Forum speakers and discussions.

Why Food Work Isn't Good: Summary of Current Challenges

Without wanting to rehearse challenges well known to students of agri-food systems, it is important to have a clear sense of what prevents many food workers from having safe, dignified and rewarding work to identify where change is needed most. In this section we focus on current barriers to good food work according to those involved in the Forum, reflecting an assessment of the challenges grounded in their collective expertise. As is apparent in Table 1, barriers to good food work are seen to be deeply rooted and extensive, arising from food systems' neoliberal capitalist imperatives and the legacies of their colonial history. These are knotty problems, often not visible to or understood by consumers, and hence there is a lack of pressure on retailers to make changes in their supply chains. At the same time, those among the

most harmed—food workers—are effectively prevented from challenging their conditions because they often have precarious jobs and immigration statuses.

Perspectives from opposite sides of the globe revealed how seasonal workers in horticulture are in particularly vulnerable positions; they are failed by current regulatory regimes. Recent research by FLEX working with the Fife Migrants Forum (2021) shared by Dr. Granada focused on the UK Seasonal Workers Pilot, a temporary labor migration program intended to address labor shortages in agriculture. FLEX's investigation directly engaged with seasonal workers in Scotland for first-hand insights and to identify risks of human trafficking by applying the ILO's indicators of forced labor. They found that many recruits take on debt to travel to work in the UK, and the threat of withdrawal of work and subsequent lost income effectively coerces workers into accepting unsafe and unfair conditions. Although technically free to leave an employer, in practice worker requests for transfers are often not delivered. This and unresolved complaints about living conditions show how seasonal workers lack influence, a situation Dr. Granada highlighted to be reinforced by lack of inspection and rigorous oversight of the scheme.

The UK's Seasonal Workers Pilot is reminiscent of programs in North America, Australia, and Europe that similarly disempower and devalue migrant workers, resulting in dangerous conditions (Gertel & Sippel, 2017; Mešić & Wikström, 2021; Weiler et al., 2020). The work of Dr. Howe draws attention to the inadequate enforcement of labor regulations in Australia, where there are similar efforts to meet labor needs through managed migration schemes (Howe et al., 2020). In her presentation at the Forum, she called Australia's seasonal worker program the "front doors" of labor migration into horticulture. However, in many cases there are also semi-legal "side doors," and illegal "back doors," through which employers employ undocumented workers who lack labor law protections while risking the punitive force of migration law.² A primary role of labor law is to

² Dr. Howe also applies the front, back side and trap door metaphor to migration pathways for care workers in Australia and New Zealand (Howe et al., 2019)

Table 1. Barriers and Pathways to Good Food Work in the Broader Food System

Barriers to good food work	Pathways to enable good food work	Key pathway for change
1. The capitalist neoliberal organization of the food system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food system under pinned by capitalist inequities, including ethno-racial and gender hierarchies Focus on producing commodified food Alternatives outside capitalism struggle to thrive Access to land and resources to produce food are confined to those with capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decolonized labor relations Collective organization of workers Thriving grassroots movements for agroecology and human rights 	Challenge structural forces, especially capitalism and racism
2. Fractured movements, groups, and constituencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disconnections between food, labor, and environmental movements, and from the fight for racial justice Uncoordinated good food initiatives Nonwaged food work (e.g., peasant and reproductive labor) is overlooked 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unions that are relevant to the diverse social and cultural realities of people's lives Alliances (but not uniformity) beyond the food system and food movements Movements that challenge the focus on waged work; inclusion of reproductive work Labor struggles connected to racial justice struggles 	Build alliances and solidarity
3. Food workers' positions as precarious and devalued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food work (including domestic labor) perceived as unskilled and low value Workers lack recognition and voice in the system that creates their conditions Lack of collectivization increases workers' vulnerability to exploitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food work is viewed as life-giving, knowledge-intensive, and highly skilled, and as including all activities that reproduce life Workers are centered in civic life 	Elevate and empower food workers
4. Indifference of the general consumer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and knowledge about food justice and food labor are limited and poorly understood Food systems lack transparency, so eaters cannot hold industry to account 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eaters act on and care about the injustices faced by food workers The public recognize food workers as central for human flourishing Consumers are aware of food production conditions and their roots in a drive for efficiency Multiple approaches to education about food systems and labor for all life stages 	Educate and galvanize the public around worker demands
5. Complex nature of regulations, protections, and standards in globalized food systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent labor inspectorates lack power and separation from immigration systems International labor standards are inadequate and weakly enforced Migration systems drive labor exploitation and undermine worker protections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All workers protected by citizenship or residency status International standards and conventions set high standards for food work, backed by national and regional regulations Employers comply with local regulations and laws because enforcement is strict The UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants is upheld 	Improve governance, law, policy, and enforcement for worker rights

<p>6. Farmers/employers squeezed by high costs and low prices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International markets drive a race to the bottom in worker conditions and rewards • Power and profit are overly concentrated with retailers, with less returned to producers • Social and ecological costs are displaced to peripheral regions or marginalized groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses of all sizes enabled to invest in good working conditions • Public investment in just and sustainable food production along rights-based frameworks • New routes to market supported by policy and development 	<p>Build supply chains to enable possibilities for good food work</p>
<p>7. Complexity and interconnectedness of food security and labor injustice issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumption of “good food” is too often inaccessible to those with low incomes • Solutions struggle to make systemic impact due to the complexity of food systems and tensions between various injustices • Wellbeing of workers, nonhumans, and consumers are traded against each other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All eaters are empowered to make choices based on their needs, preferences, and place • Enhanced dialogue between food system actors • Systems that reflect the interconnectedness of all life (including animals, plants, workers, and everyone else) and between human, animal, and planetary wellbeing • True cost accounting that captures human and nonhuman dimensions 	<p>Take a systems approach to address challenges</p>

offer safeguards for workers who are in unequal relationships with their employers, whereas migration law fundamentally restricts individuals’ membership to states and therefore their labor markets. In practice, the punitive power of migration law tends to override the protective force of labor law, such that migrant workers receive more harm than protection from state regulatory powers (Costello & Freedland, 2014). This imbalance needs addressing if the law is to protect migrant workers and their role in food systems. A labor market with multiple doors of entry creates segmentation and a hierarchy in which some workers have more rights, better conditions, and earning capacity (Howe et al., 2020). These underlying conditions have strong parallels elsewhere in the Global North and trace back to the supermarket shelf. Farmers who use the most regulated paths for employment (which provide migrant workers more entitlements) face higher labor costs, thus incentivizing informal hiring practices. Retail prices exert downward pressure on farmers, encouraging them to pay workers as little as possible (Rye & Scott, 2018).

Current regulatory systems are failing seasonal workers, and protective regulations are not sufficiently enforced where they do exist. There is a need for increased independent controls such as workplace inspections and consultation with workers. Over and

above regulation, how and whether workers are racialized as nonwhite also affects their treatment. In Australia, workers racialized as white are treated better than those racialized as Asian, across different avenues into the labor market (Underhill & Rimmer, 2016). Workers feel the harsh impacts of this racialization in their bodies because their lives are treated as subservient to those of the plants or animals they tend. For example, in U.S. factory farming, workers’ bodies are contoured and remade according to the needs of intensive production systems (Blanchette, 2020). The drive for efficiency leads to incredibly fast, time-pressured work that significantly impacts workers’ bodies—bodies that are less likely to be white (Guthman, 2019; Holmes, 2013).

Portraits of marginalized food workers who are segmented by migration law, unprotected by inadequate regulatory controls, and devalued in the market-driven race to the bottom were familiar to Forum participants. Familiar too is the difficulty of knowing where to begin picking apart the tangle of threads which pull power away from workers. It is this complexity to which Dr. Minkoff-Zern turned our attention, with her urging to think about labor justice from a food systems perspective. She began with the questions: Is it possible to build a food system that is devoid of human exploitation and

suffering? What would it take to do so? She cautioned that academics and researchers seeking answers have tended to focus on specific parts of the food system, especially on agricultural workers. But labor injustices abound across the food chain, and she reminded us that “struggles of farmworkers in the field are inextricable from those of servers and bussers being paid tipped wages, and Uber Eats drivers working in the gig economy.” Minkoff-Zern’s contribution, drawing on her collaboration with Theresa Mares (Minkoff-Zern & Mares, in press), underscored how working *with* the connections between all workers in the food system will combat the segmentation of workers, and enable collective struggle against common forces hurting workers.

This food systems approach to labor is apparent in social justice and worker organizations’ applied research, such as that of the Food Chain Workers Alliance and Race Forward (Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2012; Liu & Apollon, 2011). Some academic work also follows a food systems analysis of labor (Besky & Brown, 2015; Levkoe et al., 2016; Lo & Jacobson, 2011, 2011; Minkoff-Zern, 2017; Sbicca, 2015; Wald, 2011). Minkoff-Zern and Mares’s vision of scholar-activism resonated with Forum participants for its inclusion of food-based work that takes place both inside and outside the home (i.e., reproductive labor). It also seeks to counter current fractures between movements and actors, with work to support, reflect, and enable coalitions between food workers. Minkoff-Zern also highlighted the need for such coalition-building beyond the food system, such as for the labor movement to address disparate food sectors and for food movements to better address the demands and concerns of the labor movement.

So far we have shown how Forum speakers highlighted that, while possibilities for different futures are apparent in the margins, good food work remains largely unrealized. At the root of the barriers explored during the Forum are unjust power dynamics, which tend to work against workers’ interests. There is growing recognition of the need to address power imbalances within food systems, as highlighted by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food Michael Fakhri and others concerned with corporate domination of the

recent UN Food System Summit (Clapp, 2021; Clapp et al., 2021; Fakhri, 2021). As Clapp notes, a small number of large companies bear huge influence on how food is produced and conditions for food system workers, with profit prioritized over livelihoods (2021). And if corporations continue to consolidate their position, they gain greater bargaining power, further driving down wages and labor conditions (Autor et al., 2017; Khan & Vaheesan, 2017; LeBaron, 2020). So, what is the alternative, and what can we do to help achieve it? In the next section, we lay further groundwork for the vision for good food work by turning to why such visions are important.

Three Archetypes of Food Labor Futures

Professor Guthman’s contributions to the Forum galvanized our efforts to coalesce around a vision of good food work, by highlighting visions that are gaining prominence amongst decision-makers and those who hold power in agri-food systems. She urged paying attention to new technology-focused actors in food systems, including data scientists and app builders, alongside those working on food technology. Their techno-centric vision often entails automated production environments—such as indoor or vertical growing—where many agricultural workers are replaced with drones, robots, artificial intelligence, and “professionalized” labor, such as cell biologists, IT specialists, food scientists, and nutritionists. Under current governance and regulatory regimes, this would likely result in a highly capitalized, industrialized, and biologically simplified agricultural production model (e.g., input- and energy-intensive monocultures).

The automation of food production through technology such as robots, AI, and indoor growing was advocated by many industry actors as a solution to problems revealed or exacerbated by the pandemic (Reisman, 2021). But as critical agri-food scholars have highlighted, tech-centric trajectories are far from politically neutral, and may further entrench food system inequalities, so they require careful consideration (Reisman, 2021; Rose & Chilvers, 2018; Rotz et al., 2019). Techno-centric labor futures would rely heavily upon industries to produce technological equipment (Lakhiar et al., 2018), so they might simply displace dirty and

dangerous jobs from food supply chains to other workplaces (Reisman, 2021). At present, innovations toward data-driven digital farming are usually corporate-led, so they tend to serve corporate interests (Birner et al., 2021; Carolan, 2020; Duncan et al., 2022) and rarely seek to advance ecologically diversified or socially just alternatives to industrialized food production (Wittman et al., 2020), risking potentially adverse lock-ins with undesirable consequences (Clapp, 2021). Many of these agri-tech solutions remain inaccessible to global smallholder farming populations or farmworkers (Mehrabi et al., 2021; Rotz et al., 2019). Also, the automation required to replace the most numerous agricultural jobs (such as harvesting) are thought to be at least a decade away, with no guarantee they will become widely accessible or practical. The risks that agri-tech innovations exacerbate inequities and unsustainable food systems should be central in discussions of their potential, with social and political dimensions considered alongside technical potential (Rose & Chilvers, 2018). Crucially, a rapid transition to more technified and mechanized agriculture is not likely to serve the workers who currently depend on these jobs, yet their interests are rarely represented in agri-tech forums (Reisman, 2021).

As Guthman outlined, this techno-centric trajectory is garnering support in policy and commercial circles, and it presents new questions regarding what constitutes good food work. Why push for more dignified, better protected food jobs, when there is a very real prospect of those jobs disappearing? And how can advocates call for the protection of food jobs from automation without defending the poor nature of current working conditions? At the heart of Guthman's provocation was the question of whether the food movement has a vision clear and compelling enough to counter that of the techno-centric labor future. In the absence of a unified and comprehensive vision for food labor that is just, sustainable, and people-centered, techno-centric visions are likely to continue to gain influence, and might preclude alternatives.

Through discussions at the Forum and subsequent reflection and analysis by the authors, a sketch emerged of two visions typically at play in

minority world food movements that act as alternatives to the techno-centric vision. First is what we might call an "agroecological" approach to food work espoused by alternative food movements and cooperatives, such as those advancing food sovereignty, agroecology, and local food systems. Proposals in this archetype are often grounded in agrarian values of small-scale, family, or subsistence farming and land-based work, and are often detached from status-quo and capitalist food systems. Actors and movements such as La Via Campesina strive for autonomy from a system of "race to the bottom" business approaches and microcontrolled workplace environments. Instead, they aspire to building self-sufficiency, localizing food systems, learning, preserving bio-cultural heritage, and enacting new modes of equality in both the productive and reproductive spheres of living. These systems are often labor-intensive due to crop diversity, less mechanization, and using manual practices in lieu of inputs to control pests (Finley et al., 2018; Jansen, 2000; Montt & Luu, 2019). Given the increased labor requirements of agroecological farming systems, scholars have argued for training an ecologically skilled workforce to steward them (Carlisle et al., 2019) and that work opportunities on these farms have the potential to advance more just working conditions due to the variety of tasks and opportunities for learning (Timmermann & Félix, 2015). However, as research on agro-ecological production has shown, this vision can perpetuate its own forms of exploitation (Ekers et al., 2016; Ekers & Levkoe, 2015; Galt, 2013; Pilgeram, 2011; Weiler, 2022; Weiler et al., 2016), and there remain many unanswered questions about to what extent they offer a more fair alternative in terms of labor.

This "agroecological" vision for food work does not usually involve contracts, fixed working hours or employment benefits such as pensions, hence the significance of the second archetype, what we might call the "formally regulated" workplace. Formal workplace procedures, entitlements, and employment benefits like these are considered important aspects of job quality (Kalleberg, 2013). Though rarely applied to agricultural work—due in part to the pervasive logic of agricultural and migrant worker exceptionalism (Getz et al., 2008;

Weiler & Encalada Grez, 2022)—these characteristics of good-quality jobs are another component of a vision for food work, with strong linkages to labor law, unionization, and industrialization. This vision is a reality for some food workers, such as those who have been able to leverage collective bargaining power through unions like the United Food and Commercial Workers Union. However, there remain serious barriers to such improvements for significant groups of food workers, especially seasonal migrant workers.

This second vision of the “formally regulated” labor future is of waged workers working for good employers within the status-quo food system, under strong regulatory protection. But as Guthman suggested at the Forum, “both [alternative visions] are inadequate and are also flip sides of the same thing, which leaves the core of the food system untouched. The task of imagination is to think beyond both.” Productive re-imagining of better labor futures, she suggested, must seek to go beyond these archetypes and consider how to challenge the status quo and repair the harms it has done.

These contrasting visions for the future of food work (techno-centric, agroecological, and formally regulated) sit among many possibilities, each with shortcomings and advantages. We recognize, for example, the shortcomings of an overly optimistic view of labor in the alternative food sector, which is not exempt from the inequities of food work (Harrison & Getz, 2015; Weiler et al., 2016). Due to lack of state provision of specialist training and the challenges agroecological growers face, unpaid or low-paid traineeships are currently a key developmental pathway, and this risks being exclusive and exploiting those who volunteer their time (Pitt, 2022). Public investment in quality training pathways would help remedy this as an interim solution until these production systems are economically robust enough to generate living incomes. We also recognize the benefits of formal workplace procedures and benefits, but at the same time, we see both that views need to be complicated by the messy reality of food work, including the prevalence of subcontracting, differential arrangements for workers in a shared

workplace, and the hidden nonwaged work happening in homes and elsewhere.

Neither participants nor organizers espouse the view that technology is inherently bad; rather, we amplify the concern that workers’ interests must feature more prominently in assessments of innovation, and calls that agri-tech transformations should not foreclose diverse ways of doing and owning food production. As well articulated by Matt Huber, “What parts of these automated technologies can be repurposed to create agroecological growing systems rather than monoculture-plantation profit machines?” (Huber, 2020, “Socialise the Food System,” para. 10). The Forum’s vision, therefore, includes consideration of how future food systems can harness technologies that enable worker wellbeing and more sustainable and humane food production models.

Outcomes: A Vision and Pathways for Good Food Work

Our objective for the Good Work for Good Food Forum was to craft a shared vision for good food work. To develop a comprehensive and nuanced vision, we had to negotiate tradeoffs between what we outline in the previous section as the three competing archetypes for labor in food systems. The discussions summarized in the previous sections highlighted that a vision for good food work may be even more urgently needed than we realized when conceiving the Forum.

Our proposed vision for good food work in just and sustainable food systems (Figure 1) rejects the view that the best way to deal with the indignities and inequities of food work is to eradicate it. Instead, we advocate a more critical examination of the potential of technology in creating the conditions for good food work. We seek to go beyond what existing employment standards and regulatory controls should achieve to propose a comprehensive vision that lays out what food workers deserve, now and in the future. This vision was crafted by the authors based on insights that emerged from the Forum and shared back to all Forum attendees for feedback and approval. As such, we consider it a collective vision endorsed by Forum participants. It is important to note that the workers currently laboring in food systems have immediate needs

Figure 1. A Collective Vision for Good Food Work

Our vision is to expand and build upon the existing legal standards and best practice in the sector with aspirational principles for how work in food systems can protect, reward, and celebrate those making their livelihoods from this important sector. The principles we propose emerged from the Good Work for Good Food Forum, and in response to concerns regarding visions for food systems that often eclipse, rather than prioritize, the rights of food workers.

Good food work across all sectors and all scales should:

1. Be recognized as valuable and skilled;
2. Be fairly paid, often well-paid, and personally fulfilling;
3. Be available to everyone regardless of personal identity or immigration status;
4. Be safe and be carried out in a healthy and supportive environment;
5. Use technology where it assists workers;
6. Include opportunities for skills development and career progression;
7. Provide workers with access to social security support;
8. Have conditions and terms determined together with workers; and
9. Enable workers' freedom of association and engagement in collective action.

These nine principles should be underpinned by appropriate international law, enforced by nation states, respected by private actors, and open to scrutiny by trade unions and civil society groups. Furthermore, it is important that actors whose role it is to protect and enforce labor standards, such as labor inspectorates, be independent of migration enforcement agencies, who may undermine their protective roles and decrease workers' trust in them. In order for labor standards to be enforced, national labor inspectorates should be given sufficient resources to undertake this work, in line with ILO targets.^a

^a These targets are 1 per 10,000 workers in industrial market economies; 1 per 15,000 in industrializing economies; 1 per 20,000 in transition economies; and 1 per 40,000 in less developed countries (ILO, 2006, p. 4).

that should be met as a matter of urgency—for them, better work conditions are not a distant dream imagined for some vague future. We also recognize our privileged position as academics who can think and write about visions for better worlds of work without having to suffer the injustices and harms of living current labor regimes.

Having identified fundamental principles of a vision for good work, participants at the Forum considered where change is most urgently required to achieve this vision and the barriers to the changes. The main outcomes of these discussions are summarized in Table 1: the first column identifies the main challenges (see the third section, above) that currently prevent good food work from becoming a reality and the conditions underpinning them. The second column suggests enabling factors required to make good work the norm across food systems. The third column char-

acterizes the change sought to realize this element of the vision. As captured in challenge 7, all aspects of the problem are highly interconnected and deeply embedded in global social and economic patterns. Any analysis and plan of action therefore requires a systems approach that considers all parts of a food system and how they interact with wider socio-ecological systems.

It should be apparent from the aspirations in Table 1 that making positive progress requires action both to undo what is “bad” in current systems and to shape alternatives that enact what is “good”; prefiguring alternatives while leaving flawed food systems in place is insufficient. Discussions also highlighted how existing controls and regulations should enable good food work but currently do not, due to inadequate implementation or weak enforcement. Enforcing such regulations more robustly is an obvious action for immediate attention.

Discussions during the Forum also worked to identify priority actions and who might be well placed to initiate them. Participants identified actions in four key domains associated with key actors and spheres of influence: Government, Civil Society, the Private Sector, and Research (Table 2). The actions and enabling pathways most relevant for international agencies such as the FAO, ILO, and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights were captured in our open letter, which highlighted actions relevant to the UN IYFV and beyond (Good Work for Good Food Forum, 2021). Given the international participation and purview of the discussion, it was clear that any action would need to be adapted to territorial context while taking a multifaceted approach targeting all parts of the system.

While the Forum identified opportunities for action, some notes of caution that emerged from our discussions should be acknowledged. First, there are concerns about the limitations and problematic nature of consumer-focused solutions such as product labeling to certify better working conditions, as they tend to act weakly on worker conditions and emphasize individual action and care for self, rather than the collective action and care for others (Brown & Getz, 2008). A second note of caution was sounded in relation to the potential for small-scale agroecological farming as a transforma-

tion pathway. Increasingly promoted by the FAO as having an important role in post-pandemic food system resilience, agroecological and localized food systems can improve environmental and health outcomes (FAO, 2018; Higher Level Panel of Experts, 2019; Wittman et al., 2017). But there remain unanswered questions around the politics, ethics, and sustainability of labor relations that feature heavily in this production (Dumont & Baret, 2017; Ekers et al., 2016; Weiler et al., 2016). Finally, a third unresolved tension that surfaced was whether and how unwaged reproductive labor—an essential part of food systems—features and is accounted for in a good food work agenda. These caveats highlight that there is unlikely to be a single, or simple, pathway toward good food work. It is our hope, however, that the preliminary vision, pathways, and priority actions we present here can be another step in advancing work toward more fair and sustainable labor futures.

Conclusion

The objective of the Forum was to facilitate dialogue between international scholar-activists working on food labor and to coalesce around a vision for good food work. We offer this vision to scholar-activists and others who seek to both advocate for better work across food systems, and to counter visions that fail to consider implica-

Table 2. Priority Actions to Advance Good Food Work for Key Actors in Government, Civil Society, the Private Sector, and Research


Actor	Priority actions
Government	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that the number of labor inspectors meets minimum targets set by the ILO; 2. Ensure that national labor inspectorates are sufficiently resourced and independent from migration enforcement; 3. Implement labor law with remedies and mechanisms of redress for migrant and seasonal workers; and 4. Support seasonal and migrant workers to access remedies for the contravention of labor law.
Civil Society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build solidarities and alliances across movements, especially between food and labor movements; 2. Follow workers' leads and center their demands and experiences; and 3. Advocate comprehensively for all needs across the good food work agenda across food systems.
Private Sector	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure transparency in labeling and information to enable informed consumer choices; 2. Prioritize unionized sourcing; 3. Implement true cost accounting of social and environmental costs; and 4. Create jobs and career pathways offering permanence and full employment rights.
Research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver transdisciplinary work to build understandings of how to support good food work; 2. Take action on worker precarity within university spaces; and 3. Conduct comparative policy analysis to identify best practices across countries.

tions for workers. While not presenting here examples of the vision or pathways in action, participants in the Forum noted positive practices during our discussions; learning about and from such initiatives is a future aspiration for the network emerging from the Forum. This collective learning, and awareness of alternatives to current food work regimes provides hope that better food work is possible.

In addition to the proposed vision and pathways toward it, this work has surfaced questions and tensions that we and others need to grapple with in order to make progress toward good food work. How do we help elevate the voices and power of food workers, making them visible in the context of exploitative structural forces, including capitalism, racism, xenophobia, and sexism? And, how do we do so in ways that do not tokenize their participation, and that are based in trust? How can we better contribute to the development of governance and policy for food workers' rights, especially for (im)migrant workers? What are creative ways that scholar-activists can better bridge academic, social movement and policy spaces through our work?

While work in agriculture and food service are well-studied, transportation, online retail, gig work, haulage and logistics are under-researched forms of food work. Fuller attention to these is required to enable a fully systemic view on food work. Forum participants also highlighted the need for further interrogation of feminist perspectives on food labor in the home, and for decolonial perspectives on the global peasant movement which oppose the neoliberal industrial food system and its corporations. Both these important forms of food work remind us to consider the value and needs of workers beyond those engaged in paid labor, for whom the nature of good work may be quite different. But care is required to ensure that a vision inclusive of unpaid labor does not dilute or undermine demands for enforceable protections for waged workers.

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed the brittle nature of our food system (Hendrickson, 2020), and the ways that labor inequities undermine resilience (Klassen & Murphy, 2020). The urgent need for changes regarding food work was made

abundantly clear, representing a possible opening to make some of these. In her contribution to the Forum, Minkoff-Zern described similar historic moments of heightened public consciousness of food labor injustices which tended to be short-lived, as public awareness of workers' plight gave way to individualistic consumer interests around food health or safety. How do we ensure that the current moment to improve conditions for food workers is not lost? Such a challenge can seem overwhelming, but perhaps our best start point is as Guthman urged, "We need lots and lots of organizing!" Given the scale of the challenge, and that collective action seems the most fruitful path forward, it is heartening that the participants in our Forum expressed a will to continue cooperating. We must begin by finding effective, fair ways to learn from and act in solidarity with food workers themselves. 

Acknowledgments

We warmly acknowledge the contribution of all those who participated in the Good Work for Good Food Forum, both as participants on the day, and in providing writing contributions in advance. Their ideas and labor were crucial to shaping the discussions, and to the content of this paper. In preparing the manuscript we sought confirmation from the speakers that we had represented their views appropriately. We thank them for their time and support. The paper authors take full responsibility for any errors or omissions.

Speakers: Lucila Granada, Julie Guthman, Joanna Howe, Laura-Anne Minkoff-Zern

Participants who attended the Forum and made advance written contributions: Carol Adams, Jennifer Alstrom, Jasmine Black, Adam Calo, Alessandra Corrado, Kamila Fialkowska, Jenny Gerrard, Giulio Iocco, Anna Isaacs, Natascha Klocker, Karen Lawson, Kristin Lozanski, Siobhan Maderson, Teresa Mares, Tezcan Mert-Cakal, Robin Oakley, Kirstie O'Neill, Gabrielle Reagan, Mark Reed, Bethany Robertson, Ben Rogaly, David Rose, Sarah Rotz, Pablo Saralegui, Heidi Saxby, Lopa Saxena, Joshua Sbicca, Johanna Schenner, Sam Scott, Ruth Segal,

Divya Sharma, Fritzie Sison, Victoria Stead, Elaine Swan, Irina Velicu, David Watson, Karen Wilkes

Emmanuelle Hellio, Vicki Hird, Anna Krzywoszynska, Stuart Lang, Natalie Langford, Charles Levkoe, Emily Reid-Musson, Ben Reynolds, Rebecca Sandover, Emily Grace Scurrah, Desiree Simandjuntak, Eren Şimşek, Emily Soh, Mark Stein, Georgie Styles, Cecilia Vergnano, Avalon VerWiebe, Anelyse Weiler

Participants who made advance written

contributions only: Fatmah Alyousif, Azri Amram, Becca Berkey, Beth Cloughton, Olivia Dun, Evelyn Encalada, Nicholas Follett,

References

- Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C., & Reenen, J. V. (2017). Concentrating on the fall of the labor share. *American Economic Review*, 107(5), 180–185. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171102>
- Besky, S., & Brown, S. (2015). Looking for work: Placing labor in food studies. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 12(1–2), 19–43. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15476715-2837484>
- Birner, R., Daum, T., & Pray, C. (2021). Who drives the digital revolution in agriculture? A review of supply-side trends, players and challenges. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 43(4), 1260–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aecpp.13145>
- Blanchette, A. (2020). *Porkopolis: American animality, standardized life, and the factory farm*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478012047>
- Brown, S., & Getz, C. (2008). Privatizing farm worker justice: Regulating labor through voluntary certification and labeling. *Geoforum*, 39(3), 1184–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2007.01.002>
- Carlisle, L., Montenegro de Wit, M., DeLonge, M. S., Iles, A., Calo, A., Getz, C., Ory, J., Munden-Dixon, J., Galt, R., Melone, B., Knox, R., & Press, D. (2019). Transitioning to sustainable agriculture requires growing and sustaining an ecologically skilled workforce. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 3(96), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2019.00096>
- Carolan, M. (2020). Automated agrifood futures: Robotics, labor and the distributive politics of digital agriculture. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 47(1), 184–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2019.1584189>
- Clapp, J. (2021). The problem with growing corporate concentration and power in the global food system. *Nature Food*, 2(6), 404–408. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00297-7>
- Clapp, J. (2022, March 29). *Global food security and the war in Ukraine* [Webinar presentation]. Global Donor Platform for Rural Development. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vRHE4zWFLC4>
- Clapp, J., Noyes, I., & Grant, Z. (2021). The Food Systems Summit's failure to address corporate power. *Development*, 64(3–4), 192–198. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00303-2>
- Coolsaet, B. (2016). Towards an agroecology of knowledges: Recognition, cognitive justice and farmers' autonomy in France. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 47(A), 165–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.07.012>
- Costello, C., & Freedland, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Migrants at work: Immigration and vulnerability in labour law*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198714101.001.0001>
- Douglas, L. (2020, April 22). *Mapping Covid-19 outbreaks in the food system*. Food and Environment Reporting Network. <https://thefern.org/2020/04/mapping-covid-19-in-meat-and-food-processing-plants/>
- Dumont, A. M., & Baret, P. V. (2017). Why working conditions are a key issue of sustainability in agriculture? A comparison between agroecological, organic and conventional vegetable systems. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 56, 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.07.007>
- Duncan, E., Rotz, S., Magnan, A., & Bronson, K. (2022). Disciplining land through data: The role of agricultural technologies in farmland assetization. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 62(2), 231–249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12369>
- Ekers, M., & Levkoe, C. Z. (2015). Transformations in agricultural non-waged work: From kinship to intern and volunteer labor: A research brief. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 6(2), 179–183. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2016.062.010>
- Ekers, M., Levkoe, C. Z., Walker, S., & Dale, B. (2016). Will work for food: Agricultural interns, apprentices, volunteers, and the agrarian question. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 33(3), 705–720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-015-9660-5>

- Fakhri, M. (2021). A trade agenda for the right to food. *Development*, 64(3–4), 212–219.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00305-0>
- Finley, L., Chappell, M. J., Thiers, P., & Moore, J. R. (2018). Does organic farming present greater opportunities for employment and community development than conventional farming? A survey-based investigation in California and Washington. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, 42(5), 552–572.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2017.1394416>
- Focus on Labour Exploitation (FLEX). (2021). *Assessment of the risks of human trafficking for forced labour on the UK Seasonal Workers Pilot*. <https://www.labourexploitation.org/publications/assessment-risks-human-trafficking-forced-labour-uk-seasonal-workers-pilot>
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO]. (2018). *The 10 elements of agroecology: Guiding the transition to sustainable food and agricultural systems*. <https://fao.org/3/I9037EN/i9037en.pdf>
- FAO. (2020). *Fruit and vegetables: Your dietary essentials. The International Year of Fruits and Vegetables, 2021, background paper*. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cb2395en>
- FAO. (2021). *The International Year of Fruits and Vegetables, 2021*. <https://www.fao.org/fruits-vegetables-2021/en/>
- Food Chain Workers Alliance. (2012). *The hands that feed us: Challenges and opportunities for workers along the food chain* [Report]. <https://foodchainworkers.org/2012/06/the-hands-that-feed-us/>
- Freshour, C. (2017, November 7). “Ain’t no life for a mother!” *Racial capitalism and the crisis of social reproduction* [Forum essay]. Society + Space. <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/aint-no-life-for-a-mother-racial-capitalism-and-the-crisis-of-social-reproduction>
- Galt, R. E. (2013). The moral economy is a double-edged sword: Explaining farmer earnings and self-exploitation in community-supported agriculture. *Economic Geography*, 89(4), 341–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecge.12015>
- Gertel, J., & Sippel, S. R. (Eds.). (2017). *Seasonal workers in Mediterranean agriculture: The social costs of eating fresh*. Routledge.
- Getz, C., Brown, S., & Shreck, A. (2008). Class politics and agricultural exceptionalism in California’s organic agriculture movement. *Politics & Society*, 36(4), 478–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329208324709>
- Good Work for Good Food Forum. (2021, October). *Open letter*. Organise Platform.
<https://the.organise.network/campaigns/teamup-good-work-for-good-food>
- Gottlieb, R., & Joshi, A. (2010). *Food justice*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/7826.001.0001>
- Gray, M. (2014). *Labor and the locavore: The making of a comprehensive food ethic*. University of California Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520957060>
- Guthman, J. (2019). *Wilted: Pathogens, chemicals, and the fragile future of the strawberry industry*. University of California Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520973343>
- Harrison, J. L., & Getz, C. (2015). Farm size and job quality: Mixed-methods studies of hired farm work in California and Wisconsin. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 32(4), 617–634. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9575-6>
- Hendrickson, M. K. (2020). Covid lays bare the brittleness of a concentrated and consolidated food system. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 37(3), 579–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-020-10092-y>
- Higher Level Panel of Experts (HLPE). (2019). *Agroecological and other innovative approaches for sustainable agriculture and food systems that enhance food security and nutrition* (HLPE Report No. 14). Higher Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. <https://www.fao.org/3/ca5602en/ca5602en.pdf>
- Holmes, S. M. (2013). *Fresh fruit, broken bodies: Migrant farmworkers in the United States*. University of California Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt7zw45x>
- Howard, N., & Forin, R. (2019). Migrant workers, ‘modern slavery’ and the politics of representation in Italian tomato production. *Economy and Society*, 48(4), 579–601. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2019.1672426>
- Howe, J., Charlesworth, S., & Brennan, D. (2019). Migration pathways for frontline care workers in Australia and New Zealand: Front doors, side doors, back doors and trapdoors. *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, 42(1), 211–241. <https://doi.org/10.53637/KFDM2981>
- Howe, J., Reilly, A., Clibborn, S., van den Broek, D., & Wright, C. F. (2020). Slicing and Dicing Work in the Australian Horticulture Industry: Labour Market Segmentation within the Temporary Migrant Workforce. *Federal Law Review*, 48(2), 247–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X20905956>

- Huber, M. (2020, April 19). Socialise the food system. *Tribune Magazine*.
<https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/04/socialise-the-food-system>
- International Labour Organization [ILO]. (2006). Strategies and practice for labour inspection (Document GB.297/ESP/3). ILO Governing Body, 297th Session.
https://www.ilo.org/gb/GBSessions/WCMS_GB_297_ESP_3_EN/lang--en/index.htm
- Jansen, K. (2000). Labour, livelihoods and the quality of life in organic agriculture in Europe. *Biological Agriculture and Horticulture*, 17(3), 247–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01448765.2000.9754845>
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2013). *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States*. Russel Sage Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017013480403>
- Khan, L. M., & Vaheesan, S. (2017). Market Power and Inequality: The Antitrust Counterrevolution and Its Discontents. *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 11, 61.
- Klassen, S., & Murphy, S. (2020). Equity as both a means and an end: Lessons for resilient food systems from COVID-19. *World Development*, 136(105104), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105104>
- Lakhiar, I. A., Jianmin, G., Syed, T. N., Chandio, F. A., Buttar, N. A., & Qureshi, W. A. (2018). Monitoring and Control Systems in Agriculture Using Intelligent Sensor Techniques: A Review of the Aeroponic System. *Journal of Sensors*, 2018, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/8672769>
- LeBaron, G. (2020). *Combating Modern Slavery: Why Labour Governance is Failing and What We Can Do About It*. Polity.
- Levkoe, C. Z., McClintock, N., Minkoff-Zern, L.-A., Coplen, A., Gaddis, J., Lo, J., Tendick-Matesanz, F., & Weiler, A. M. (2016). Forging Links Between Food Chain Labor Activists and Academics. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 6(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2016.062.009>
- Levkoe, C. Z., & Offeh-Gyimah, A. (2020). Race, privilege and the exclusivity of farm internships: Ecological agricultural education and the implications for food movements. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(2), 580–598. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619872616>
- Liu, Y. Y., & Apollon, D. (2011). *The Color of Food*. Race Forward.
https://www.raceforward.org/sites/default/files/downloads/food_justice_021611_F.pdf
- Lo, J., & Jacobson, A. (2011). Human Rights from Field to Fork: Improving Labor Conditions for Food-sector Workers by Organizing across Boundaries. *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, 5(1), 61–82.
<https://doi.org/10.2979/racethmulglocon.5.1.61>
- Mehrabi, Z., McDowell, M. J., Ricciardi, V., Levers, C., Martinez, J. D., Mehrabi, N., Wittman, H., Ramankutty, N., & Jarvis, A. (2021). The global divide in data-driven farming. *Nature Sustainability*, 4(2), 154–160.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00631-0>
- Mešić, N., & Wikström, E. (2021). Ruptures and acts of citizenship in the Swedish berry-picking industry. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 88, 518–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.04.011>
- Minkoff-Zern, L.-A. (2014). Challenging the Agrarian Imaginary: Farmworker-led food movements and the potential for farm labor justice. *Human Geography*, 7(1), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/194277861400700107>
- Minkoff-Zern, L.-A. (2017). The case for taking account of labor in sustainable food systems in the United States. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 32(6), 576–578. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170517000060>
- Minkoff-Zern, L.-A., & Mares, T. (in press). *Will work for food: Labor across the food chain*. University of California Press.
- Montt, G., & Luu, T. (2019). Does Conservation Agriculture Change Labour Requirements? Evidence of Sustainable Intensification in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 1477-9552.12353.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12353>
- Pilgeram, R. (2011). “The only thing that isn’t sustainable%is the farmer”: Social sustainability and the politics of class among Pacific Northwest farmers engaged in sustainable farming. *Rural Sociology*, 76(3), 375–393.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2011.00051.x>
- Pitt, H. (2022). *Knowing to grow: Increasing the resilience of plant centred food production skills* [Research briefing]. School of Geography and Planning, Cardiff University.
https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/2633211/KtoG-Findings-Biling.pdf

- Reisman, E. (2021). Sanitizing agri-food tech: COVID-19 and the politics of expectation. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 48(5), 910–933. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1934674>
- Rose, D. C., & Chilvers, J. (2018). Agriculture 4.0: Broadening responsible innovation in an era of smart farming. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 2, Article 87. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2018.00087>
- Rotz, S., Gravely, E., Mosby, I., Duncan, E., Finnis, E., Horgan, M., LeBlanc, J., Martin, R., Tait Neufeld, H., Nixon, A., Pant, L., Shalla, V., & Fraser, E. (2019). Automated pastures and the digital divide: How agricultural technologies are shaping labour and rural communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 68, 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.01.023>
- Rye, J. F., & Scott, S. (2018). International labour migration and food production in rural Europe: A review of the evidence. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 58(4), 928–952. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12208>
- Sachs, C., Allen, P., Terman, A. R., Hayden, J., & Hatcher, C. (2014). Front and back of the house: Socio-spatial inequalities in food work. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-013-9445-7>
- Sbicca, J. (2015). Food labor, economic inequality, and the imperfect politics of process in the alternative food movement. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 32(4), 675–687. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-015-9582-2>
- Sbicca, J. (2017). Resetting the “good food” table: Labor and food justice alliances in Los Angeles. In A. Alkon & J. Guthman (Eds.), *The new food activism: Opposition, cooperation and collective action* (pp. 107–132). University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520292130.003.0005>
- Soper, R. (2019). How wage structure and crop size negatively impact farmworker livelihoods in monocrop organic production: Interviews with strawberry harvesters in California. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 37(2), 325–336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-019-09989-0>
- Timmermann, C., & Félix, G. F. (2015). Agroecology as a vehicle for contributive justice. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 32(3), 523–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9581-8>
- Underhill, E., & Rimmer, M. (2016). Layered vulnerability: Temporary migrants in Australian horticulture. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58(5), 608–626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185615600510>
- Wald, S. D. (2011). Visible farmers/invisible workers: Locating immigrant labor in food studies. *Food, Culture & Society*, 14(4), 567–586. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174411X13046092851479>
- Wax, E. (2020, March 25). ‘There’s work on the farm’ EU countries tell the newly unemployed. POLITICO. <https://www.politico.eu/article/coronavirus-agriculture-coronavirus-hit-countries-to-newly-unemployed-help-us-farm/>
- Weiler, A. M. (2022). Seeing the workers for the trees: Exalted and devalued manual labour in the Pacific Northwest craft cider industry. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 39(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-021-10226-w>
- Weiler, A. M., & Encalada Grez, E. (2022). Rotten asparagus and just-in-time workers: Canadian agricultural industry framing of farm labour and food security during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Canadian Food Studies / La Revue Canadienne Des Études Sur l'alimentation*, 9(2), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v9i2.521>
- Weiler, A. M., Otero, G., & Wittman, H. (2016). Rock stars and bad apples: Moral economies of alternative food networks and precarious farm work regimes. *Antipode*, 48(4), 1140–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12221>
- Weiler, A. M., Sexsmith, K., & Minkoff-Zern, L.-A. (2020). Parallel precarity: A comparison of U.S. and Canadian agricultural guestworker programs. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 26(2), 143–163. <https://doi.org/10.48416/ijfaf.v26i2.57>
- Wittman, H., Chappell, M. J., Abson, D. J., Bezner Kerr, R., Blesh, J., Hanspach, J., Perfecto, I., & Fischer, J. (2017). A social–ecological perspective on harmonizing food security and biodiversity conservation. *Regional Environmental Change*, 17(5), 1291–1301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-016-1045-9>
- Wittman, H., James, D., & Mehrabi, Z. (2020). Advancing food sovereignty through farmer-driven digital agroecology. *International Journal of Agriculture and Natural Resources*, 47(3), 235–248. <https://doi.org/10.7764/ijanr.v47i3.2299>
- Wozniacka, G. (2020, March 25). *Farmworkers are in the coronavirus crosshairs*. Civil Eats. <https://civileats.com/2020/03/25/farmworkers-are-in-the-coronavirus-crosshairs/>