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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

PIGS IN SPACE:
GHOSTS, GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN A DEBATE ABOUT REGULATING
INDUSTRIAL HOG FARMS IN KENTUCKY

In 1997, Governor Paul Patton of Kentucky asked the state Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection to develop administrative regulations for industrial hog farms in the state. The regulatory process has been contentious. From 1997 through 1998, the Cabinet held five public hearings to elicit comments on the proposed regulations. This study is designed to answer two questions. First, how, within parameters of participation established by the Kentucky Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, have participants in the debate deployed notions of risk to privilege certain gendered and sexualized farming identities, farming practices, and notions of rurality? Second, how will the spatial arrangements proposed by participants alter social relationships?

A theoretical framework that draws from Foucault’s work on governmentality and power/knowledge, feminist theories and Latour’s actor network theory was developed for this analysis which combines discourse analysis with participant observation. The study examines texts produced by the Cabinet and three groups: the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, Kentuckians for the Commonwealth and Community Farm Alliance. Texts include transcripts of hearing comments, published histories, newspapers and web sites produced by three studied, law suits related to the debate, and newspaper coverage of the debate. Participant observation was conducted at public hearings and meetings of the Kentuckians for the Commonwealth and Community Farm Alliance.

Results from this project suggest that gender and sexualization play very important roles in establishing hierarchies between organized groups and government agencies. Results also indicate that the constructions of farmers, farming and rurality produced by hierarchical relationships are largely dependent on distinct spatial arrangements which have very real effects on human-human, human-environment and human-animal relationships.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction:
Hogs, hybridity, and hauntings

No longer can we speak of separate spheres of culture and nature, but rather of 'hybrid spaces' of the cultural and the natural where are conjoined knowledges, products, images, and experiences of both artificial and natural derivation.¹

This is a ghost story. Through a poststructural feminist analysis of a battle about regulation of industrialized hog farming² in Kentucky, I interrogate the categories of farming, farmers, rurality and Kentucky to evoke the multitude of often-gendered exclusions that, having been repressed, hover like specters about the debate. Throughout, when I use the term “environment” I am signifying “the biophysical material medium through which agriculture is practiced” and when I refer to “agri-environmental activism,” I am referencing the “political relations and discursive agendas articulated as farmers and other industry participants attempt to monitor and manage aspects of the biophysical context” (Liepens 1998: 1180). In this introduction, after explaining why this dispute is important and identifying key participants, I discuss how similar debates have been theorized by social scientists. I then lay out an alternative theoretical framework, which I argue better captures the complexities of such debates. Finally, after explaining my methodology, I outline the chapters that follow.

Importance of the debate

The debate began when two large-scale industrial hog producers announced plans to locate facilities in western Kentucky in 1997. Under pressure from concerned residents of western Kentucky, Governor Paul Patton ordered a moratorium on the issuance of permits to industrial hog farms and instructed the Kentucky Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection to develop emergency and permanent regulations for industrial hog farms. I am analyzing the comments made at five hearings that the Cabinet held to elicit public response from late 1997 through the fall of 1998. Because the debate is still ongoing in the legislative session of 2002, I will summarize subsequent public hearing comments and changes in the regulations in an afterword.

The debate is heated for a number of reasons. First, farming is a major constituent of western Kentucky’s identity. Agriculture in Kentucky is “a venerable social and cultural institution” (Raitz 1998: 155). Like other states in the US Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) southern region, “Kentucky has more of a small farm character than that of the nation at large” (Wimberley 1986: 99).³ Thus, changes in farming practices that are seen to threaten the family

² I am working with Goldschmidt’s (1998: 184-185) definition of industrialized agriculture: “large-scale operations with state-of-the-art technology, fully integrated into the market system, dependent upon wage labor under a hierarchical scheme of management. It is efficiency driven and unsentimentally profit oriented.”
³ As will be discussed later, farms in western Kentucky, however, are on average larger than those in central and eastern Kentucky. Farm sizes in many counties in the western portion of the state range from 226 to 300 and 301 to
farm become political issues because the identities of farmers and rural communities are involved and because of the “political leverage” (Raitz 1998: 155) of farmers that has resulted from the favored status of agriculture in Kentucky.

Because “farm pollution is socially constructed and shaped by rural and social change” (Ward et al. 1995: 1193), pollutions often become “analogies for expressing a general view of the social order” (Douglas 1996: 4). In the Kentucky debate, notions of farm pollution, and of associated risks, are intimately connected to participants’ perspectives on changes in agricultural practices. Those expressing the greatest sense of risk are most apprehensive about industrial hog farming; those asserting that there is insufficient risk to warrant regulation represent industrial farming as ‘progress’.

It is impossible to understand this debate without linking “the fortunes of the local area to the wider national and international scene” and to “the different levels of change going on within the local area” (Massey 1991: 271). The shift to industrialized hog farming in Kentucky and elsewhere can be understood only within the larger context of the changing nature of agriculture in an increasingly global economy (Buttel et al. 1990; Friedmann 1994; Marsden and Whatmore 1994; McMichael 1994, 1995; Whatmore 1995). Following the dismantling of the Bretton Woods system in the 1970s and subsequent restructuring of global markets in the 1980s, agricultural commodities were drawn into global capital markets precipitating engagement of industrial, and service sectors with agricultural production (McMichael 1994). Critics of US farm policy point out that increased production by other exporting countries, inelasticity of farm product prices and a lack of competitive markets that have resulted from this restructuring have resulted in the loss of US farms. Littleston and Ritchie (2000: 11) report, “The total number of farms in the US has declined from 6.5 million in 1935 to 2.05 million in 1997.”

Kentucky has also experienced a steady loss of farms. Table 1.1 demonstrates the reduction in numbers of farms over time.

Table 1.1. Decline in numbers of Kentucky farms, 1978-1997 (USDA 1997 Census of Agriculture, p. 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102,263</td>
<td>101,642</td>
<td>92,453</td>
<td>90,281</td>
<td>82,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

600 acres while much of the central and eastern counties have farms ranging from one to 75 acres, excepting much of the Blue Grass region where farms range from 151 to 225 acres (Raitz 1998).

4 Many of the remaining farms are utilized primarily as residences or as retirement homes rather than being maintained as working farms that produce income (Littleston and Ritchie 2000).

5 I am using the US Department of Agriculture’s definition of a farm as “any place from which $1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sole, or normally would have been sold during the census year” (1997 Agricultural Census, p. 5). Clearly, operations with such low sales figures are not viable economically and depend upon off-farm income.
Figure 1.1 is a map of Kentucky counties to which I will refer in this and later chapters.

Figure 1.1. Map of Kentucky counties. From 1997 USDA Agricultural Census. (Prepared by Richard Gilbreath).

Figure 1.2 illustrates the average farm size in each county of the state. As indicated by map, although Kentucky’s farms are, on average, small, most counties, excepting those in the eastern Appalachian region, are home to some farms of over 1,000 acres.6

6 Numbers of farms over 1,000 acres per county are as follows: Adair, 5; Allen, 14; Anderson, 5; Ballard, 24; Barren, 13; Bath, 12; Boone, 5; Bourbon, 29; Boyd, 2; Boyle, 10; Bracken, 4; Breathitt, 4; Breckenridge, 29; Bullitt, 4; Butler, 21; Caldwell, 21; Calloway, 33; Carlisle, 20; Carroll, 7; Carter, 3; Casey, 12; Christian, 64; Clark, 24; Clay, 2; Clinton, 4; Crittenden, 19; Cumberland, 14; Daviess, 60; Edmonson, 2; Elliott, 1; Estill, 2; Fayette, 19; Fleming, 14; Franklin, 2; Fulton, 35; Gallatin, 2; Garrard, 6; Grant, 3; Graves, 50; Grayson, 15; Green, 3; Greenup, 4; Hancock, 8; Hardin, 23; Harrison, 10; Hart, 8; Henderson, 57; Henry, 14; Hickman, 30; Hopkins, 35; Jackson, 2; Jefferson, 1; Jessamine, 7; Kenton, 1; Knox, 4; Larue, 9; Laurel, 5; Lawrence, 1; Lee, 2; Leslie, 1; Lewis, 9; Lincoln, 10; Livingston, 19; Logan, 48; Lyon, 7; McCracken, 16; McCreary, 1; McLean, 30; Madison, 16; Magoffin, 1; Marion, 13; Marshall, 10; Mason, 12; Meade, 9; Menifee, 2; Mercer, 9; Metcalfe, 5; Monroe, 16; Montgomery, 10; Morgan, 4; Muhlenberg, 22; Nelson, 13; Nicholas, 8; Ohio, 26; Oldham, 11; Owen, 12; Owsley, 1; Pendleton, 3; Perry, 1; Powell, 1; Pulaski, 11; Robertson, 2; Rockcastle, 3; Rowan, 1; Russell, 3; Scott, 18; Shelby, 11; Simpson, 2; Spencer, 5; Taylor, 2; Todd, 40; Trigg, 22; Trimble, 4; Union, 57; Warren, 26; Washington, 11; Wayne, 14; Webster, 34; Whitley, 1; Wolfe, 4; and Woodford, 18.
Changes related to this restructuring have been especially apparent in regional reorganizations of livestock production in the US (McMichael 1994). These regional reorganizations have relied upon the use of technology to reduce risks and thus make livestock production more attractive to investors from the industrial, financial, and service sectors (Ufkes 1995). Confinement of hogs in climate-controlled buildings called Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) reduces weather-related risks, artificial insemination allows farmers to mate sows with the semen of boars whose genes will produce hogs with desired muscle to fat ratios, the addition of antibiotics to feed and strict adherence to stringent rules regarding human-animal contact minimize the risk of disease outbreak, and visual technology to measure fat ratios lessens the risk that hogs will be rejected by slaughter houses for failing to meet new criteria to ensure production of lean pork (Ufkes 1995). These changes, which have been designed to “alter the interior geography of the pig for profit” (Ufkes 1995: 683), have also altered the geographies of production, geographies on the farm, and, as a result of increased use of migrant laborers in production and farmers who leave the farm and enter the wage labor force, the geographies of labor.

The shift to CAFOs has occurred rapidly. After the restructuring of the hog production industry, the three largest pork producers in 1978—Oscar Mayer, Wilson Foods, and Purina Mills—were replaced by Murphy Family Farms, Carroll’s Foods Inc, Prestage Farms, Inc., Circle Four (Carroll’s; Murphy through its Utah subsidiary, West Isle; Prestage; and Smithfield through its subsidiary Smithfield Carroll), Cenex/Land O’Lakes; Alliance Farms Cooperative (Farmland Industries, Yuma Milling, and Mercantile Cooperative); and Smithfield (Horwitz 1998). These firms obtain the majority of their hogs from Pig Improvement Company, the largest swine genetics company in the US and owner of the United Kingdom’s National Pig Development Company (Horwitz 1998). These standardized genetically altered pigs have replaced the plethora of breeds—Duroc, Hampshire, Berkshire, Yorkshire, Poland China, Landrace, and Chester White—that once grunted across the American landscape (Horwitz 1998). The major firms, often referred to as corporate integrators, contract with individual farmers, in
some cases, financing building costs and a portion of the mortgage, and arranging for commercial loans for the remainder of the costs of constructing a state-of-the-art operation (Horwitz 1998). Similar concentration has occurred in the pork production input industry (Horwitz 1998) and in meatpacking (Horwitz 1998, Ufkes 1995). In 1980, less than two percent of pork was produced under contract or full vertical integration, however, in the 1990s, this share increased to 32 percent and “the top 15 hog producers now own 22 percent of the breeding stock in the United States” (Lamb and Beshear 1998: 49-66).

Although it occurred later than the restructuring in the Midwest Swine Belt (Horwitz 1998) and North Carolina (Furuseth 1997), Kentucky’s experience is typical of national pork sector restructuring. Since 1982, figures compiled by the University of Kentucky’s Department of Agricultural Economics show increasing concentration in hog production in the state. While the number of hogs produced in Kentucky has declined since 1982, during the same period eleven counties in the western part of the state saw a simultaneous 25 percent increase in the number of hogs produced and 45 percent decrease in the numbers of farms producing hogs (Cabinet Regulatory Impact Analysis). Figure 1.3 illustrates changes in the number of hogs in Kentucky counties from 1992 to 1997 an the presence of hog farms with more than 1,000 head.ogs in According to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), from 1978-1998 operations with hogs in Kentucky decreased from 31,000 to 1,700 and Kentucky currently ranks 18th nationally in hog and pig7 production with 520,000 head as of 1 December 1998, a record low which represented a nine percent decrease from the previous year’s record low.

**CHANGE IN NUMBER OF HOG FARMS**

![Map of Kentucky showing changes in number of hog farms from 1992 to 1997.](image)

Figure 1.3. Change in number of hog farms – 1992 to 1997, and counties in which number of hogs increased from 1992 to 1997. From 1997 Agricultural Census. (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath and John Hintz)

Currently the Kentucky Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection holds permits on 143 agricultural waste handling systems with 1,000 or more head of swine. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, some farmers maintained that the proposed regulations were unnecessary because the Cabinet currently operates a permit regulation system under the

---

7 According to USDA, hogs are animals that meet weight criteria for slaughter; pigs weigh too little to slaughter profitably.
Kentucky No-Discharge Operational Permit program. Cabinet personnel and activists, however, maintained that the current permit program was insufficient to regulate the wastes produced by large CAFOs.

According to the Cabinet, the four largest swine feeding operations are located in Nelson County (16,400 swine), Graves County (12,000 swine), Allen County (11,200 swine), and Butler County (11,020 swine). Figure 1.3, which has been compiled from data supplied by the Kentucky Auditor indicates the location and numbers of AFOs across the state. The Cabinet defines AFOs as: “A lot or facility where animals have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period, and where crops, vegetation forage, growth, or post-harvest residues are not sustained over any portion of the lot or facility in the normal growing season.”

Under the Cabinet’s definitions, a CAFO is an AFO with the following additions to the AFO definition: “If there are more than 300 Animal Units confined and there is a discharge to the Waters of the Commonwealth, then the operation is a CAFO, or . . . if there are more than 1,000 Animal Units confined, then the operation is a CAFO.” For the purposes of discussion, I am following participants in the debate by using the term CAFO as synonymous with swine feeding operations. Figure 1.4 indicates the presence of AFOs in the state; Figure 1.5, the presence of CAFOs.

---

9 Ibid.
The simultaneous decline of hog farms and concentration of larger numbers of hogs on larger farms is illustrated in the following counties where, between 1992 and 1997, hog farms were lost while hog numbers increased: Allen County, 58 fewer hog farms, 3,680 more hogs; Bourbon, 17 fewer hog farms were lost, 3,226 more hogs; Butler, 68 fewer hog farms, 6,851 more hogs; Daviess, 40 fewer hog farms, 1,592 more hogs; Graves, 45 fewer hog farms, 1,445 more hogs; Hancock, 19 fewer hog farms, 2,828 more hogs; Letcher, 2 fewer hog farms, 36 more hogs; Montgomery, 3 fewer hog farms, seven more hogs; Nelson, 56 fewer hog farms, 11,513 more hogs; Perry, one less hog farm, nine more hogs; Rockcastle, five fewer farms. 153 more hogs; Todd, 39 fewer hog farms; 696 more hogs; Trigg, 21 fewer hog farms, 12,105 more hogs; Warren, nine fewer hog farms, 1,405 more hogs; and Wolfe, 12 fewer hog farms, 59 more hogs.
It is noteworthy that most of the existing CAFOs are in the western portion of the state where, as will be discussed later, much of the underlying geology is prone to karst formation. The increasing consolidation and concentration of hog production is not inevitable. The reach of agribusiness firms (and other transnational corporations) depends upon intricate interweavings of situated people, artifacts, codes and living things and the maintenance of particular tapestries of connection across the world. Such processes and patterns of connection are not reducible to a single logic or determinant interest lying somewhere outside or above the social fray (Whatmore and Thorne 1997: 288).

Because these processes of globalization are uneven, they create spaces for resistance in which often oppositional networks may operate.

In this context, alternative geographies of food are located in the political competence and social agency of individuals, institutions, and alliances enacting a variety of partial knowledges and strategic interests through networks which simultaneously involve a ‘lengthening’ of spatial and institutional reach and a ‘strengthening’ of environmental and social embeddedness. Such networks exist alongside the corporate and state networks of orthodox accounts of globalisation, sometimes overlapping them in space (Whatmore and Thorne 1997: 294-295).

The Kentucky debate was heated also because environmental and public health effects of industrial hog farming have become a matter of national concern. The efficiency of the hogs’ digestion systems, which metabolizes everything useful to the animal, leaves only matter of high biochemical demand (making it harder to decompose) to be released into the environment (Horwitz 1998). “On average, a hog produces two tonnes of manure each year” (Choudhary et al. 1996: 581). The result is that, roughly speaking, a modest operation (a farm that raises pigs from a breeding stock of 100 sows) produces about the same amount of pollution as 5,000 people. These days state-of-the-art farms are more likely to count their breeding stock in the thousands. So... a big guy’s building complex down the lane has the environmental impact of 100,000 toilets. And they are not attached to a sewerage plant or even a septic tank, just a giant, open cesspool that they call a ‘lagoon’ (Horwitz 1998: 53).

In CAFOs animals are kept in large houses from which waste is collected and piped into these odiferous cesspools, where solid waste decomposes and liquid waste is drawn off and sprayed upon adjacent fields. Environmental problems associated with CAFOs include contamination of surface and groundwater resulting from leaks or collapses of sewage lagoons and from disposal of dead animals, soil degradation as a result of nitrogen and phosphorous buildup, and odors. Figure 1.5 illustrates the complex environmental effects on ecosystems generally, and water, soil and air specifically that are associated with industrial hog farming practices.
National environmental organizations, including the Sierra Club and Greenpeace, have consistently called for national regulations, and the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is currently developing such regulations. National newspapers, including the *New York Times*, Wall Street Journal, and *Washington Post* have run stories about deleterious environmental impacts and occupational safety issues related to hog CAFOs. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have issued advisories about occupational dangers, including deaths resulting from fermenting manure (Morse et al. 1981), deaths resulting from liquid manure systems (*Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1981), and fatal inhalation of liquid manure gas (Ebert and Dennis 1993, Eisma 1990, Hagley and South 1983, Murphy 1991). Gases of concern include methane, hydrogen sulfide, carbon dioxide, and ammonia.

Other identified hazards include respiratory illnesses related to inhalation of dust, hearing loss resulting from noise levels in the buildings where hogs are confined, and diseases such as *pfesteria*, which causes nausea, migraines, sores that do not heal, and memory loss, as well as *leptospirosis*, a bacterial disease associated with exposure to water contaminated with the urine of infected animals (Centers for Disease Control 1998), and other gastrointestinal illnesses (Gomez et al. 1995). Exposure to sulfates in drinking water presents a particular danger to women and children: it has been correlated with spontaneous abortions. Incidence of infantile methemoglobinemia, a potentially fatal illness, has been correlated with bottle-fed infants’ exposures to high nitrate levels in water (Jackson 1998). These are examples of

---

gender-related differences in reactions to environmental substances. Persistent toxic chemicals, largely because of their ability to cross the placenta, to bioaccumulate, and to occur as mixtures, pose serious health threats disproportionately to infants, mothers, and the elderly (Warren 1997: 10).

Cabinet spokesman Mark York reports there are some 250 CAFOs producing hogs and chickens in Kentucky—roughly 90 percent of which are located west of I-65 (DeGrand 2000). According to York, “a CAFO with 2,500 hogs produces 1.25 million gallons of waste a year and a 100,000 poultry operation generates 600 tons of waste annually” (DeGrand 2000: 12). Cabinet figures compiled since 1993 indicate that “the Division of Water [of the Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection] responded to 31 complaints of lagoon leaks, failures, or overflows, 69 complaints of off-site swine waste runoff, 45 complaints of direct discharge of swine waste to surface waters, and 10 fish kills attributed to swine waste.”

Participants. As structured by the Cabinet, public participation consisted of the opportunity to comment orally at the public hearings and/or in writing. As indicated by Figure 1.3, the Cabinet selected five locations for the public hearings held in 1997 and 1998: Hopkinsville, the county seat of Christian County; simultaneous hearings in Paducah, the county seat of McCracken County, and Bowling Green, the county seat of Warren County; Frankfort, the state capital and county seat of Franklin County; and Cadiz, the county seat of Trigg County. Also, as indicated on the map, comments, both oral made at the hearings14 and written, were made by residents of roughly one-third of Kentucky’s 120 counties. Comments came from Allen, Anderson, Barren, Breathitt, Caldwell, Calloway, Christian, Cumberland, Daviess, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Graves, Green, Hardin, Harrison, Henderson, Henry, Hickman, Hopkins, Jefferson, Jessamine, Logan, Marshall, McLean, Montgomery, Muhlenberg, Nelson, Rockcastle, Rowan, Shelby, Trigg, Trimble, Union, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Webster, and Woodford Counties.

Figure 1.7 indicates the hearing sites and the geographical areas from which people who attended the hearings traveled.

HEARINGS SITES AND COUNTIES PARTICIPANTS TRAVELLED FROM

Figure 1.7. Locations of hearings and counties of residence reported by hearing attendees. (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath.)

13 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 16.
14 These counties are self-reported. Many people who signed in did not indicate their county.
Cabinet figures indicate that 556 non-official personnel attended the Hopkinsville hearing; 168, Bowling Green; 133, Paducah; 110 Frankfort; and 181, Cadiz.\(^{15}\) Although the Cabinet selected locations near those areas it expected to be affected, as indicated in Table 1.2, many people drove substantial distances to attend more than one hearing.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing locations</th>
<th>Numbers attending</th>
<th>Hearing Locations</th>
<th>Numbers attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; P</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>H &amp; BG</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>H &amp; C</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>P &amp; C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG &amp; F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BG &amp; C</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F &amp; C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>H, BG &amp; F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H, P &amp; F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>H, BG &amp; C</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG, F &amp; C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H, F &amp; C</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, F &amp; C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>H, BG, F &amp; C</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H, P, F &amp; C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation entails transaction costs. Many people who attended hearings at some distance from their homes incurred the additional expense of obtaining lodging near the hearing site to avoid initiating a long drive after 10 or 10:30 p.m. when the hearings usually ended. Not surprisingly, many who attended three or more meetings were representatives from agribusiness firms, whose related expenses were likely paid by employers, and employees of the state university system, whose expenses were likely paid by the university.\(^{16}\) Additionally, unlike agribusinesses which have funds available to hire experts to research and prepare reports and can deploy university experts, members of activist groups and concerned citizens had to find the time and energy to conduct their own research and write their own reports and letters. Although most participants were taking activist positions, trying to influence the content of the regulations, I am using the term ‘activist’ to differentiate groups working to strengthen the proposed regulation from the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation (KFB), agribusiness groups, and land grant personnel who campaigned to weaken the proposed regulations.

Just as farm women (Myer and Lobao 1994) and rural women (Sachs 1994, Whatmore et al. 1994) have experienced the effects of restructuring differently than men, there are also gender differences in ability to pay the transaction costs of participation in the debate. Like men who work off-farm, women working off-farm tend to work set hours and may not be able to negotiate time off or afford lost wages.\(^{17}\) Further, because of caregiving roles, women are likely to stay at

---

\(^{15}\) Because some people who attended may not have signed in, attendance may have been higher than these figures indicate. Additionally, because Cabinet employees did not participate in the hearings but rather observed, I did not count Cabinet personnel in my tally.

\(^{16}\) For example, the University of Kentucky paid lodging expenses related to my and a faculty member’s attendance at the Cadiz hearing.

\(^{17}\) USDA reports that “almost 90 percent of the total income of rancher or farmer households now comes from outside earnings” (Littleston and Ritchie 2000: 9).
home while male family members attend meetings. These gendered constraints may account for some of the gendered differences in participation that I found.

Working from the Cabinet’s transcripts of the hearings, I determined that 961 people submitted comments in oral and written form and 724 people who attended hearings did not comment at all. The total number of people involved with the hearings, including those who attended hearings but did not comment, was 1,685. Male participation was slightly more than twice of that of females: 1132 men and 505 women either commented and/or attended the hearings.18

Many participants submitted their opinions in writing rather than attending the hearings. The Cabinet reported that 282 people submitted written comments associated with the Hopkinsville hearing, 388 with Bowling Green and Paducah, 37 with Frankfort, and 189 with Cadiz.19 The more constrained social roles of women (caregiving, jobs) may have contributed to the fact that, as indicated in Table 1.3, a larger percentage of women (92.3%) who participated submitted written comments than did men (82.3%) who participated. Some people submitted both oral and written testimony at one or more hearings. Occasionally, as will be discussed in a subsequent chapter, people submitted academic reports and newspaper articles to support their positions.

Table 1.3. Numbers and percentages of comments by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>Percent of participants</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>Percent of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and oral</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who commented at the five hearings, an overwhelming majority, 705 (78.9% of the total of comments), sought stronger regulation than that proposed by the Cabinet. Seventy-two people (8.1% of the total comments) called for weaker regulation and/or argued that regulation was not necessary, and 117 (6.9%) argued that the Cabinet should retain the regulations as originally proposed.

Table 1.4 shows opinions on regulation by gender. A greater majority of women argued for stronger regulation than did men. Similarly, smaller percentages of women who participated argued to keep the regulations as proposed or to weaken the regulation than did men who participated.

Table 1.4. Opinions on proposed regulation by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION ON REGULATION</th>
<th>MEN Number</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
<th>WOMEN Number</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For stronger regulation</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For proposed regulation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For weaker or no regulation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>499</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 I could not determine gender for 48 people whose names could have been male or female (e.g., Chris or Toby) or signed in using initials.
19 These numbers may not reflect letters signed by more than one person. Also, some people gave oral testimony at the hearings and also wrote letters.
Members of KFB and agribusiness groups immediately charged that the regulations were unduly stringent and, if implemented, would jeopardize the livelihoods of Kentucky hog farmers. Although compliance costs will vary across farms, the Cabinet’s general breakdown of new costs to hog farms that would fall under the proposed regulation is summarized in Table 1.5. As indicated, costs will vary from site to site by liner and monitoring requirements, which will be determined by the Cabinet from materials submitted by applicants. The bulk of the costs will be incurred in the first year when hog farmers will need to hire experts to assess the proposed site and prepare the permit application and nutrient management plan, and during construction. The heaviest costs will incur to farmers who the Cabinet requires to construct synthetic liners and groundwater monitoring wells. Farmers who are allowed to use compacted soil liners and lysimeters will incur fewer costs. All farmers, regardless of construction and monitoring stipulations, will incur annual costs related to groundwater monitoring and lagoon and soils testing.

Table 1.5. Cabinet estimates of costs of regulatory compliance in the order in which they would be accrued.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th>DOLLAR AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitability assessment of lagoon site</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit application preparation and nutrient management plan</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon construction with compacted soil liner</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If synthetic liner is required, add</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon liner permeability test</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater monitoring well installation</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If lysimeters are appropriate, the cost is lowered to</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly groundwater monitoring</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon waste testing (for five land application events)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil testing (per field)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS

| Quarter-year groundwater monitoring                                      | 1,600         |
| Lagoon waste testing (for five land application events)                 | 250           |
| Soils testing (per field)                                               | 50            |

The Cabinet estimated it would need to spend an additional $125,000 to hire two additional engineers and four additional inspectors to review and issue permits and conduct a review of reports submitted by permit applicants.21 Additionally, Cabinet officials indicated a need to hire an additional biologist and another groundwater hydrologist to collect surface and groundwater ambient monitoring data at an estimated $72,000 for both positions. Further, the Cabinet said it would have to devote additional staff time if repairs to facilities were needed.

Table 1.6 shows the number of groups referenced by hearing participants and breaks down membership identification by gender and percentage of total participants who indicated membership in each group.

---

Table 1.6. Numbers of participants who indicated group affiliation and percentages of total participants who affiliated with each group by gender.\textsuperscript{22}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MEN Number, percent of participants</th>
<th>WOMEN Number, percent of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Farm Alliance (CFA)</td>
<td>7 .7%</td>
<td>5 6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentuckians for the Commonwealth (KFTC)</td>
<td>5 1.9%</td>
<td>6 8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Resource Council</td>
<td>1 .4%</td>
<td>3 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Revolting Against Pigs and Poultry (CRAPP)</td>
<td>1 .4%</td>
<td>6 8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>3 1.2%</td>
<td>3 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>50 19.5%</td>
<td>5 6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County official</td>
<td>14 5.4%</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State official (excluding Cabinet personnel)</td>
<td>47 18.3%</td>
<td>6 8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State educational institutions</td>
<td>25 9.7%</td>
<td>2 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Family Farms (CFF)</td>
<td>4 .4%</td>
<td>4 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Pork Producers</td>
<td>11 4.3%</td>
<td>2 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Waterways Alliance</td>
<td>1 .4%</td>
<td>2 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance business</td>
<td>1 .4%</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Health Concern</td>
<td>2 .8%</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens’ Environmental Defense League</td>
<td>1 .4%</td>
<td>1 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
<td>57 22.2%</td>
<td>18 24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Cattleman’s Association</td>
<td>5 1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Corn Growers’ Association</td>
<td>2 .8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{22} Some participants indicated membership in more than one group. One woman listed membership in KFTC, CFA and Future Farmers of America. Similarly men listed the following joint memberships: Kentucky Corn Growers Association and KFB; KFTC and CFA; Kentucky Pork Producers and KFB; and Citizens Revolting Against Pigs and Poultry and county official. To simplify the table, I did not include women or men who represented less than one percent by gender when only one woman or man listed the group. However, one woman listed herself as a swine expert; a second, as a member of the Calloway County Association of Concerned Citizens; and a third, the Kentucky Soybean Association. Similarly, one man listed membership in the Kentucky Hog Marketing Association; another, Kentucky Resources Council; another, United We Stand; another, Kentucky New Era; another, Science in the Public Interest; another, Rockcastle River Rebirth; and another, Kentucky Medical Association. One man identified himself as a banker; five as federal environmental officials; and one man signed in as an employee of an environmental firm.
The breakdown indicates that women represented the majority of participants speaking for a number of groups, including KFTC and CFA, who argued to strengthen the regulations. Conversely, men represented the majority of those speaking for KFB to weaken the regulations and speaking to eliminate the regulations.

As indicated, the debate engaged a broad spectrum of Kentucky residents from a large geographical area across the state. With the background of the debate and participants’ perspectives outlined, I turn to a discussion of the theoretical frameworks used in analyses of such disputes.

**Other theoretical approaches**

*Hazards and risk literature.* Typically, academic accounts of risk disputes have investigated disputes related to differences in risk perceptions (e.g., Austin and Schill 1994, Cvetkovich and Earle 1992, Lidskog 1992, Lidskog and Elander 1992, McAvoy 1998, Salleh 1992, Spies et al. 1998, Wisner 1995, Wright 1993). This literature is broad in scope and intentions and the accounts of geographers reflect the disciplinary divide between physical and human geography criticized by Whatmore (1999). Research produced by physical geographers tends to focus upon “extreme natural events” and/or disasters, such as landslides (DeGraff 1991), sinkholes (Kemmerly 1993), precipitation (Winkler 1992), tornadoes (Perry and Reynolds 1993), lava lake activity (Oppenheimer 1998), and tectonics (Petley 1998). As a rule, human activities that may exacerbate such events are not referenced in the physical geography literature. For example, Smallwood et al.’s (1998) investigation into the impacts of animal burrowing on hazardous waste storage facilities does not consider the human production and consumption activities that create the waste that needs to be stored.

The research produced by human geographers tends to focus upon technological or more long-term “chronic technological disasters” (Kroll-Smith and Couch 1991) and is oriented to the study of human perceptions and/or social response and hazards management to the exclusion of the biophysical processes involved. For example, Lindell (1994) has researched the relationship of risk perceptions to the probability of a risk event and Rich et al. (1993) have stressed the primacy of experts in determining what constitutes risk. Social scientists from a number of disciplines have also analyzed risk disputes without reference to the biophysical world: Douglas and Wildavsky (1983) argue that risk perceptions are correlated with different forms of social organization; Edelstein (1988) employs a psychosocial framework, and Murphy (1994) argues for the development of new forms of rationality for risk. Much of this research is done by sociologists who, following the lead of Catton and Dunlap (1978, 1980; Dunlap and Catton 1979, 1983), are critical of the discipline’s failure to account for the “embeddedness of social action in the processes of nature” (Murphy 1994: ix).

---

23 I am referring to Gilbert White’s (1974: 3) examples of extreme natural events, which include “avalanche (snow), coastal erosion, drought, earthquake, flood, fog, frost, hail, landslide, lightning, snow, tornado, tropical cyclone, volcano, and wind.”

24 Kroll-Smith and Couch (1991) coined this term to express the differences between short-term technologically-induced events, such as that which occurred in Bhopal, India, and long-term events, such as cleanup activities at hazardous waste sites in places like Love Canal where, prior to an EPA decision to evacuate the neighborhood, residents were exposed to prolonged periods of stress while government agencies investigated, developed and implemented plans.
To bridge this divide, my analysis forefronts the biophysical processes that are important to the debate. I use the work of physical geographers to corroborate or confirm representations of biophysical processes put forth in the debate and to analyze the types of knowledges that the Cabinet incorporated into the regulations. Later in this chapter, I will discuss the need for a more radical move that I make here, that of engaging the biophysical world as an actor in the debate.

Often the geographers’ social constructionist approach fails to account for power relations (sociologists are more likely to discuss power relations). For example, Greenberg et al.’s (1996) analysis of risk perceptions in a ‘hazardous neighborhood’ fails to consider that the poverty and/or presence of hazards in the neighborhood they research is the result of processes of capital accumulation which are ultimately power relations and Hellesoy et al. (1998) do not question why their research subjects are working in dangerous environments. Analyses of power occur mainly in political economy analyses.

Political economy analyses of risk. Although a number of geographers employ a political economy approach to risk (Coughlin 1996, de Souze Porto and de Freitas 1996, Jones 1992, Wisner 1995), David Harvey’s (1996) Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference is the most comprehensive geographic attempt to theorize understandings of the environment within a Marxist-based political economy framework. However, Harvey ultimately falls back on an economically determinist explanation for human-environment relations (Katz 1998). Like the other social scientists (e.g., de Janvry et al. 1989, Heffeman and Constance 1994, Kenny et al. 1989, McMichael 1996, O’Connor 1994, Salamon and Tornatore 1994, Watts 1994) working within a political economy perspective, both Harvey (1996) and O’Connor (1994) implicitly argue that environmental degradation is the direct result of an unequal distribution of capital in a variety of forms—land tenure, ownership of the means of production, wealth. Similarly, political ecology literature, likely because it was established as an area of inquiry by a geographer and economist (Blaikie and Brookfield 1987) focuses upon similar questions using a political economy framework Gender, however, has been taken more seriously within political ecology literature.

US agricultural geographers have tended similarly toward structural analyses of the results of changes in agricultural production and practices. For example, Furuseth (1997) has researched the effects of the restructuring of the hog industry on North Carolina, Hart and Mayda (1997) on the Oklahoma panhandle, and Ufkes (1995) has researched consolidation within the hog industry. A subtheme has emerged in both British and American research into the role of technology and the state in agricultural restructuring (e.g., Busch 1994, Busch et al. 1989, Friedland 1994, Friedland et al. 1981, Ward et al. 1998 and Whatmore 1995). This research is important for a number of reasons: it locates the linkages between “capital, state and science institutions and practices”; it focuses upon the ways in which technological interventions are altering both spatial and social relations; and it raises questions about the “inequalities in social access to, and political control over, such technologies” (Whatmore 1991: 305). Marsden (1995: 389) maintains that changing policies toward agriculture have contributed to the development of “new rural spaces” or post-productivist countrysides and that these policies have contributed to a new form of regulation which has been manifested in planning efforts at the local level which in turn has resulted in the “ politicization and professionalization of local decision making.”

25 For example, see Aronoff and Gunter (1994), Kroll-Smith and Couch (1991), and Murphy (1994).
26 The research in Feminist Political Ecology: Global Issues and Local Experiences (1996) is an exemplar of this genre.
(Marsden 1995: 292). I wish to avoid a neat distinction between the ‘global’ and ‘local’. I am similarly uneasy with such distinctions between productivist and post-productivist agricultural practices. I will return to this in the discussion of network theory that follows.

Challenging universalized narratives and unitary theories of the state, Marsden and Arce (1995: 1266) write:

Local producers and consumers socially embody the state. In this perspective, the state loses much of its separate and coherent character and it thus becomes subject to local forms of variability because of rather than despite transnationalism.

Thus, through an analysis that focuses upon permeabilities of borders between ‘global’ and ‘local’ and state and citizen, I challenge universalizing explanations.

Although gender relations constitute a major form of variability, male-produced social construction, political economy literature has, as a rule, paid scarce attention to gender.27 Whatmore et al. (1994: 3) argue that much of the work on restructuring has ignored the ways in which it has reshaped gender relations, “empowering and disempowering women (and men) in different ways in particular localities, complicated by their intersection with other axes of social relations. . .” They (Whatmore et al. 1994) maintain that just as gendered experiences differ across locales, so do gendered subjectivities, and these differences necessitate interrogation of gender categories and the meanings and practices that construct those categories. They (Whatmore et al. 1994: 5) direct attention to “the growing significance of the dynamics of the construction of food and ‘nature’ as they become foci for the mobilization of powerful social forces contesting land-uses” and advocate research into the cultural politics of rurality.


In the US, the majority of research on gender and rurality is being done by rural sociologists. Examples include Fink’s study of rural women in Nebraska (1992) and Iowa (1986), Flora and Flora’s (1988) examination of the effect of policy upon women in agricultural locales, Myer and Labao’s (1994) investigation of gender and restructuring, Oberhauser’s construction of a gendered regional geography (1995a) and gendered economic strategies (1995b) in rural Appalachia, and Sachs’ investigations into rural women, agriculture, and environment (1996), rural women’s activism (1994), and women’s and girls’ activities on Pennsylvania farms (1988). Within US geography, excepting Pulido’s (1997) analysis of an activist group in Los Angeles, and feminist political ecology literature, women are specters in such debates.

**An alternative theoretical approach**

*Human-environment relations.* Although I draw from work produced by the theorists cited above, because my subject entails consideration of human-environmental relations as articulated through agricultural change, rurality, government regulation, science and technology,

27 Friedland (1991) is an exception. Feminist political ecologists, however, are producing gendered analyses. See Feminist Political Ecology: Global Issues and Local Experiences in the references
environmental issues, gender, sexuality, and desire, it cannot be analyzed within one theoretical framework; it requires a hybrid theoretical approach. Because of its disciplinary history of studying human-environment relations, a geographical perspective is ideally positioned to study such debates. The disciplinary history, however, is problematic as a result of geographers’ reliance upon Enlightenment-derived binary systems of representation (Farinelli 1999, Glacken 1967, Gregory 1994, Livingstone 1998, Pratt 2000) in which humans were separated from ‘nature’ and ‘animals’ and because, in the US, Semple’s (1911) representation of German geographer Friedrich Ratzel’s work evolved into a form of environmental determinism.\(^{28}\) In 1967, Glacken challenged this determinism with his investigation of the historical relationship between culture and nature by examining a variety of historical forms of separation of man from nature: the ‘edenic’ view of man in harmony with nature, the environmental determinist reading of the relationship and the more modern view of nature subject to human control.

Investigations into human-environment relationships also led to a research approach called human ecology when Barrrows (1923), working with concepts developed by sociologist Robert Parks, asserted that geography was the science of human ecology. Although human ecology never found a substantial base among geographers, many of the human ecologists’ concerns about population, environment, social organization and technology were incorporated into environmental hazards literature in the 1970s (Johnston et al. 2000). The modern conception of the natural world as susceptible to human intervention is the representation of the environment that underlies hazards research, a subarea that developed from White’s (1973, 1974) research into human responses and adjustments to floods. Recently, geographers (Massey 1999, Whatmore 1999) have challenged the institutional separation of physical from human geography.

With the exception of Marxist-inspired political economy approaches, the risk and hazards literature produced by geographers tends to be atheoretical. Academics working without theory fail to look beyond the actual dispute at hand and locate the dispute within broader social arrangements. Thus, their research implicitly supports existing hegemonic arrangements. This literature also tends to overlook the imaginative geographies (Said 1978) from which risk constructions are produced.

Poststructuralism, feminist theory, and science and technology studies. Although I locate my work within this disciplinary history, as a poststructuralist, I see the ability to construct the categories that are the basis of our ontologies as a form of power (Natter and Jones 1997). Categories are not merely a way to order random objects; they function to “seize alterity and assign it a social significance” (Natter and Jones 1997: 143). While the category constructs what it (erroneously) represents as a homogenous interior, it simultaneously constructs the ‘other’, that or those who are ‘outside’ of the boundaries that the category asserts. Thus invocation of a category always already calls into being those constitutive outsiders whose presences have been repressed: they operate as specters, threatening to destabilize the category.

Through an interrogation of the categories deployed in the debate, I seek to undermine their authority by locating the constitutive outsiders. In this way, I want to argue that ‘outsiders’ are epistemological rather than ontological entities and that the creation of the ‘inside’ could not exist without the ‘outside’. Because “questions of epistemology are also questions of social order” (Moscovici, quoted in Latour 1993: 14-15), such a strategy is more politically efficacious than maneuvers that call instead to broaden a category to include more ‘others’ or to locate

\(^{28}\) Semple’s reading of Ratzel is challenged in Wolfgang Natter’s forthcoming analysis.
power in the ‘margins’. By failing to interrogate the categories that have established the social order, those maneuvers are not sufficient to change social orders (Natter and Jones 1997).

I argue that gender is not a fixed or stable category. Rather, gender is relational and fluid across other subject positions, and, equally importantly, gender is performative. By this, I do not mean that an operating subject performs a gender role compatible with a pre-given subject position; rather, like Butler (1990, 1996), I assert that gendered subjects are actually constituted within such performances.

[T]he performative needs to be rethought not only as an act that an official language-user wields in order to implement already authorized effects, but precisely as social ritual, as one of the very ‘modalities of practices [that] are powerful and hard to resist precisely because they are silent and insidious, insistently and insinuating. The performative is not merely an act used by a pregiven subject; rather, it is one of the powerful and insidious ways in which subjects are called into social being, inaugurated into sociality by a variety of diffuse and powerful interpellations. In this sense the social performative is a crucial part not only of subject formation but of the ongoing political contestation and reformulation of the subject as well. In this sense, the performative is not only a ritual practice: it is one of the influential rituals by which subjects are formed and reformulated (Butler 1996: 43-44).

This understanding of multiple subject positions as performative is important in such debates because it provides the means to avoid a ‘false consciousness’ argument in cases of people who are more or less concerned than circumstances might seem to warrant. Further, it provides a richer analysis of the ways in which the hearing process and the regulatory regime produce subject effects. This production of subjects is inherently political: “The affirmation (and refusal) of forms of subjective identify might then be examined as a function of political power relations” (Burchell 1991: 199-120).

Gender relations are also always already political. Excepting feminist work previously cited, however, most analyses of risk disputes that consider gender at all do so through the treatment of gender as a fixed stable unitary variable. Notable exceptions to this rule can be found in the US environmental justice literature, which has investigated the distribution of environmental risks within context of class, gender, and race. Gender plays a crucial role in the Kentucky debate beyond gender differences in constructions of risk.

Feminist theoreticians from a number of disciplines have investigated the roles of gender “as a fundamental influence on person/society/space relationships” (Little 1986: 2). They have examined the gendering of spaces through the deployment of a binary that posits a public (male) private sphere of production vis-à-vis a (female) private sphere of reproduction. Peter et al. (2000) report that the division of labor on Iowa farms is gendered.

...men do most of the outdoor work, and women support the men’s hectic schedules by providing meals at odd hours, doing chores, running the household, going out for tractor parts and working off-farm jobs—not to mention taking care

of the children and anything else the men do not have time to do. But although women play an integral role in Iowa agriculture, it is the men who most often claim, and are ascribed, the identity of ‘farmer’ (Peter et al. 2000: 216).

The allocation of the outdoor work to the male domain, genders the agricultural landscape as male because a “landscape’s meanings draw on the cultural codes of the society for which it was made” (G. Rose 1993: 11). This male gendering is strengthened when the agricultural landscape contains “big machinery” used to subdue biophysical processes (Peter et al. 2000: 226). It is noteworthy that women’s roles in the domestic sphere as child-bearers and nurturers within the home, which was “central to the domestic idyll,” necessitated a denial of their sexuality (Little 1986: 2).

Some feminists have challenged this binary (Little 1986, 1994; Peter et al. 2000; Whatmore 1994). For example, Little (1994: 46) argues that

The agenda of farm women is not limited to reproductive issues. The farm is a home and a workplace, the locus of productive and reproductive activities. There is no separation of public and private spheres for farm women and the personal is of intense political significance to them as they attempt to restucture gender relations in rural areas.

Research related to the role of women in rural locales (Hughes 1997, Liepens 1998, Little 1994, Peter et al. 2000, Sachs 1994) is important to an analysis of the role of women in the Kentucky debate. Like Liepens (1998: 1192), I will argue that “activism which constructs nature and rural environmental concerns, is gendered.” There are, however, other forms of gendering in such debates.

Because technologies play a crucial role in environmental disputes, feminist research into the gendered nature of technology to construct and control biophysical processes (Buckingham-Hatfield 1998; Haraway 1978, 1991, Harding 1984, Plumwood 1993, Warren 1997) is necessary to my analysis. Further, I will argue that the regimes of truth established by the Cabinet’s scientific knowledges produce a feminized environment and hogs that can be represented as controllable by humans. Technologies, such as monitoring wells, geothermal investigations, and GIS mapping, have been developed to gather data that are then used to buttress government agencies’ claims to predict and control such things as surface and groundwater and air flows, floods, and soil changes. Working from analyses produced by Deleuze and Guattari (1983), Irigaray (1985), and Theweleit (1987, 1989), I will indicate how the flows of biophysical processes, which are associated with the feminine, also have become sexualized in this debate. I will then show how the hogs themselves, which are produced through technologies (Ufkes 1995, 1998), have been similarly feminized and sexualized. Although I have some hesitancy about ecofeminist analyses, particularly those that implicitly posit a unitary subject to argue that (essentialized) women must be concerned about environmental issues, like Warren (1997: 12), I argue that the “exploitation of nature and animals is justified by feminizing them, the exploitation of women is justified by naturalizing them.” In addition to gender, the categories of farmer, farming practices, rurality, human and animal are important to this debate.

The interrogation of categories also points to the importance of Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) notion of the social as consisting of a multiplicity of sites of antagonism that result from

30 I will discuss the implications of this public/private binary and the ‘domestic idyll’ in chapter 6.
the inability to fix social arrangements that are based upon the acceptance of differences established through categories. In lieu of a fixed ‘society’, Laclau and Mouffe (1985) posit the social, a fluid unbounded space in which a host of alternatives to present arrangements are possible. In their view, ‘society’ exists in a narrow unstable and consistently contested terrain between contingency and fixity. Fixity is attempted through the deployment of discourses constructed about nodal points or partial fixations that function as privileged signifiers to fix the meaning of a signifying chain. The signifying chains consist of elements, which are differences that had not been articulated, but entered the discourses through combination with nodal points of signifying chains. These elements are drawn from networks distributed through space, each with its own spatial arrangements. For example, participants in the debate have drawn elements from numerous Kentucky locales (e.g., coalfields, tobacco farms, watersheds, cities), from global networks of environmental, scientific, and legal thought, food chains and markets, and technology into competing signifying chains. Participants have then reordered “spatial differences into temporal sequences, where the multiplicities of difference are reimagined as a place in the queue” (Massey 1997: 15), thus privileging very specific types of farmers, farming, and sociospatial relations. In this debate, farming practices, hog waste, environmental protection, economics, and science are nodal points, however, the chains of signifiers constructed from these nodal points differ dramatically. In Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) formulation, elements are floating signifiers; although they can be mobilized as nodal points in a signifying chain, their meaning cannot be fixed, so there is always a potential for alternative meanings to become incorporated into alternative signifying chains.

I conceptualize this conflict about regulation as emanating from the impossibility of suturing the social. As such, the debate indicates the heterogeneity that forms the grounds upon which democratic practices may be constructed (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, Wolfe 1998). Unlike the risk literature cited previously, I see risk disputes as more than disagreements about the meaning of environmental contaminants. Rather, they are, first and foremost, conflicts about the ways in which the world is made intelligible and practicable, and domains are constituted such as ‘the market’, ‘the family’ which are amenable to interventions by administrators, politicians, authorities, and experts—as well as by the inhabitants of those domains themselves (Rose 1993: 288-289).

Thus, I argue that analyses of risk disputes should consider how relevant domains—in this case, science and economics—produce subjects, including the ‘environment’ and hogs, that are amenable (or not) to manipulation.

Through analysis of the ways in which categories create and naturalize social arrangements, postructuralism “problematize[s] the separation of ontology and epistemology as discourses” (Haraway, quoted in Goodeve 2000: 78). Participants in this debate, like the academic research referenced previously, operate on the assumption that there is a ‘natural’ and knowable environment. Although unquestionably there is a biophysical world, I argue that our understandings of it are always partial and situated because they are always socially mediated (Thrift 1999, Whatmore 1999).

Like Latour (1993), Latour and Woolgar (1986), Harding (1984, 1991), and Haraway (1991a, 1991b), I approach scientific knowledges of the environment as social constructions that quite literally produce a certain type of biophysical world that is represented as ‘nature’ and thus
removed from the human sphere of ‘culture’. Latour (1993) argues that our notions of modernity are founded on assertions that humans are separated from everything else in the world.

Modernity is often defined in terms of humanism, either as a way of saluting the birth of ‘man’ or as a way of announcing his death. But this habit itself is modern, because it remains asymmetrical. It overlooks the simultaneous birth of ‘nonhumanity’ – things, or objects, or beasts – and the equally strange beginning of a crossed-out God, relegated to the sidelines. Modernity arises first from the conjoined creation of those three entities, and then from the masking of the conjoined birth and the separate treatment of the three communities while, underneath, hybrids continue to multiply as an effect of this separate treatment (Latour 1993: 13).

This separation has been maintained by two processes that, although intimately linked, have been represented as separate.

The first set of practices, by ‘translation’, creates mixtures between entirely new types of beings, hybrids of nature and culture. The second, by ‘purification’, creates two entirely distinct ontological zones: that of human beings on the one hand; that of nonhumans on the other (Latour 1993: 10-11).

My analysis will focus upon the importance of both practices in the debate as they relate to relations between participants and human-environment and human-animal relations. Latour (1993) maintains that our ‘modern’ understanding of relations between humans, objects and things and our insistence upon separate zones has been defined by a constitution drafted by politicians and some scientists working within Western hegemonic discourses.

For political constitutions, the task falls to jurists and Founding Fathers, but so far they have done only a third of the work, since they have left out both scientific power and the work of hybrids. For the nature of things, it is the scientists’ talk, but they have done only another third of the work, since they have pretended to forget about political power, and they have denied that hybrids have any role to play even as they multiply them. For the work of translation, writing the constitution is the task of those who study those strange networks that I have outlined above, but science students have fulfilled only half of their contract, since they do not explain the work of purification that is carried out above them and accounts for the proliferation of hybrids (Latour 1993: 14).

I think of the hybrids much like Haraway’s cyborgs (1991b). Because their presences have been repressed, they also operate as specters in this debate. Although the most obvious hybrids are the genetically altered hogs whose production has become contentious, through a discussion of permeabilities in the categorical borders asserted by participants, my analysis unearths other ghosts.

Technologies often produce hybrids, such as the genetically altered hogs whose waste is the subject of regulation. Technological innovations have made CAFOs possible and the Cabinet is relying upon technologies to determine the possibility of siting CAFOs in specific locales and to monitor for environmental and public health effects of CAFOs once sited. These innovations
bear directly upon my use of both feminist and actor network theory. A number of feminist theoreticians have written about the gender bias of science and technology (Buckingham-Hatfield 1978; Haraway 1978, 1991; Harding 1984, 1991; Plumwood 1993; Schillo 1998; Shiva 1988; Warren 1997). They share Haraway’s concern about technoscience.

Feminist technoscience studies . . . involves technoscientific liberty, technoscientific democracy, understanding that democracy is about the empowerment of people who are involved in putting worlds together and tearing them apart. That technoscience processes are dealing with some worlds rather than others, that democracy requires people to be substantively involved and know themselves to be involved and are empowered to be accountable and collectively responsible to each other. And feminist technoscience studies keeps looping through the permanent and painful contradictions of gender.

Technoscientific processes at the moment rely on vast disparities of wealth, power, agency, sovereignty, changes of life and death. The enlightenment projects for equality have a kind of muted salience inside technoscience now (Haraway, quoted in Gooedeve 2000: 157).

Our knowledges (Haraway 1991a) are not only situated and partial, they are also mediated by the terms of the ‘modern constitution’ which allocates the representation of ‘nature’ and ‘animals’ to scientists (Latour 1993, Woods 2000). Scientific knowledges play a crucial role in risk disputes—it is science that constitutes ‘expert’ over against ‘lay’ knowledges. Academic analyses of risk disputes tend to implicitly assume that it is possible to attain consensus by fixing a definition of risk (usually one put forth by ‘experts’). This acceptance, which tends to be based upon the subsequent valorizing of the scientific as ‘objective’ over against the ‘subjectivity’ of social constructions has had real effects in disputes about risk. The assumption that it is possible to know “nature in the raw” (Whatmore 1999) and the valorization of science as the sole ‘objective’ method to obtain knowledge that accurately corresponds to ‘nature’ has resulted in the privileging of scientific discourses over against those of ‘non-experts’ whose knowledges are denigrated as ‘subjective’ (Kroll-Smith and Couch 1991, Murphy 1994, Schillo 1998, Schrader-Frechette 1991, Wynne 1998). Schillo (1998: 2765) notes

. . . reliable scientific knowledge has traditionally been understood to not reflect personal, social, or cultural biases. Methods of scientific inquiry (:the’’ scientific method) are viewed as ways of filtering out these biases.

Thus,

. . . objectivity is much more than merely the opposite of subjectivity: It is an instrument of disciplinary power that can distinguish science from art and professional knowledge from preprofessional opinion (Natter et al. 1995:11).

Scientific knowledges are also gendered. Like objectivity, the practice of science, especially animal science (Schillo 1998), is gendered male; preprofessionals are feminized. Following Haraway (1989, 1991a, 1991b) and Harding (1984), I analyze the gendered aspects of discourses deployed and representations of the biophysical world put forth by participants.
In this debate, the role of knowledge production, especially those knowledges produced by scientists, is a political issue. KFB’s claims to expertise emanate from the group’s embeddedness in a network of land grant universities as well as state and federal agricultural agencies that produce agricultural knowledges and develop new technologies. Through its linkages to knowledge-producing institutions, members of the KFB group have successfully represented changes in farming practices as the inexorable march of ‘progress.’ The deployment of progress to undermine competing assertions of risk speaks to the intimate relationship between progress and risk. “Risk, enterprise, progress and modernity are genealogically interdependent ideas” (Gordon 1991: 39).

I challenge the technological determinism of the KFB group by identifying the social and institutional networks upon which their deployment of technology both erases and relies. This identification is important politically because the effectiveness of these networks often “renders them transparent” (Ward et al. 1998: 1166).

Such networks for agriculture typically link together R&D institutions, manufacturers, suppliers, advisors, and producers, and are supported by the policy and regulatory framework. The arrangements and principles thereby forged to promote and sustain past technological developments also set the preconditions for successor products and practices which, if compatible, flow with greater ease along the established networks, often giving the appearance to observers that a technological system has become autonomous. . . (Ward et al. 1998: 1166).

A network approach also avoids distinctions between the global and local because it understands globalization as “partial, uneven, and unstable; a socially contested rather than logical process in which many spaces of resistance, alterity, and possibility become analytically discernible and politically meaningful” (Whatmore and Thorne 1997: 289). The network gains authority by the numbers of agents it enrolls as it lengthens across space-time (Latour 1993, Whatmore and Thorne 1997). Such an approach also has the benefit, as will be discussed in a following section, of focusing attention on non-human agents.

Power-knowledge. In the US and Kentucky, the knowledges produced within this agricultural network have historically been represented as ‘expert’ knowledge of agriculture to federal and state legislators charged with producing Farm Bills and developing policies that directly and indirectly affect agriculture. Although much of the academic literature on risk disputes tends to assume that the ‘expert’ notion of risk is more scientific (and therefore more valid) than that of non-experts, I approach both expert and non-expert constructions of risk as socially constructed. To this end, I employ Foucault’s theory of power-knowledge to locate the sites of dispersion and genealogies of knowledges deployed in the debate, the relationships between knowledge producers and to identify those knowledges that have been included and excluded during the development of the regulations. In this way, I can examine power relationships inherent in the production and deployment of knowledges. Thus, my analysis focuses upon the ways in which power relations have influenced the history of environmental protection in Kentucky. Excepting the academic literature previously indicated, the historical power relations that are so crucial to understanding the derivation of notions of risk have been largely ignored in risk and hazards research.
This Foucauldian analysis also allows me to consider the social context in which scientific knowledges are deployed to produce the truth effects through which we are governed and govern ourselves. Like Foucault (1991: 79), I am referring to the “establishment of domains in which the practice of true and false can be made at once ordered and pertinent.” This does not imply “the production of true utterances,” rather it involves the creation of ‘regimes of truth’. Foucault (1991: 79) suggests that an analysis of these regimes entails interrogation of “programmes of conduct which have both prescriptive effects regarding what is to be done (‘effects of jurisdiction’) and codifying effects regarding what is to be known (‘effects of verification’).” The debate about whether state regulation of industrial hog farming is necessary is an effect of jurisdiction; the struggle about what knowledges should provide the basis for the regulations, an effect of verification.

Historically, the establishment of domains to produce ‘truth effects’ necessitated the production of experts to occupy these domains. Thus, “the authority of expertise becomes inextricably linked to the formal apparatus of political rule” (Rose 1993: 285). The reliance upon experts had two immediate effects: 1) the professionalization of those certified as experts and 2) a concomitant negative impact on democratic practice (Reddy 1996, Rose 1993, Schrader-Frechette 1991). In environmental disputes, experts produce the knowledges that form the basis of risk analysis and assessments that determine government action or failure to act. Reddy (1996) asserts that the expert focus on ‘risk’ to the exclusion of ‘uncertainty’ has narrowed the parameters of politics by relocating properly political issues into the expert purview of risk, a fact that he asserts has been overlooked by Beck (1992) and Beck et al. (1995).31

Gordon (1991: 43) argues that the notion of risk, derived from insurance techniques, has been adopted by governments because “[o]ne of the most important strengths of the insurance technique is its use of expertise as the technical basis of a form of security which can dispense with recourse to continual surveillance.” He identifies two strands in Foucault’s thought about governmentality

Foucault seems to think that the very possibility of an activity or a way of governing can be conditional on the availability of a certain notion of its rationality, which may in turn need, in order to be operable, to be credible to the governed as well as the governing: here, the notion of rationality seems clearly to exceed the merely utilitarian bounds of a technique or know-how, as in Foucault’s earlier notions about power and knowledge. The second is the thought that ideas which go without saying, which make possible existing practices and our existing conceptions of ourselves may be more contingent, recent and modifiable than we think. The two themes connect because government is a ‘conduct of conduct’: because the relationship between the government and the governed passes, to a perhaps ever-increasing extent, though the manner in which governed individuals are willing to exist as subjects (Gordon 1991: 48).

**Governmentality.** To capture the nuances of power relations among participants in the debate, I employ Foucault’s conception of governmentality to examine the role of regulation in creating new subject positions. The Foucauldian subject (1977) is an effect of power, brought into existence by the disciplining practices of multiple techniques of power exercised by

31 Barnett (1994), Freudenburg (1993) and Yeager (1991) are also critical of governmental reliance upon risk ‘experts’.
numerous sectarian authorities (e.g., governmental agencies, medical practitioners, educations, penal authorities) or ‘experts’. Foucault does not posit a pre-existing unitary subject who will act rationally to maximize opportunities for him/herself; instead Foucault’s (1995) subject is continually constituted by multiple, often intersecting, techniques of powers and rationalities. Foucault theorizes power as the ability to act in such a way that the actions of other are modified. Power, in his reading, exists only when put into action and power relations are embedded in social networks rather than located in a particular structure. I argue that participants who occupied a number of subject positions (e.g., farmers, non-farmers, property owners, male, female, ‘rural’, ‘urban’) when they entered the debate, were then constituted as political subjects, in the western liberal democratic sense, during their participation in the networks engaged in the hearing process. My analysis focuses upon the tensions produced by the addition of this new subject position. I understand the intensity of emotions that participants brought to the debate as an indication of the ways in which

individuals [who] attach a value to their ‘self-image . . . are most deeply affected by political power when it impinges on this relation they have to themselves. They are most profoundly affected when the way they are governed requires them to alter how they see themselves as governed subjects (Burchell et al. 1991: 119).

A Foucauldian analysis also has the benefit of challenging the notions of a unitary state that implicitly underlays much of the academic literature on regulation.

State theory attempts to deduce the modern activities of government from essential properties and propensities of the state, in particular its supposed propensity to grow and to swallow up or colonize everything outside itself. Foucault holds that the state has no such inherent propensities; more generally, the state has no essence. The nature of the state is, Foucault thinks, a function of changes in practices of government, rather than the converse (Gordon 1991: 4-5). These changes in practices include

initiating roles of private individuals and organizations in the exploring and defining of new governmental tasks (many aspects of social hygiene and medicine, social work, the collection of statistics, etc.); the cross-fertilizing interplay between different agencies and expertises, public and private alike. . . ; the propensity of the public institutions of government to secrete within themselves their own multiple spaces of partly autonomous authority. . . . (Gordon 1991: 36).

Thus, my analysis will locate the tensions and negotiations between different sectors of the state during regulatory development.

Foucault’s power-knowledge formulation is also helpful to analyze the role of technology in the Kentucky debate. By technology, I refer to both machinery and the social relations necessary to produce, sustain and develop technologies (Ellul 1964). Technocratic
rationality is of particular importance to my analysis. By technocratic, I mean practices that accept “the validity and efficacy of a scientific discourse as a universal rule for all other practices, without taking account of the fact that it is itself a regulated and conditioned practice. . . .” (Foucault 1991a: 69).

There are a number of rationalities operating within this debate—government, economics, science, environment, and health. These rationalities, which are also situated within different governmental agencies, are susceptible to change. In some cases (especially apparent in the practice of governmental, economic, scientific, and environmental) these rationalities are articulated such that one has the effect of strengthening the others. In other instances (especially in the activist group’s arguments for environmental and health rationalities), one form of rationality may weaken the strength of others. Because “Foucault was interested in government as an activity or practice, and in arts of government as ways of knowing what that activity consisted in, and how it might be carried on” (Gordon 1991: 3), my analysis focuses upon the ways in which competing constructions of the biophysical world imply differing forms of governmentality. In my reading then, a rationality of government will thus mean a way or system of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed), capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon whom it was practiced (Gordon 1991: 3).

Foucault maintains that the ‘modern’ state’s forms of governmentality are intimately enmeshed within the ‘modern’ economy.

It was through the development of the science of government that the notion of economy came to be recentered onto that different plane of reality which we characterize today as the ‘economic’, and it was also through this science that it became possible to identify problems specific to the population; but conversely we can say as well that it was thanks to the perception of the specific problems of the population, and thanks to the isolation of that area of reality that we call the economy, that the problem of government finally came to be thought, reflected and calculated outside of the juridical framework of sovereignty. And that ‘statistics’ which, in mercantilist tradition, only ever worked within and for the benefit of a monarchical administration that functioned according to the form of sovereignty, now becomes the major technical factor, or one of the major technical factors, of this new technology (Foucault 1991: 99).

This linkage of statistics and government rationalities is of particular importance in risk disputes because statistical probabilities form the basis of both the risk and cost-benefit analyses that determine the level of protection afforded to the biophysical world and human and animal populations.

The concept of social risk makes it possible for insurance technologies to be applied to social problems in a way which can be presented as creative simultaneously of social justice and social solidarity. One of the important
strengths of the insurance technique is its use of expertise as the technical basis of a form of security which can dispense with recourse to continuous surveillance (Gordon 1991: 40).

Cabinet officials have consistently represented the regulations as a form of security, a category that Foucault sees as “distinct alike from the purely legal and the purely economic” (Gordon 1991: 19). Through this category, Foucault sees the meshing of “the universe of police with that of political economy” (Gordon 1991: 19). The relevance of this linking of police and political economy is manifested in the debate in the form of concerns about the knowledges upon which the regulations are based which determine the amount of protection afforded as well as the political economy of surveillance and enforcement.

In this debate, in ways very similar to that of environmental justice campaigns researched by academics, members of the activist group have challenged the Cabinet’s insistence that all residents are uniformly protected by the regulation. The activists’ critique is articulated through references to a regulatory past that they have found insufficiently protective. This focus upon inequalities in the distribution of environmental risk is a hallmark of environmental justice groups, one that distinguishes them from “the traditional well-established sectors of the environmental movement” (Taylor 1997: 40). Because many participants have represented industrial farming practices as discriminatory to rural residents, unlike most risk and hazards literature, my analysis interrogates the ways in which the state has distributed and currently attempts to distribute environmental risks in Kentucky.

**Rurality.** Rural geographers, sociologists, and anthropologists have researched the effects of agricultural transformations on localities. Much of this literature posits the ‘rural’ as the site of ‘traditional values’ and social formations that are threatened by the intrusion of ‘urban’ capital and values, such as those associated with industrial agriculture. With other geographers (Lowe et al. 1993, Massey 1991, Murdoch and Pratt 1993), I am critical of a tendency in this literature to represent the rural as as not quite as ‘modern’ as the urban which is posited as the agent of change to which the rural reacts. Through a contextualized analysis of the strategies and politics of participants in this debate, I indicate that “[l]ocal action may be constrained in its broader context but it cannot be simply ‘read off’ from some notion of structural change” (Lowe et al. 1993: 210).

Also, although British rural geographers have critically interrogated the category of ‘rural’ and assumptions about rurality, American rural geographers have rarely done so. Yet, like Halfacree (1997: 125), I see

the significance of the category ‘rural’ in everyday life as it is constructed through, and embedded in, historically and spatially specific social and cultural practices which have invested it with particular significance. . . . the multiple meanings attaching to rural areas must be uncovered if contemporary rural experiences are to be fully understood and explained. Rurality is culturally defined and, as a result, the social, economic and cultural meanings inferred in relation to, and embedded in, rural places need to be addressed if we are to understand how these discourses inform contemporary experience.

Liepens (1998: 1179) reports that “constructions of rurality are also drawn upon by specific interest groups” to implement specific visions of rurality. Thus, I will locate the competing
constructions of rurality and Kentucky as a rural space embedded within participants’ assertions of risk.

Identity, space, and spatiality. The geographical literature on risk cited previously tends to implicitly assume a (male) unitary subject. In the majority of cases, when gender is considered at all, it is often treated as a variable that posits unitary essentialized males and females. My analysis differs in that, like Spivak (1985), I understand identities to be effects of positions within complexly interwoven networks. As such identities are constituted of multiple subject positions that are in turn constituted by power relations within these networks. In other words, I am arguing that the unitary subject that populates the pages of much academic research is fictive.

The changing socio-spatial arrangements resulting from regulation have powerful implications for identity formation. My analysis focuses upon the ways in which spatial formations are both produced by and productive of social arrangements. Because spatiality is crucial to identity formation (Massey 1999), I focus upon participants’ imaginative geographies to locate the identities that they wish to privilege.

Ghost hunting

The most radical difference between risk and hazards and agricultural literatures across disciplines and this analysis lies in my focus upon the permeabilities of the human-environment and human-animal boundaries posited by the modern constitution to locate hybrids and on my effort to facilitate the return of the repressed by engaging components of the biophysical world and the hogs themselves as actors in the debate. Using actor network theory, my analysis seeks moments of hybridity between humans and machines/technologies, between humans and the biophysical world and humans and animals to challenge the categorical boundaries of the modern constitution.

This strategy is of particular importance in my treatment of the hogs. Animals have been overlooked in agricultural (and other) geographies (Yarwood and Evans 2000). In 1995, however, the erasure of animals became the subject of an issue of Society and Space. Subsequently, both Wolch and Emel (1998) and Philo and Wilbert (2000) produced edited volumes that included chapters written by the authors of articles in Society and Space. Both edited volumes challenge geography’s human-centered accounts—many illustrate some of the myriad ways in which categorical assumptions have also shaped our relations with animals (Yarwood and Evans 2000).

In the Kentucky dispute, the corporeal hogs have been erased. The debate is instead focused upon a geography of waste.

Animal products, their bodily wastes in this case, may have effects which can diffuse beyond the bounds of the spaces where they are immediately present, creating a spatial connection from the pigs and chickens on their farms to a range of environments beyond the farm boundaries. . . . In this instance, a complex human-animal relation is established which does not operate solely through the physical proximity of humans and animals, but rather entails a spread-out geography through which animals are able to have an effect on humans at-a-distance. Wider questions, for example about private property, the byproducts of economic activity, and the duty of the state to regulate agricultural activities in
the interest of preventing pollution and preserving heartlands, are once more deeply implicated (Philo and Wilbert 2000: 2).

Philo and Wilbert (2000: 5) suggest that "a new animal geography" should "follow how animals have been socially defined, used as food, labeled as pets or pests" to discover "the many ways in which animals are ‘placed’ by human societies in their local material spaces (settlements, fields, farms, factories, and so on), as well as in a host of imaginary, literary, psychological and even virtual spaces.” They also point to the role of the natural sciences, especially biology, in maintaining the border between humans and animals.” Citing the “strange admixtures of expert, lay, political and moral discourses on both sides of the anti and pro [hunting] schisms,” Philo and Wilbert (2000:9-10) note that the divisions between the scientist expert and lay knowledges are “often not so clear-cut and opposed as such a binary implies.” Thus, my analysis will focus upon congruences between lay and expert knowledges.

The maintenance of the human-animal border posited by the modern constitution is inextricably linked to Enlightenment notions of agency that entail a conscious intentionality which is assumed to exist in humans only. The human is represented as the ‘rational’ being who can think and act in the world; passions and instincts have been relegated to those judged lower than humans. Because this rational human agent is male, this narrow definition of agency has operated to place women, people of color, children, people judged to suffer from mental disabilities, animals and constituents of the biophysical world in subordinate positions (Elder et al. 1998, Harding 1984, 1985; Irigaray 1985; Nast 2000, Plumwood 1993, Pulido 2000). In Chapters Seven and Eight, I challenge this limited definition of agency by locating the emotionalism that underlies the purported rationality of KFB and the Cabinet.

To facilitate the return of the repressed, I want to insert the biophysical world and hogs as actors32 into the debate. Haraway warns against anthropomorphism, noting that humans and animals exist very differently in the world.

Our relationality is not of the same kind of being. It is people who have the emotional, ethical, political, and cognitive responsibility inside these worlds. But nonhumans are active, not passive, resources or products (Haraway, quoted in Goodeve 2000: 134).

At the same time, she (Haraway 1991a) also argues that we find ways to activate that which has been represented as inanimate. Similarly, Philo and Wilbert (2000: 20) assert that “[i]t is important that animal geographers exercise their imaginations in trying to glimpse something of these beastly places. . . .”

I argue that “[s]ubjectivity, corporeality, is no more a property of humans, of individuals, of intentional subjects than being an outside reality is a property of nature” (Latour 1999: 23). Thus I conceptualize the hogs and constituents of the biophysical world as occupying distinct subject positions in this debate. We may not understand how they experience the biophysical world and their parts in it but there is no doubt that they do. Animals shy away from some things, approach others, suddenly change course, tremble, utter sounds. If they are merely reacting to external stimuli, they are still acting even though we may

---

32 Latour (1993) uses the term actants to signify those others, whose presence has been erased, yet are active in networks. I prefer to use the term actor because once non-humans are referenced by the term, it raises more of a challenge to Enlightenment epistemologies than does the term actant.
never know the meaning of their actions. Similarly, natural processes, once initiated, continue despite human attempts to stop them or divert courses. It should go without saying that humans often respond viscerally—the blink of an eye when an object nears, the rush of adrenaline in frightening situations, the tears that sometimes flow unbidden—in ways that challenge arbitrary distinctions between human-animal-non-human. Much of our ‘agency’ is located within our bodies—in hormones, cells, electrical synapses—giving the lie to the Enlightenment mind/body split.

Borrowing Spivak’s (1993: 4) notion of “strategic essentialism,” I propose to undertake ‘strategic anthropomorphism’ as a tactic. Spivak (1993) argues that essentialism can be a valid political strategy when the strategist indicates clearly that essentialism is inherently problematic politically because it erases differences within the category. Similarly, although I also am concerned about the imposition of a human voice on these ‘others’, I adopt anthropomorphism strategically for three reasons. First, I wish to decenter the human subject of modernism to undermine modernist practices of purification. Second, it is the most direct way to insert the ‘environment’ and hogs as actants in the debate. Third, following Doel’s (1999:75) admonition to “resist exchanging its affect (which disturbs) for a representation (which settles),” I want to disrupt my narrative.

I have selected to interrupt my account of the debate with what I conceptualize as interpolations. Webster’s Dictionary (1996: 348) defines interpolate as:

1. to introduce (something extraneous) between other things, or parts. 2. to alter (a text) by the insertion of new matter, esp. without authorization.

My interpolations are representations of the voices of the repressed, those that have been erased by the modernist contract. I hope that these voices alter my text, making it less human-centered. Clearly, however, I do not have authorization for my attempts to ‘speak for’ those excluded others.

‘Rights’ as a problematic

My interpolations should not be taken as an argument for animal rights. Arguments for rights are constructed upon notions of a (human) liberal subject who is inseparable from the epistemologies of the modern constitution, capitalism and science that have created the ghosts I seek here. I will discuss these epistemologies in Chapters Seven and Eight, however, it is important here to note the incongruencies between rights discourse, environmental concerns, and the fate of animals (Whatmore 1997). In Western discourses, rights are articulated through discussions about ethics (O’Neil 2000). Whatmore (1997) reports that the (human) body is the site to which ethics are attached. This has spatial implications.

Where the individual, the person, is the ethical unit, this ethics becomes spatially articulated: the space that is the body of the person is defined, and the spaces within which that body operates also become ethically defined. Not only in theory is the body itself an ethical territory, but the space around it also becomes

---

33 I am not concerned with a notion of a prime mover. Nor am I concerned with teleology. Rather, I am noting that, despite human interventions, surface and groundwater flows, often veering off in unanticipated courses, rivers flood and lyrics from the score of My Fair Lady notwithstanding, hurricanes do (frequently, in some locales) happen.
But, if the individual body is not the ethical unit coming under ethical consideration but rather some collective of abstracted bodies (such as factory-farmed pigs), then the ethical impulse is not articulated in association with the spaces of the body and the spaces around the body. Consequently, the ethics here remain in the realm of the abstract, if they survive at all, and leave these spaces as ethical blanks. Without the presence of the ethically visible body to ground the ethical practices within these spaces, whatever ethical consideration there may be becomes generalized and dissipated via convention, markets, legislation, discourse and practices, often generating a tendency of downgrading towards lowest common denominators (Jones 2000: 285-286).

Thus, the placement of factory-farmed animals and laboratory animals in secured buildings, out of sight, and the invisibility of much of the biophysical world contributes to the maintenance of the modern constitution because “the very spaces that they occupy” are “profoundly other to the one(s) that humans generally occupy” (Jones 2000: 286).

Many ecofeminists approach these ethical issues by arguing for the development of an ethics of “care.” I argue, however, that this is insufficient because such ethics implicitly contain elements of colonial paternalism (superior humans caring for ‘others’), imposes an ageographical universalized notion of ethics on others, and leaves the binary systems and power relations that underlie Enlightenment-derived notions of rights intact. Instead, I support Whatmore’s (1997) call for recognition of the embodied practices of ethical communities as a strategy that will allow humans to “rediscover the totality of [their] practical bonds with ‘others’ ” (Kruks, quoted in Jones 2000: 288-289). Thus, a focus upon bodies and permeabilities is necessary.

Desire. I want to argue that social boundaries are expressions of desire. In this case, for reasons that will be discussed in Chapter Seven, some participants desire to separate humanity from ‘nature’ or ‘animals’. There are a number of other desires, however, many of which are gendered, expressed in this debate. To avoid economic determinism and the associated notion of power as top-down, working from Deleuze and Guattari’s (1983) theorization of the intimate relationship between economics and desire, I focus upon the role of desire in the construction of the biophysical world and as expressed in the socio-spatial arrangements that have been asserted by participants in the debate.

Methods

I am conducting a discourse analysis of the textual productions of three groups: the Kentuckians for the Commonwealth (KFTC), Community Farm Alliance (CFA), and the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation (KFB). KFTC and CFA were formed in the early 1980s and have been involved from the beginning of this debate. Unlike some of the other activist groups involved in the debate, KFTC and CFA publish newspapers, maintain web sites and lobby at the state level. KFB, which was chartered under state law in 1921, is intimately connected to the University of Kentucky’s College of Agriculture. It also publishes a newspaper, maintains a web site and lobbies at the state level. The Division of Water of the Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection is charged with development of the regulations.
My archive consists of drafts of the regulations and impact statements, public hearing transcripts prepared by the Cabinet, correspondence to the Cabinet, newspapers produced by KFTC, CFA, and KFB, material on the three groups’ web sites, other publications, e.g., histories, position papers and press releases, produced by the groups, as well as CAFO-related news stories, editorials, and letters to the editor published in the state’s two largest daily newspapers, the *Lexington-Herald Leader* and the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. Most of the academic literature about risk disputes cited previously analyzes comments made during the dispute, or interviews or surveys people to ascertain their strategies during such struggles. I take a different approach, analyzing multiple genres to locate the embeddedness of risk constructions and to identify the socio-spatial relations within which notions of risk are produced and which they seek to maintain or alter.

Taking a genealogical approach, I seek to discover changes in discourses over time and identify the operative discursive formations—the statements, practices, non-discursive domains, positivities (past and present practices, assumptions, rules and relationships that function to fix the discourse), systems of dispersion and domains of governmentality (Foucault 1991a). Following Foucault (1991a: 56), I am focusing upon three areas. First, I identify intradiscursive changes, which may include inclusions or exclusions, changes in generalizations or alternatives. Second, I locate changes that impact the discursive formations themselves, such as shifts in the boundaries that define the possible objects of the discourse, changes in the role and position of subjects who may speak within the discourse, changes in the functioning of the mode of language with respect to objects in the discourse (e.g., from descriptive to scientific language) and changes in the localization and circulation of discourse within social arrangements. Third, I am seeking changes that affect several discursive formations simultaneously, such as the inversion of a hierarchical structure, change in the directing principle, and displacements of function. Within the debate, participants are grappling with a number of discursive formations (economic, scientific, agricultural, legal, and ethical) through different genres of texts. I examine the interplay of these discourses to see how they “fit into one another, interpenetrate one another, support one another, reinforce one another, auto-engender and engender one another” (Wittig 1988: 431) or challenge or modify one another. Hall (1997) refers to these relationships between discourses as inter-textuality and points to the importance of these relationships in establishing a regime of representation through which preferred meanings are established and maintained. Because inter-textuality is important, Hall (1997: 233) argues that it is essential to read an image or event “against the grain” in relation to similar images within the appropriate regimes of representation.

I am comparing discourses of KFTC, CFA, and KFB across genres because each genre “possesses definite principles of selection, definite forms for seeing and conceptualizing reality, and a definite scope and depth of penetration” (Medvedev and Bakhtin 1978: 131). Hall (1997) directs attention to the standardization of production of genres that both standardizes the production process and stabilizes an audience. Just as Foucault (1995) reports that one of the hallmarks of modernity is the simultaneous universalization and individualization of subjects, so standardization of production also entails differentiation that is manifested by the production of different genres for different audiences and variation within genres (Hall 1977). Each genre is a distinct signifying practice although the boundaries between genres are also not fixed (Hall 1997). Thus, each genre is oriented specifically toward conditions of performance and perception and by its particular thematic content (Medvedev and Bakhtin 1978). To locate conditions of performance and perception, I examine each genre to locate the modulation of language (e.g.,
strident, passionate, detached, casual, formal), the associations of each text with a particular group, the intended audience, authorial assumptions about where the audience will likely engage with the text and how the audience will react, the relationship between the audience and authors of the text, and the space the text occupies in terms of daily life.

The second orientation, the thematic content, is manifested in the unity of meanings in elements employed. Because “the theme of the work is the theme of the whole utterance as a definite sociohistorical act” (Medvedev and Bakhtin 1978: 132), each genre must be sited within the circumstances under which its texts are produced. Both orientations are inextricably connected and interdependent. Because each of the genres analyzed “is a complex system of means and methods for the conscious control and finalization of reality” (Medvedev and Bakhtin 1978: 133), each must be interrogated for its situated version of reality.

Each of the genres I examine offers a particular kind of information and, although each genre is distinct, the genres are connected intertextually which necessitates an analysis of each genre within context of others produced. Each genre offers specific information. The regulations and Cabinet employees’ statements allow for analysis of the knowledges that Cabinet personnel considered sufficiently valid to be addressed in the regulations and provide Cabinet-sanctioned scientific data from which to triangulate claims of participants in the debate. Comments and correspondence provide the means to identify participants and their positions vis-à-vis the regulations and, because both comments and correspondence contain knowledges that participants brought to buttress their representations of risk, these knowledges can be compared with those that the Cabinet sanctioned by incorporation into the regulations. Histories, publications and position papers of participants provide the context for the three groups’ positions as well as specific representations of the regulations and the other categories I am researching. The daily newspapers provide additional information pertaining to people who did not attend the hearings or submit correspondence.

Throughout all genres, I am seeking the limits and forms of the sayable. What is it possible to speak of? What is the constituted domain of discourse? What type of discursivity is assigned to this or that domain (what is allocated as matter for narrative treatment; for descriptive science; for literary formulation?) (Foucault 1991: 59-60).

I conceptualize the unsayable as that which is repressed.

I initiated my analysis with identification of hearing participants and their opinions from public hearing transcripts prepared by the Cabinet. Working with a statistical program, I entered the name of each participant who signed in at the hearings and created variables for each participant’s gender, group membership, county of origin, locations of hearings attended, occupation, types of comments (oral or written), position upon the regulations as proposed, and concerns and recommendations expressed. Although this method allowed me to run frequencies across codes, it had a number of shortcomings. First, because some people may not have signed in, hearing attendance may have been larger than that reported. Secondly, as previously indicated, it was not possible to determine gender from some names. Thirdly, some people who may have been members of groups may not have indicated group membership and fourthly, the majority of participants did not indicate occupation. Finally, the Cabinet summarized comments, taking them out of context of the whole comment.
Once I had input the information from the hearings, I found myself with 324 variables. To determine which concerns were most important in the debate, I ran frequencies. The analyses that follow are developed from those concerns most frequently expressed by participants. This step is similar to the content analyses that form the basis of most of the risk and hazards literature across disciplines.

Unlike the risk and hazards literature, I took another step. To locate the context in which concerns were derived, I turned to histories, publications, press releases and position papers produced by KFTC, CFA and KFB to determine the genealogy of the issues they raised. This method also allowed me to locate differences in opinions expressed to different audiences and to better understand what group members meant by the use of such terms as ‘grassroots’, ‘participation’, ‘environment’, and ‘environmental protection’. Further, it provided an historical overview of each group’s practices and relationships with other participants, which I used to locate the groups’ imaginative geographies as well as the bases of tensions between the three groups and the Cabinet.

Structure of this study

Chapter Two provides the historical and geographical contexts in which KFTC and CFA were begun and examines their organizational structures. I chart changes in the groups’ thematics and agendas over time to situate their concerns about industrial farming within their pre-existing agendas. I then discuss the risks that members of both groups, and other similarly-minded participants, expressed, noting gendered differences, and focusing upon their representations of the biophysical world.

Chapter Three examines KFTC’s and CFA’s textual productions in other genres to further contextualize arguments that members made at the hearings. Through an analysis of the news stories in both groups’ newspapers, I discuss similarities and differences in the groups’ thematics, memberships, priorities and audiences, as well as their political tactics and coaltional politics. I focus upon the representations of the biophysical world and the role of women and people of color in both groups’ in challenging regimes of representation and regimes of truth.

Chapter Four examines the ways in which KFB became institutionalized, emphasizing the importance of the group’s relationships with the University of Kentucky, the state’s land grant university, and state and national governmental agencies, which has contributed to the group’s hegemony and the group’s organizational structure, thematics, agendas and political strategies over time. I then interrogate the concerns that members of the KFB group brought to the public hearings to locate the discourses that the group privileges and its representations of the ‘environment’ and activists who are working to strengthen the regulations.

Chapter Five analyzes the risks that KFB expressed at the hearings within context of the group’s historic attitudes toward farming and environmentalists. I examine KFB’s strategies of containment, focusing particularly on the role that gender plays in the group’s formulation of the ‘environment’, environmentalists and women.

In Chapter Six, I examine the Cabinet’s role in the debate through a discussion of the rationalities it brings to governing, its jurisdictional boundaries and the ways in which jurisdictional constraints have affected the legislative history of the regulations. Through analysis of changes made to the regulations over time and Cabinet employees’ responses to comments made by participants, I examine the ways in which the regulations privilege certain knowledges.

34 My coding strategy is included in the Appendix.
specific gendered forms of farming and subject positions. I focus upon the Cabinet's construction of the 'environment'.

Chapter Seven explores the ways in which the modern constitution is articulated through participants' constructions of the 'environment' and their erasure of the corporeal hog and other hybrids. Through an analysis of participants' representations of human-environment and human-animal relationships, I locate the gendered and sexualized imaginaries that underlie participants' environmental productions and produce the specters than haunt the debate. Then, working from Deleuze and Guatarri's (1983) and Irigaray's (1985) discussions, I examine the role that desire, articulated through gender and sexuality, plays within this dispute.

In Chapter Eight, I continue the analysis by exploring the linkages between participants' religious and economic imaginaries to their imaginaries of ‘wife and mother’. I then turn to the ways in which these imaginaries and the gendered environments that they have produced have been incorporated into participants’ imaginative geographies, which have been deployed to deterritorialize and reterritorialize. I conclude with a discussion of questions suggested by my research.
“A large dairy animal approached Zaphod Beeblebrox’s table, a large fat meaty quadruped of the bovine type with large watery eyes, small horns and what might almost have been an ingratiating smile on its lips.

‘Good evening,’ it lowed and sat back heavily on its haunches. ‘I am the main Dish of the Day. May I interest you in parts of my body?’ It harrumphed and gurgled a bit, wriggling its hind quarters into a more comfortable position and gazed peacefully at them.

Its gaze was met by looks of startled bewilderment from Arthur and Trillian, a resigned shrug from Ford Prefect and naked hunger from Zaphod Beeblebrox.

‘Something off the shoulder perhaps?’ suggested the animal. ‘Braised in a white wine sauce?’

‘Er, your shoulder?’ said Arthur in a horrified whisper.

‘But naturally my shoulder, sir,’ mooed the animal contentedly, ‘nobody else’s is mine to offer.’

Zaphod leapt to his feet and started prodding and feeling the animal’s shoulder appreciatively.

‘Or the rump is very good,’ murmured the animal. ‘I’ve been exercising it and eating plenty of grain, so there’s a lot of good meat there.’ It gave a mellow grunt, gurgled again and started to chew the cud. It swallowed the cud again.

‘Or a casserole of me perhaps?’ it added.

‘You mean this animal actually wants us to eat it?’ whispered Trillian to Ford.

‘Me?’ said Ford, with a glazed look in his eyes. ‘I don’t mean anything.’

‘That’s absolutely horrible,’ exclaimed Arthur, ‘the most revolting thing I’ve ever heard.’

‘What’s the problem, Earthman?’ said Zaphod, now transferring his attention to the animal’s enormous rump.

‘I just don’t want to eat an animal that’s standing there inviting me to,’ said Arthur. ‘It’s heartless.’

‘Better than eating an animal that doesn’t want to be eaten,’ said Zaphod.

‘That’s not the point,’ Arthur protested. ‘I mean right,’ eh said, ‘maybe it is the point. I don’t care, I’m not going to think about it now. I’ll just . . . er . . . ’

The Universe raged about him in its death throes.

‘I think I’ll just have a green salad,’ he muttered.

‘May I urge you to consider my liver?’ asked the animal, ‘it must be very rich and tender buy now, I’ve been force-feeding myself for months.’

‘A green salad,’ said Arthur emphatically.

‘A green salad?’ said the animal, rolling his eyes disapprovingly at Arthur.

‘Are you going to tell me,’ said Arthur, ‘that I shouldn’t have green salad?’

‘Well,’ said the animal. ‘I know many vegetables that are very clear on that point. Which is why it was eventually decided to cut through the whole tangled problem and breed an animal that actually wanted to be eaten. And here I am.’

It managed a slight bow.

‘Glass of water please,’ said Arthur.

‘Look,’ said Zaphod, ‘we want to eat, we don’t want to make a meal of the issues. Four rare steaks please, and hurry. We haven’t eaten in five hundred and seventy-six thousand million years.’

‘The animal staggered to its feet. It gave a mellow gurgle.

‘A very wise choice, sir, if I may say so. Very good,’ it said. ‘I’ll just nip off and shoot myself.’

‘He turned and gave a friendly wink to Arthur.

‘Don’t worry, sir,’ he said. ‘I’ll be very humane.’

‘It waddled off to the kitchen.

‘A matter of minutes later the waiter arrived with four huge steaming steaks.

‘Zaphod and Ford wolfed straight into them without a second’s hesitation. Trillian paused, then shrugged and started into hers.

‘Arthur stared at his feeling slightly ill.’
CHAPTER TWO

KFTC and CFA: the activist agenda

... there are distinct spatialised modalities of control, and ... resistance... people are positioned differently in unequal and multiple power relationships, that more and less powerful people are active in the constitution of unfolding relationships of authority, meaning and identity, that these people are active in the constitution of unfolding relationships of authority, meaning and identity, that these activities are contingent, ambiguous and awkwardly situated, but that resistance seeks to occupy, deploy and create alternative spatialities from those defined through oppression and exploitation.37

This chapter is the first of two that examine the discourses of two activist groups—KFTC and CFA—which have been embroiled in the debate about regulating industrial hog farms. Although a number of activist groups participated in the debate, I focus upon these groups because both have been in existence for some time and have developed social critiques that approach environmental issues as more than simply matters of environmental contamination—both groups view environmental degradation as an indicator of social inequalities. Additionally, because KFTC has adopted an environmental justice stance and CFA is primarily concerned with agriculture, a comparison of both groups’ agendas provides insight into the ways in which constructions of the environment can be mobilized in different ways to achieve varying agendas and attract supporters from different social locales.

In this chapter, I provide brief histories of the two groups. Because all knowledge is partial and situated (Haraway 1991), it is essential to locate those knowledges within the lived experiences that shape understandings of the world and contribute to agreed-upon epistemologies. The histories of the two groups provide the context in which to examine their discourses about the need to regulate industrial hog farming and the tactics they used to represent hog CAFOs as potential threats to farmers, farming, and rurality. Although both groups argued for stronger regulation of hog CAFOs and have developed political economy critiques and broad social agendas, they came into being for different reasons in different contexts. Thus, they drew from different populations within the state: KFTC’s focus on mining attracted members from eastern Kentucky; CFA’s agricultural agenda drew members from central Kentucky. As a result, the spatial distribution and sizes of their memberships vary. After the groups’ histories, through a content analysis of comments made at the hearings and in correspondence to the Cabinet, I indicate the congruence between the representations of the majority of participants and the two groups and interrogate the representations of farmers, farming, and rurality embedded in the comments. In the second of these two chapters, I will examine the textual productions of KFTC and CFA across a number of genres to locate similarities and differences that will indicate the ways in which the state’s hearing process created subject positions for participants in the debate.

KFTC history

KFTC was formed in 1981 as the Kentucky Fair Tax Coalition to address issues related to mineral taxation and strip mining in Appalachia (KFTC 1991). From its inception, KFTC was concerned with environmental and social justice issues. In its five-year report, covering the years 1982-1986, the group defined itself as:

... a statewide, multi-issue, membership-based organization. Our members seek to address the long-standing problems of land and mineral use and ownership, as well as immediate issues such as water quality, toxic wastes, legislative democracy, education, and a lack of community services. KFTC activity is directed toward statewide changes while fostering the development of local groups to participate in community affairs (KFTC 1986: unnumbered).

Working from an Appalachian Land Ownership study (1983), produced by a task force that investigated land ownership patterns in West Virginia and Kentucky, KFTC challenged Kentucky’s mineral taxation policies with the goals of improving community services by increasing revenues for local governments and school systems (KFTC 1986). Along with its legislative agenda, the group published a summary of the Appalachian Land Ownership Study and history of KFTC under the title Struggling for Tax Justice in the Mountains. The Appalachian study had found that

76 percent of the land in the 12 [Kentucky] counties surveyed belonged to corporations or individuals from outside the counties or to government agencies. Just 25 corporate and individual owners owned more than a million acres of land, mineral rights or both. All but three of these 25 were headquartered outside the mountains, all but six outside the state. Corporations alone held 42 percent of that million acres. The federal government, through the U.S. Forest Service, owned 13 percent, most of it national forest land in Laurel County (KFTC 1991: 12).

In addition to tackling corporate power, the group had also to take on state officials who had a history of cooperating with corporate interests. For example, in 1921 the first court decision on surface rights ruled that the mineral owner has dominant rights over the surface owner. Similarly, in 1955 a Circuit court judge ruled that a mining company did not need the surface owner’s permission to strip mine the land and in 1978 the Kentucky General Assembly had exempted unmined coal from property taxation and prohibited local governments from taxing coal. Citizen attempts to gain more autonomy were often unsuccessful at the state level—bills that would have given the owners of surface rights protection from mining companies had been rejected by the General Assembly. Citizens also confronted political fiefdoms at the local level.

38 The study was important to activists for two reasons: 1) through its analysis of land and mineral ownership in the region, it demonstrated that Appalachian poverty was directly related to “inequality in land and mineral ownership and property tax systems”; and 2) because it relied upon research accomplished primarily by non-professionals, it provided a catalyst for local activists (KFTC 1991: 11).
39 balancing the scales, 21 November 1991.
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The Martin County Housing Agency was largely made up of relatives and political allies of the historically corrupt Martin Fiscal Court. Martin County bureaucracy in the fall of 1979 read like a family tree. The wife of the county-judge executive (who had earlier gone to prison for diverting federal flood relief funds for his own use) was the county treasurer. One of the judge’s sisters was an officer in the housing agency. His sister-in-law, the mother of the county planner, headed the housing agency, where her niece was employed as a secretary. And so on.

Tightly controlled political machines are common throughout eastern Kentucky. Most citizens who have ever tried to buck the system are painfully aware of the consequences. Family members and friends may lose jobs and be permanently blacklisted so they cannot get another job in the area. Children are harassed at school. Government assistance benefits mysteriously dry up. Roads near the homes of those who stand against the power structures are neglected. People receive threatening phone calls (KFTC 1991: 5-6).

So, from the onset, state and county government and officials were perceived both as an impediment to and potential facilitator of the group’s agenda.

In September of 1982, the newly formed Leslie County Concerned Citizens group published the results of its study of land ownership in Leslie County (which had not been included in the Appalachian Land Study). The Leslie County study found that the top 10 surface owners—almost all absent ownership—controlled 94,000 acres. In what has become a characteristic of KFTC, the group worked with the Leslie County citizens’ group. By late 1982, KFTC was also dealing with water pollution problems such as damaged or destroyed private drinking water wells resulting from underground coal mining in Martin County and illegal brine discharges from oil wells in Magoffin County. By the end of its first year, KFTC had roughly 225 members in about 30 counties, predominantly in eastern and central Kentucky. The group’s early campaigns were targeted toward developing an unmined minerals tax bill and a bill to limit abuses in the state’s broad deed system.

Broad form deeds, also used in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia, separated mineral ownership from ownership of surface land. However, during the 1940s and 1950s, Kentucky courts interpreted broad form deeds to mean the surface owner also sold, along with the minerals, the right to extract them through whatever means the mineral owner chose (KFTC 1991: 67).

Although the General Assembly failed to pass both bills, the group learned from the experience (KFTC 1991). Because, after approval by House committees, both bills had been killed by the House Rules Committee in meetings from which the public was excluded, the group realized that it had to press for a more democratic decision-making process. To accomplish this

---
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goal, the group made alliances with other groups across the state and nation, and developed a program to produce leaders with organizing skills (KFTC 1991).

In 1982, in response to growing concerns about water quality problems, KFTC hired a hydrologist and launched a Citizens Education and Water Monitoring Project through which it trained citizen groups to establish water monitoring projects with portable water testing equipment loaned by KFTC. The group also conducted workshops with the Kentucky Accountability Project to inform citizens about strip mining regulations and water pollution standards, and developed a leadership development skills manual for its own field staff and to share with other citizens’ organizations (KFTC 1991).

In 1986, KFTC established the Kentucky Leadership School to conduct several statewide and multi-county leadership workshops yearly (KFTC 1991). The group also periodically holds workshops for staff and other citizen groups (KFTC 1991). KFTC maintains lending libraries in its headquarters and chapter offices, and occasionally runs book and video reviews in a column titled “Leadership Resources” in balancing the scales. The group also invites members and other readers of its newspaper to review books, periodicals, web sites, and videos that relate to KFTC’s work and submit reviews for publication.

KFTC also offers workshops on the media to educate members and the general public about the effective construction and framing of messages for both press and legislators. For

44 The group has worked with a number of citizens’ groups including Agricultural Missions, Appalachian Alliance, Appalachian Community Fund, Appalachian Research and Defense Fund, Appalshop, Campus Outreach Opportunity League, Carolina Community Project, Catholic Committee of Appalachia, Center for Health Services at Vanderbilt University, Center for Popular Economics, Charlotte [NC] Organizing Project, Citizens Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes, Coal Employment Project, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, Commonwealth Tax Policy Education Group, Community Farm Alliance, Connective Ministries, Covington Community Center, Cumberland Chapter of the Sierra Club, Democracy Resource Center, Grassroots Leadership, Highlander Center, Institute for Southern Studies, Kentucky Action for Human Needs, Kentucky League of Women Voters, Kentucky Resources Council, Kentucky Youth Advocates, Minnesota COACT, Mountain Life and Work, National Wildlife Federation, Rural Coalition, Northern Plains Resource Council, Save Our Cumberland Mountains, Southern Appalachian Leadership Training, Southern Empowerment Project, Southern Poverty Law Center, and the Western North Carolina Alliance. The group also works with student organizations on campuses across the state. For example, the Central Kentucky Chapter is involved with the University of Kentucky’s Leftist Student Union in ongoing campaigns to obtain a living wage for Fayette County workers and hazardous duty pay for the county solid waste workers, and has also worked with the University of Kentucky Coalition Against Sweatshops.


46 Many of the suggested readings are written by academics and activists who employ a critical political economy perspective. For example, a reading list published in balancing the scales (10 August, p. 10) recommended Bagdikian’s Media Monopoly, Ferguson and Rogers’ Right Turn: The Decline of Democrats and the Future of American Politics, Greider’s Who Will Tell the People: The Betrayal of American Democracy, and Alinsky’s Rules for Radicals.
example, in 1997 the group conducted a free media skills training workshop for all Kentucky citizens\(^\text{47}\) and the group’s Special 2000 Legislative Guide included a full page of tips for writing letters and the addresses of daily and weekly newspapers across the state.

Effective January 1, 1988, the Kentucky Fair Tax Coalition became Kentuckians for the Commonwealth, a name that reflected both an agenda that had come to include more than mining, forestry and taxation issues and a growing diverse base of support across the state from both rural and urban areas. Currently the group has six offices and roughly 1500 members drawn from the counties indicated in Figure 2.1. The group is now a presence throughout much of the state. Relatively small membership numbers notwithstanding, the group has become an accepted institution for social change, and draws upon members’ networks including “families, friends, co-workers, neighbors, fellow church members” (Szakos 1993: 116) as well as its ties to other citizen groups.

**KFTC’S PRESENCE IN KENTUCKY**

![Figure 2.1. KFTC’s presence in Kentucky. (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath).](image_url)

Members vote yearly for the organization’s officers and chapter steering committee representatives and set the annual platform of goals and priorities. Every September, county chapters meet to rank the issues that the group should work on and the steering committee compiles those rankings into a proposed platform that is published in the group’s newspaper, *balancing the scales*, and is voted on at the annual meeting in October.

KFTC works on statewide issues only when a problem cannot be solved at the local level or if a chapter formally requests statewide action (Szakos 1993). Over the years, the group developed subcommittees including executive, personnel, finance, leadership development, environmental rights, land reform, as well as a youth council and a legislative democracy working group. It also hired three groups of employees—organizers, program managers, and a staff coordinator.

KFTC has struggled to reach its targeted constituency. The group has a sliding scale for dues, full dues waivers on request, travel cost reimbursement for regional meetings, car-pooling, and scholarships for workshops and conferences. In 1988, the group published a 23-page book,

---

\(^{47}\) *balancing the scales*, 31 July 1997.
Save the Homeplace designed to educate children and people with low literacy levels about the abuses of the broad deed system.

The group has had more success in recruiting women for leadership positions than it has with other members of its targeted constituency. Since its inception, 132 women and 123 men have held elected positions.48 Of the members’ interviews published in balancing the scales, 19 were with women, 10 with men, and three with male-female couples. Currently women represent more than half of the group’s employees.

In April 1982, KFTC established its basic organizational structure that it continues to modify to increase members’ involvement in decision-making (Szakos 1993). Members currently pay dues of $10 to $25 a year depending upon ability to pay, and chapters are established in every county where KFTC has 15 or more active members. Currently the group has chapters in Floyd, Harlan, Hopkins, Jefferson, Knott, Leslie, Letcher, Perry, Rowan, and Union Counties. It also has a Tri-County chapter that covers Laurel, Knox, and Whitley Counties and a Central Kentucky chapter that covers Bourbon, Fayette, Jessamine, Mercer and Woodford Counties. The group has offices in Harlan, London, Lexington, Louisville, Morgantown, Prestonburg, Salyersville, Whitesburg.

KFTC holds periodic membership drives to fulfill its ongoing strategic goal of recruiting 500 new members a year. Recruitment strategies include booths at county fairs and other events, house parties for new members, and current members asking people to join the organization. To encourage recruitment efforts, at KFTC’s annual meeting, the chapter that recruits the most new members receives an award.

Members’ dues cover roughly 20 percent of the group’s operating expenses. The remainder of its funding comes from a number of sources, including a quilt project. The first quilts were constructed as part of the group’s 10th anniversary celebration. KFTC chapters and group members throughout the state created squares that were assembled into two quilts: the first was raffled off with proceeds going to the group’s endowment; the second stayed with the organization as a reminder of the first decade’s accomplishments. Two new quilts with social justice concerns were created for the group’s 20th anniversary celebration that began on August 18, 2001. The use of quilts, which are associated with Appalachia’s crafts heritage, evokes KFTC’s origins in eastern Kentucky while providing a beautiful and, for the winner of the raffle, useful household item.

KFTC constantly seeks donations of supplies, equipment, and other usable assets. Also, the group holds regular fundraisers that include raffles of items donated by businesses and members, house parties, bake sales, phon-a-thons, film festivals, T-shirt and novelty item sales, and membership renewals. Funds raised from these sources are crucial because, the group is restricted from using grant money for lobbying or any other effort that could be construed as political under the laws that govern non-profit organizations. These laws effectively constrain non-profit organizations, such as KFTC, by forcing members to divert valuable time and energy from social justice campaigns into constant fundraising efforts.

During its history, the group has received funding from numerous agencies.49 Some of this funding comes in the form of matching grants, many of which are associated with organized

48 It was not possible to determine gender from 12 names.
49 Contributors (compiled from a list in Making History: The First Ten Years of KFTC and newspapers from 1991 to the present) include: the 1122 Fund, Abelard Foundation, Adrian Dominican Sisters, Agricultural Missions, Appalachian Community Fund, Appalachian Fund/National Fund, Appalachian People’s Service Organization, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Beldon Fund, Bench Trail Foundation, Barry and Edith Bingham, Mary and
religions. For example, in 2000 the group sought an additional $5,000 in dues from new members in order to obtain a $5,000 grant from the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock. The campaign was successful, netting the group $7,007 in new dues and the $5,000 grant.\(^{50}\)

The number of Roman Catholic groups from which KFTC (and CFA) receive funding is surprising because there is not a strong Catholic presence in Kentucky. The US census no longer compiles information about religious affiliation. As of 1990, however, there were only 348 Catholic churches in Kentucky, compared to 6,957 churches of Protestant denominations (Bradley et al. 1992). Although some Protestant and Christian churches (especially those that formed by leaving a larger church) may have relatively small memberships compared to Catholic churches, Catholics are still outnumbered by Protestant denominations in Kentucky.\(^{51}\)

In addition to organized protests, press conferences, lobbying and letter-writing campaigns, KFTC has also mounted legal challenges. In 1981, KFTC members in Harlan, Floyd, and Martin Counties appealed assessments of absentee-owned coal and other property to local and state boards;\(^{52}\) in 1983 the group made an agreement under which the Southern Poverty Law Center would assist KFTC in the research and filing of major legal actions to challenge property tax structures and methods of calculating taxes in Kentucky,\(^{53}\) and the following year the group filed a class action law suit in U.S. District Court against six property valuation administrators.\(^{54}\) This was followed by a number of successful lawsuits that: forced the state to sign an out-of-court settlement to enforce an existing groundwater monitoring law for coal mines, limited mining companies’ rights under broad deeds, and got legal recognition

---

50 The Catholic Church did not supply membership numbers so I cannot compare actual numbers of church members in the state currently. As of 1990, 43 percent of Kentucky’s church members belonged to the Southern Baptist Convention; 16 percent, Catholic; 10 percent, the United Methodist Church; four percent, the Christian Church and Church of Christ; four percent, African American Baptist Churches; and three percent, the Church of Christ (Raitz and Schein, with Clay and O’Malley 1998).

51 The number of Catholic groups from which KFTC (and CFA) receive funding is surprising because there is not a strong Catholic presence in Kentucky. The US census no longer compiles information about religious affiliation. As of 1990, however, there were only 348 Catholic churches in Kentucky, compared to 6,957 churches of Protestant denominations (Bradley et al. 1992). Although some Protestant and Christian churches (especially those that formed by leaving a larger church) may have relatively small memberships compared to Catholic churches, Catholics are still outnumbered by Protestant denominations in Kentucky.

52 The Catholic Church did not supply membership numbers so I cannot compare actual numbers of church members in the state currently. As of 1990, 43 percent of Kentucky’s church members belonged to the Southern Baptist Convention; 16 percent, Catholic; 10 percent, the United Methodist Church; four percent, the Christian Church and Church of Christ; four percent, African American Baptist Churches; and three percent, the Church of Christ (Raitz and Schein, with Clay and O’Malley 1998).

53 Ibid.

54 Ibid.
that the state’s tax rate on unmined coal was so low that it was a de facto exemption from taxation.\textsuperscript{55} Although roughly half of the group’s legal challenges were successful, sometimes a favorable lower court decision was overturned by a higher court.\textsuperscript{56}

These legal tactics notwithstanding, generally the group tries to avoid legal action because court rules can be “confusing and controlling,” because the courts can define standing in such a way to exclude the public, and because the group’s opponents typically can “far outspend KFTC on expert testimony and case preparation.”\textsuperscript{57} KFTC has also produced numerous publications. In the first ten years of its life, in addition to \textit{balancing the scales}, KFTC produced four general publications, six tax-related publications, and seven reports on water quality.

The group’s concerns about environmental degradation led it to expand campaigns to include industrial farming, impacts of power plants, solid waste disposal, water quality, and the effects of a massive coal sludge spill in Martin County in 2000. Recognizing that Kentucky’s political arrangements were not conducive to facilitating the group’s agenda, it began to focus upon tax and campaign finance reform, government secrecy, police violence, fuel costs, living wages, and economic development.\textsuperscript{58} The group brought 16 years of experience in social justice struggles and a history of alliances with other grassroots groups to the debate about industrial hog farming. One of its strongest allies is the Community Farm Alliance (CFA).

\section*{CFA history}

Where KFTC organized in the eastern part of the state to address mining-related issues, CFA formed in central Kentucky in 1985 in response to what has become known as “the farm crisis” of the 1980s. During this period, many American farmers confronted shrinking agricultural export markets, a global recession, a decline in farm commodity prices as a result of a glut of grain on world markets, increases in interest rates as a result of federal fiscal and monetary policies, and competition from the agricultural products of less developed nations trying to repay debts (Buttel et al. 1990). Hamilton and Ryan (1993: 128) report that interest rate hikes were disastrous because farm debt had risen “from $30 billion in the early 1970s to over $225 billion in the early 1980s” as farmers took out loans to purchase the technologies that they believed would make them more efficient. The unsustainable debt burdens,\textsuperscript{59} combined with falling commodity prices, created a desperate situation for many farm families—roughly 20 percent of American farmers left farming from 1981 to 1987 (Hamilton and Ryan 1993).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid, p. 153.
\item \textsuperscript{58} \textit{balancing the scales}, 31 January 2002 and 25 May 2001.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Farmers in the entire USDA Southern region were dramatically affected by the Farm Crisis. Molnar (1986: 2-3) reports that 1986 figures from the American Banking Association’s mid-year farm credit survey shows that Southern banks discontinued financing on 6.9 percent of the farm loans during the year ending June 1985, the highest in any national region; 5.6 percent of Southern farmers went out of business in 1985; 5.7 percent of Southern farmers went into bankruptcy, 4.7 percent of Southern farmers loaned up to their practical limit and 48.6 percent expected to reach that limit in the next year. Farmland values dropped from 1 to 33 percent between 1981-1986 in the Southern region (less than the 30 to 59 percent land value reductions experienced in the Midwest during the same period).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Hundreds of thousands of farmers participated in the farm movement of the mid-1980s out of frustration, sometimes desperation, and with a sense of disbelief over what was happening to them. Each farmer’s own dream was collapsing. Farmers were losing not only their jobs, but also their homes and land, homes and land that often carried generations of family history (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 129).

From its inception, CFA members were critical of the American “green revolution” with its dependence upon chemical inputs, hybrid seeds, and sophisticated technology. They were equally critical of agricultural experts’ discourse and of the connections between agricultural experts and agribusinesses who

[c]arefully nurture a one-dimensional image of success, an image that relies upon the self-consciousness of farmers as business operators.

The ‘best’ farmers have often come to be defined as the ones who are the most modern, who use the latest machinery and chemicals to produce the largest yield. The ‘best’ farmers are developed as leaders and held up as examples to all of their colleagues. Modern farming methods and modern farming thinking are packaged together. It has become almost a sin for local activists to question free market capitalism or technological progress (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 128).

Hamilton and Ryan (1993) maintain that farmers’ interest in productivity and desires to increase family income left them vulnerable to this ‘expert’ discourse. CFA’s analysis of expert discourse and knowledge production in its published history (Hamilton and Ryan 1993), newspaper and position papers is similar to Foucault’s (1980a) understanding of the role that power relations play in constructing both subjects and knowledges which in turn produce ‘truths’. In particular, CFA was critical of agricultural experts and farm crisis activists who, by focusing almost solely on federal policy solutions, overlooked corporate influence, regional differences that could not be accounted for in a ‘one size fits all’ Farm Bill, and the fragmentation of farmers on a national scale. Hamilton and Ryan (1993: 130) argue that regional differences in agricultural crops and practices and the diversity within what was assumed to be a homogenous farming community surfaced in the concern of Western livestock producers with the loss of markets that resulted from corporate concentration, in the difficulties that Eastern farmers’ experienced with corporate manipulation of dairy prices, and

[i]n the South, farmers faced widespread abuses of the corporate contract system in poultry production; threats to the peanut and tobacco programs; severe loss of black-owned farms due to racial discrimination in lending; and the absence of technologies, crops, and markets suitable to thin soil and rolling land.

Academic researchers have found that such regional differences have always existed within US agriculture. For example, Howe (1986) reports that differences between Midwestern and Southern members of the Farmers’ Alliance, which was active in the 1870s, caused divisions that weakened the group politically. Similarly, Shortridge (1989: 126) notes that although students of 19th century agrarian movements debate many issues, “they agree that the plains farmers of this period were distinct from those further to the east.” Yet, despite this
history of heterogeneity, with the exception of dairy policy, the economic analysis that drove US farm policy during the farm crisis “was based primarily on the situation of Midwestern farmers who produced major commodity crops, such as corn, wheat, and soybeans” (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 131). This policy stance did not help Kentucky’s small farmers (Hamilton and Ryan 1993).

In the late 1970s, Western Kentucky farmers participated in the Washington tractorcades and worked to form the American Agriculture Movement (AAM). In Kentucky, AAM focused upon organizing large farmers only because its leaders assumed that “a farm organization’s power arose from controlling production rather than from large numbers of people” (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 132).

Other major farm organizations with members in central and eastern Kentucky—most notably the Farm Bureau, commodity groups, and large cooperatives—ignored the farm crisis or called it a ‘business correction’ that would weed out the least productive farmers and leave Kentucky stronger in the long run (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 132).

CFA was different. Its roots lay in rural activism related to local rural agricultural and cultural issues in central and eastern Kentucky. In April 1985, roughly 25 people gathered at the Holiday Inn in Bardstown to form the CFA.

... the group polished a mission statement drafted by Baptist preacher Mike Thomason and approved a plan of action drafted by Tim Murphy, director of the Kentucky Resources Council. The remaining members of the founding board were farmers from Henry, Marion, Barren, and Green Counties (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 133).

Women have played key roles in CFA. A tally of the group’s leadership indicates that 59 males and 34 females have held leadership positions since the group’s inception. The current director, Deborah Webb, has held the position since 1994. Women have also constituted the majority of CFA’s staff: 18 women and 14 men have been employed by the group, and five women were featured, along with nine men, and eleven male-female couples, in the “New Member of the Month” column in the group’s newspaper, CFA News.

CFA’s concerns about social justice and sustainability are articulated through its mission to preserve the family farm. Figure 2.2 is the CFA logo. The barn, silo and farmhouse evokes a small family farm, the type of farm that the group’s mission statement asserts is integral to the viability of rural locales:

---

60 The tally, compiled from back issues of the group’s newspapers, is incomplete because the group did not keep copies of every newspaper edition that it printed. For example the group has only two issues of the 1989 newspaper, one from 1988, and one from 1989. Because leaders tend to remain involved with the group for long periods of time, however, the tally may not be far off.

61 The preponderance of women in staff positions may also reflect the comparatively low salaries offered by CFA and other non-profit groups. Women, who are frequently second sources of income, often have more latitude to accept lower-paying jobs.
We believe that family-scale farming and people working together lays a foundation for community life. Family-scale farming has been eroded so significantly that we need to create a new system of agriculture that keeps people on the land. We seek to ensure the health and well being of rural communities by advocating rural economic development whose first priority is the protection of family-scale farming.

We believe that American society is best served by family-scale agriculture, and that corporate control of agriculture endangers our land, food and communities. Family farmers best protect soil and water resources; family farmers are the most reliable producers of nutritious, reasonably priced food; and family farmers sustain thousands of rural communities.

CFA’s notion of the ‘family farm’ is complex and embedded within a very specific geography, political economy, and social history.

Given the fact that many family farms have incorporated for tax reasons, the group’s deployment of the term family farm does not necessarily imply a heterosexual nuclear male-dominated family. Incorporation that includes extended families is not uncommon. Farming, however, is a male-gendered occupation and, typically, the male farmer is represented as the operator of the farm buildings and livestock and his wife as the caretaker of home and family relations (Peter et al, 2000). As Little (1997) and Braun and Braun (1998) note, however, it is not unusual for women to share production as well as reproduction activities on the farm. In the cases of women who work off the farm, the sharing of on-farm labor is an indicator of the dual jobs performed by many women (Little 1997).

In CFA discourse, family farm refers to ownership, to the farmer’s, and by extension the locality’s, autonomy over farm operations and land use. The group’s use of the term ‘family-scale’ implicitly contrasts a scale predicated on assumptions related to ownership: the locally owned family farm will make production decisions that take into account the well-being of the rural locality in which the farm family is embedded; the corporate owner, who is assumed to be absent, will likely not factor local concerns into production decisions. In the CFA’s discourse, smaller autonomous family-owned and -operated farms are more protective of the environment and of food quality. The basis of this argument lies in accountability: the autonomous family

---

62 Printed in the group’s current brochure.
63 Another indication of the governmentality of tax systems.
64 In the case of contract farming, the corporate integrator that establishes the contract that sets the conditions for production, is absent.
farmer is accountable to the community in which he/she farms and lives; agribusiness firms are not. Thus, agribusiness firms need to be governed by stringent regulations designed to protect rural locales.

Many of the group’s concerns about the farmers’ loss of autonomy in contractual arrangements with integrators have been noted in Watts’ (1994) study of contract farming. Watts (1994: 28) reports that

Contact production presupposes some form of regulation, control, and fashioning of the labor process by the contractor, relations that are practically and ideological central to the production system. . . . It represents quite distinctive, if locally varied, social relations of production in which independent commodity producers are subordinated to ‘management’ through a distinctive labor process.

To alert farmers to the potential pitfalls inherent in contract farming, CFA has reprinted a “Livestock Production Contract Checklist,” prepared by the Office of the Attorney General of Iowa, for farmers considering signing contracts with corporate integrators. The checklist identifies questions that farmers should ask prior to signing contracts.

Additionally, the scale of the family farm referenced by CFA refers to a size, in acreage, that is manageable by a family and primarily workable by family-supplied labor. CFA’s assumptions about the linkages between farmers’ autonomy and management and labor were confirmed by Goldschmidt’s study of two California rural locales in 1940 and 1941. His study found

. . . better conditions in the community associated with farms where the majority were owner-operated and labor was primarily family-based compared to the community surrounded by industrialized farms in which ownership, management, and labor were largely divorced from each other (Thu and Durrenberger 1998: 2).

Goldschmidt’s study has been replicated in different locations, with similar findings, by MacCannell (1988) and Durrenberger and Thu (1996).

The family-scale posited by CFA implicitly contains notions of a more equitable distribution of land—smaller tracts of land owned by more people as opposed to fewer owners of larger tracts.65 This linkage of farm size to notions of democracy has wider-reaching implications than the preservation of the family farm. Hamilton and Ryan (1993) prophesied that eventually the goal of ‘saving the family farm’ would evolve into land reform. In CFA’s discourse, ‘land reform’ consists of more than the right of a farmer to decide his/her own crops and practices; it includes the right of a locality to determine acceptable land use.

The group’s struggles to obtain loans for farmers, health care reform, regulation of industrial farming, and passage of the tobacco settlement act, reinforced CFA’s early understanding that it had to integrate issues at hand with “a larger strategy for power” (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 135). Although the group’s founders assumed “racial and gender solidarity, the responsibility of government to correct the abuses of corporate interests, and a healthy irreverence toward ‘the powers that be’,” founders quickly found that members had diverse experiences (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 135). So early leaders decided to avoid the

65 Sessions (1997) also argues this point.
constant mobilization of issue campaigns in favor of a more reflexive approach that focused upon three goals:

(1) recognition of the immediate situations, experiences, and self-interests of the members as the starting point of building power; (2) a process to help members see how their immediate interests and values are threatened by major institutions and historical forces; and (3) a step-by-step organizing plan by which members learn to analyze and change institutions, thereby learning to make history (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 135).

The group took its examples of rural community organization from Appalachian groups, such as Save Our Cumberland Mountains and KFTC, which had developed leadership programs to nurture new leaders and help them develop the skills necessary to locate the linkages between local concerns and broader policy issues (Hamilton and Ryan 1993). CFA also adopted KFTC’s chapter organization.

CFA quickly followed up its first success in establishing a credit hotline to help Kentucky farmers retain their land during the farm crisis with a successful campaign, waged with the National Family Farm Coalition, that won passage of the Agricultural Credit Adjustment Act that gave borrower’s rights to thousands of farmers facing foreclosure. As early as 1987, CFA mobilized central Kentucky farmers to refrain from signing contracts with Seaboard Farms. In 1989, the group spearheaded a statewide campaign against passage of GATT.

Like KFTC, CFA also seeks to build up its membership numbers. To avoid the pitfalls associated with recruitment resulting from “hot” issues, such as member loss when the issue is resolved, CFA selects sites for organizing on the basis of their political geography. Originally, the group sent in a staff organizer, assisted by members, to ascertain the organizing potential of counties in key state or federal legislative districts. This organizing approach is staff-intensive. For its first few years, the group’s leaders also operated as staff but by 1989, the group had new staff and organizers had come to view themselves as professionals (Hamilton and Ryan 1993). CFA leaders meet at weekend retreats once or twice a year to share experiences, organize sessions for new avenues of rural organizing, and build relationships with each other. In 1988, the board initiated a long-term planning process, charting a chapter development strategy (Hamilton and Ryan 1993). The group’s agenda for the upcoming year is hammered out at the annual meeting.

Like KFTC, CFA provides leadership training through frequent seminars. Many members see leadership opportunities as a form of personal growth.

The organization has become a sort of adult university for these leaders. They are enticed and rewarded by the prospect of shaping the world to be more just and more democratic as well (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 141).

66 CFA brochure, undated.
67 Ibid.
68 Ibid.
CFA also works frequently with other groups, is a member of the Southern Empowerment Project and founded the Kentucky Leadership for Agricultural and Environmental Sustainability group.

Currently, the group, which has headquarters in Frankfort, has 1600 members and chapters in Fleming, Bath, Mercer, Casey, Harrison, Henry, Allen and Jackson Counties. Figure 2.3, prepared from information on the group’s web site, indicates the spatial distribution of CFA members.

**CFA PRESENCE IN KENTUCKY**

![CFA Presence in Kentucky Map](Map)  

Figure 2.3. CFA presence in Kentucky. (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath.)

Dues constitute roughly 20 percent of the group’s annual budget. A family membership is $25, individual membership $20 and student membership $10. Although the group has a small endowment, roughly 80 percent of its annual budget in 2001 came from grant money from a number of religious groups and private foundations. According to the group’s Executive Director Deborah Webb, CFA’s funding sources are “very similar to KFTC but they’ll get some environmental money we don’t get and we’ll get some farm money they don’t get.”

69 Though the years, CFA has worked with KFTC, the Democracy Resource Center, Kentucky Youth Advocates, Appalshop, the Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment, KFB, US Soil Conservation Service, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), University of Kentucky, University of Georgia, University of Arkansas, the Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Stations, US Geological Survey, and the Southern Sustainable Agriculture Working Group which CFA co-founded. The group has also worked with the national Family Farm Coalition and numerous church groups.


71 According to Webb, the percentage of the budget from members’ dues ranges from 18 to 25%.


73 From Webb and newspapers to the present, the groups that CFA has received funding include: the Appalachian Community Fund, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Catholic Campaign for Human Development, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, Educational Foundation of America, FarmAid, Ford Foundation, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Kellogg Foundation, Kentucky Council of Churches, Kentucky Department of Agriculture, Kentucky Leadership for Agriculture and Environmental Sustainability, New World Foundation, Jessie Smith Noyes, Oxfam America, Southern Partners Fund, and the Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock.

74 Interview, 22 June 2001, Frankfort.
In order to raise staff salaries, which account for 75 percent of CFA’s budget, the group is trying to increase the $350,000 it raised from grants and $80,000 from grassroots fundraisers and dues this past year. Like KFTC, CFA raises funds year round through film festivals, readings and book signings by Wendell Berry, Kentucky’s well-known proponent of family farms, readings and book signings by Kentucky author Ed MacClanahan, chapter fundraisers, sales of CFA T-shirts and hats, and through donations of items for auction, and office supplies and equipment.

Like KFTC, CFA generally avoids litigation but on occasion finds that a lawsuit is necessary. For example, CFA and fellow members of the Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment sued the National Pork Producers Council (NPPC) which sought the release of more than 19,000 signature on petitions distributed nationally that called to end the mandatory pork check-off tax. “CFA and the Campaign have taken a position against the release in recognition of the potential harassment and retaliation the petitioners could suffer if NPPC is able to access the database.” The suit was successful. In 1997, CFA and the Sierra Club filed a lawsuit challenging USDA’s decision to fund a $7.1 million water treatment facility for Cagle’s, Inc. At the press conference announcing the suit, a CFA member explained, “Public money needs to benefit the public. We need investment in Kentucky’s people and small businesses, not corporate welfare.”

The group is currently altering its organizing approach. Although the primary impetus for the reorganization is the method that the state selected to disburse tobacco settlement money, the reorganization will also address some drawbacks that the group has found in chapter-type organization. In Kentucky, the tobacco settlement money will be distributed by a 15-member agricultural board consisting of the governor, commissioner of agriculture, secretary to the Cabinet of Economic Development, director of the Cooperative Extension Service, seven active farmers, one representative from both the Farm Bureau and Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, an attorney familiar with agriculture policy, and one agricultural lender.

Because nine-member agricultural development councils, composed of eight farmers and the county Extension agent, will devise plans and programs for each county receiving tobacco settlement funds, CFA is changing its focus from chapter development to developing membership in tobacco-dependent counties, mainly in central Kentucky. Webb would like to have a strong CFA presence in the top 40 tobacco dependent counties, and have three CFA members or farmers who subscribe to the group’s agenda on each of the development councils.

CFA sees the settlement money distribution plan as an ideal opportunity to implement its mission of family-scale sustainable agriculture and to overhaul the group’s organization. The group hopes that the settlement funds, properly allocated to sustainable tobacco alternatives, will

78 CFA News, October 1999. The pork check-off is part of a USDA Market Promotion Program which uses export promotion money raised from tax revenues to fund advertising for agricultural products.
80 CFA News, October/November 1997, p.7. The lawsuit has not been resolved.
82 Kentucky will receive $184 million over the next two years and $1.7 billion over 25 years (CFA News, May 2000, p.1).
83 A table of the top 40 tobacco-dependent counties and the amounts they will receive from the tobacco settlement in FY 2001 and 2002 is included in the Appendix.
allow small farmers to hold onto their farms. According to the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center (2001), Kentucky lost 1,000 farms between 1999 and 2000. Currently, the state ranks fourth in the nation in numbers of small farms, with 90,000.

As tobacco declines, it is expected that many more of the small farms that generate marginal sales will also go on the auction block. Of the 90,000 farms in Kentucky, 51,000 had annual sales under $10,000, while 33,000 had sales between $10,000-$99,000 and 6,000 had sales of $100,000 or more (Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center 2001: 11).85

Reorganization will also be helpful because chapters are expensive to organize and there is no guarantee of success.86 Additionally, under CFA’s organizational rules, chapters (which must have a minimum of 30 members) have to meet once a month, which is difficult for many farmers who are working increasingly long days.87 In addition to reorganization, recruiting efforts in the top 40 tobacco-dependent counties, and working to ensure that CFA’s vision of community-based sustainable agriculture is represented in development plans, the group is also working to ensure that industrial farms, both hogs and poultry, are stringently regulated at the state level.

**Hearing comments**

Many other activist groups and people who did not indicate group membership joined KFTC’s and CFA’s call for stringent regulation of industrial hog farms. Although, as indicated previously in Table 1.3, more females than males favored strengthening the regulations, Table 2.1 indicates that a larger percentage of women at the hearings questioned the process that the Cabinet used to develop the regulations, and argued for more opportunities for public participation in the siting process.88

---

85 Given costs associated with taxes, insurance, fuel, electricity and equipment, farmers with marginal sales rates must also have off-farm income.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 Because I maintain that gender is performative and is constantly changing in relation to other subject positions, I use gender as a category with great hesitation only to indicate a broad area of difference and cannot address gender differences in opinions about regulation with any specificity. In subsequent chapters, however, I will discuss distinctly gendered aspects of the debate.
**Process**

Table 2.1. Gender breakdown of activist concerns about process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number, percent of total participants</td>
<td>Number, percent of total participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau has too much influence</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify public of permit renewals</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstate filing fees and 180-day permitting process</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many participants attributed the Cabinet’s changes in drafts of the regulations to the influence of the Kentucky Farm Bureau and commodity groups that argued for weaker regulations.\(^{89}\) Attorney, farmer and Farm Bureau member Ronald K. Bruce disagreed with the Farm Bureau’s arguments to weaken the regulations.

> It is incomprehensible for anyone to object to requiring a hog production having thousands of hogs and thousands of gallons of waste to be at least 1,500 feet from an adjacent landowner. Actually, the distance should be measured in miles.\(^{90}\)

A letter, signed by 97 men and women, submitted at the Hopkinsville hearing,\(^{91}\) complained about the Farm Bureau’s ties to commodity groups and the University of Kentucky:

> The citizens disagree with the position of the Kentucky Farm Bureau, the Kentucky Pork Producers, and the UK College of Agriculture because they are fighting to keep family hog farms in Kentucky. In states where mega hog farms reside the family farms have gone out of the swine business. The Cabinet should please keep the current regulation [the emergency regulation] in place.

As indicated by the following comment,\(^{92}\) some participants argued that the Cabinet privileged KFB:

> Apparently the only people the Cabinet considers to be credible are spokespersons like the Farm Bureau Insurance Company. The changes [reducing the time to process an application, reducing liner thickness from 18 to 12 inches, eliminating fees] were not what the citizens in Allen County and other environmental groups wanted.

---

89 These changes will be discussed in the chapter that analyzes the role of the Cabinet in the debate.
90 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 87.
91 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p.3.
To compensate for what they saw as KFB’s undue influence, activists pressed for increased public participation in the siting of industrial hog farms. CFA member Judy Herald argued for timely notification:

The permit must be publicly noticed and not allowed unless the applicant demonstrates that the regulations have been met and will continue to be met. The community in which these operations plan to locate should be notified before construction begins.

A man, who did not indicate group affiliation, pressed for the inclusion of site-specific information in the public notification:

Public notice information that is to be printed in the newspaper should include the immediate downstream watershed, creek, lake, or river that applied waste or spills could ultimately reach. Local watershed groups involved in monitoring programs will want to know the location of major hog operators. The printed public notice should give the planned method of swine waste disposal and the number and capacity of constructed lagoons or other waste-handling method, if by variance.

Then-CFA president Martin Richards argued for a longer comment period and the public’s right to demand a hearing on an application:

The public is entitled to a comment period to the agency during permit reviews, rather than being required to send comments to the applicant. A ten-day period for public comments on permit decisions, as provided for in the emergency regulations is not enough. A more reasonable time period would be thirty days.

Although CFA applauds the requirement of notifying adjacent property owners, those owners should be allowed to request an adjudicative hearing on the proposed determination prior to the issuance of a permit, or in the alternative there should be a clear right of appeals to any final permitting decision. Additionally, CFA believes that public notice at the time of submission of any application for a permit, a public review and comment period and an opportunity for an informal public hearing, should precede any written decision on permitting a facility.

A member of the state Attorney General’s staff made a similar argument:

Because of the controversial nature of large-scale livestock operations and legitimate concerns of neighbors about off-site impacts, it is imperative that the public be notified of and given an adequate opportunity to comment to the

---

93 Ibid., p. 36.
94 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 37.
95 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 58.
96 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 54.
Cabinet on applications for permits and draft permit decisions to operate these facilities.

The director of the Kentucky Resources Council\(^97\) argued that the public should also be notified of any change in ownership or control.

Saying that Cabinet employees needed sufficient time to process applications, activists insisted that the Cabinet keep the 180-day review period for applications that had been stipulated in the emergency regulations rather than the 90 days in the proposed regulations. Activists maintained that the complexity of issues raised by CAFOs necessitated the original 180-day review period. The issues they raised included environmental concerns, technical criteria, enforcement procedures, and social and health impacts. The longer review period would be necessary to conduct the review that would be required if activists’ recommendations were incorporated into the regulations.

**Environmental concerns**

As indicated in Table 2.2, a larger percentage of women participants expressed environmental concerns than did men. Broadly, activists raised four areas of concern related to: surface water degradation, volatization of gases, nutrient loading, and complexity of environmental systems.\(^98\)

Table 2.2. Environmental concerns broken down by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number, percent of total participants</td>
<td>Number, percent of total participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water degradation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatization of gases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient loading</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of natural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Less than 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activists feared that surface degradation would adversely affect recreation activities and drinking water supplies. A female member of the Kentucky Waterways Alliance,\(^99\) worried about the cumulative effect of numerous CAFOs within a watershed or river basin. She urged Cabinet officials to

> [a]dd specific language that will enable a water quality review (surface and groundwater) of proposed new facilities on a watershed basis and on a major river basin to avoid a ‘micro’ approach to permits. Any facility has the ability and predisposition to cause serious degradation of the quality of Kentucky’s waters. Under the Clean Water Act, such degradation must not be allowed to take place.

---

\(^97\) Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 38.

\(^98\) Activists were equally worried about the potential for groundwater contamination. They expressed these fears in terms of requests for geotechnical investigations and increased monitoring, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

\(^99\) Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 27.
place. All waters of the Commonwealth must be restored or maintained as fishable, drinkable, and swimmable, and all existing water quality issues of our waters must be maintained. The Cabinet should specifically address how the proposed swine regulations will meet Kentucky’s obligations to comply with and meet the Clean Water Act’s goals. Each permit application should be required to contain an analysis of all water qualifications and all current existing uses of all waters in the impacted watershed and contain specific assurances as to the applicant’s ability to prevent degradation and maintain existing areas.

Two men, one a member of CFA,\textsuperscript{100} reminded the Cabinet, “Clean water is not a luxury; it is our right.” Many argued that the quality of surface and groundwater were as threatened by volatizing gases as by direct discharges. For example, Liz Natter\textsuperscript{101} of the Democracy Resource Center (which works with both KFTC and CFA through joint membership in KEJA, the Kentucky Environmental Justice Alliance), charged that the Cabinet had underestimated the effects of volatization of gases produced by CAFOS:

Between 75-90 percent of the nitrogen treated in anaerobic lagoons and land applied volatizes. A substantial percentage is then redeposited in the area where the facility is located. A North Carolina report showed that 67 percent of hog animal waste nitrogen is volatized as ammonia, and 85 percent is redeposited within 60 miles of its source. This indicates that waterways, lakes and ponds in regions affected by intensive corporate hog farming are likely to suffer greatly from eutrophication\textsuperscript{102} and fish kills. These emissions also have a negative effect on native plant species and wildlife habitat. This particular technology of large-scale confined feeding operation with anaerobic lagoons and land application, should not be encouraged with favorable regulations, since it is subject to much greater nitrogen emissions than composing of manure from shallow or deep bedded hog facilities.

Concerns about volatization of gases are directly related to the activists’ third major environmental consideration: nutrient loading of fields where hog waste is applied. Their concern is not only for the soil on the fields themselves but that nutrients in the soil will reach ground and surface water, as this comment by a man\textsuperscript{103} who did not specify group membership indicates:

Fields where land application occurs year after year cannot be allowed to have direct discharge runnels that receive spray manure application and collect

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{101} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{102} Eutrophication is the process through which, as a result of the addition of nutrients, lakes and ponds slowly evolve into marshes and gradually disappear. This process can be speeded up when lakes and ponds receive increased amounts of nutrients, such as nitrogen and other agricultural or industrial byproducts. Ironically, I would not have thought it necessary to include a definition, however, I noted that a Cabinet employee had clearly had to look up the word, which had appeared in a letter to the Cabinet. The employee had written a definition at the bottom of letter.
\textsuperscript{103} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 31.
stormwater runoff from large areas of the field. The sure result will be nutrient loading after each application to the nearest surface water.

Many of the activists’ comments indicated concern that the regulations failed to address the complexities of Kentucky’s karst hydrogeology, the potential for spread of contaminants across the media of air, surface and ground water, and soil, and the permeabilities between media. They were particularly alarmed that the regulations failed to account for the fate\(^{104}\) of each potential contaminant in a given media or of cumulative buildups. The director of the Kentucky Resources Council\(^{105}\) advised the Cabinet to:

\[
\ldots\text{develop an explicit provision controlling the cumulative loading of pollutants onto land and into waters of each watershed. The Cabinet should also allow denial of a permit or denial of a proposed approach to land application or disposal of wastes and wastewaters where the agency finds that the addition of a new or expanded operation, reviewed against the baseline loading of nutrients onto lands and into surface and groundwater that is already occurring within a watershed, would exceed the carrying capacity of the soil and watershed. The impacts of the receiving stream and downstream waters should be evaluated to assure that the addition of pollutants from any proposed operation will not violate water quality standards or adversely affect water quality or uses.}
\]

Both the activists and KFB were constrained in that they had to respond to the regulations as written. Thus, members of both groups were governed by the regulations in that they had to formulate their comments to address specific provisions in the regulations, and address them in terms that Cabinet employees would understand and find credible. So, although it is possible that most activists, like the authors of the regulations, thought in terms of technological control of contamination, activists inclined to take another argument had to speak in the discourse of technologies of control to be taken seriously by the Cabinet.

**Technical criteria**

Again, Table 2.3 indicates, across all categories, of the total number of participants, a larger percentage of women than men, argued for more control over the release of contaminants. These concerns were expressed in ten common recommendations that the Cabinet develop more stringent technical criteria.

---

104 Fate is defined as “the disposition of a material in various environmental compartments (e.g., soil or sediment, water, air, biota) as a result of transport, transformation, and degradation (Rand and Petrocelli 1985: 653).

105 Cadiz hearing transcript, p.20.
Table 2.3. Technical recommendations by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL CRITERIA</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and percent of participants</td>
<td>Number and percent of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase setbacks</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require geotechnical investigation</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make property line point of compliance</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate groundwater monitoring</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update nutrient management plans annually</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient plans should include other minerals</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen land application requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require aerobic lagoons</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stringent lagoon criteria</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require best available technology</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demand for increased setbacks was the most common recommendation made by both genders. A member of the state Attorney General’s office\textsuperscript{106} told the Cabinet to reconsider the proposed setbacks:

Studies indicate that plumes of these odors may be transported without significant dispersion for 750-1500 feet and that they are significantly offensive at measurements in the parts per billion. The separation distance between a lagoon and dwelling is 1500 feet under the emergency regulations and 750 feet for a land spraying operation which, with the lagoon, is another significant source of odor.

Natter\textsuperscript{107} argued that the proposed setbacks would expose neighbors to [p]athogens such as bacteria, viruses, and parasites in hog waste via ingestion and contact with surface water contaminated by runoff of waste applied to land, emergency discharges from overflowing lagoons during wet weather, and catastrophic lagoon failures; [and] ingestion and contract with groundwater contaminated by seepage from manure storage areas, pits and lagoons, as well as land application, and wind and air borne pathogens from land application, and disease vectors, particularly flies carrying disease organisms. . . There is nothing in the regulations to require even monitoring of the wastes for disease organisms, so neighbors and downstream drinking water plants will not even know the potential risks.

\textsuperscript{106} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 68.  
\textsuperscript{107} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, pp. 69-70.
In a letter to the Cabinet, Alice and Herbert Myers (1997) wrote to support larger setbacks.

Our drinking water comes from surface water in the Little Crofton Lake. This past year many residents could not stand the terrible taste of the water. We worry that unregulated swine operations could further damage our water supply. The hog industry has a terrible record in many states.

To account for hydrogeological particularities, many activists were equally adamant that the Cabinet require geotechnical investigations of each potential site before evaluating applications. This argument made by the director of the Kentucky Waterways Alliance,108 is typical of activist comments:

The Division [of Water, a Cabinet department] will not have all the information it needs to determine the suitability of a site and the design criteria of the structure, without site-specific geotechnical data, sufficient geological or hydrological data, soil type, permeability, or groundwater flow information. How can the Division make the determination of the site suitability and the permit structure design criteria without this information? The situation endangers the waters of the Commonwealth and puts undue liability risk on the individuals seeking permits.

Activists were also insistent that the point at which compliance with water standards should be met was at the facility (e.g., the farrowing house, lagoon) rather than at the property line of the CAFO. CFA member Jesse Steenbergen,109 who woke one day to find that a hog farm had purchased the former horse farm next to his house, asserted:

At no time should an operation be able to contaminate to the property line because the property line crossing will not purify the water.

Worries about the potential for groundwater contamination were exacerbated by what activists deemed inadequate provisions for groundwater monitoring. If monitoring is not sufficient, contamination would not be discovered in a timely manner, putting neighbors at risk, activists said. They maintained that testing for more elements than planned was necessary, as was baseline testing, more frequent testing, and retention of test results for a longer period than the Cabinet stipulated. Craig S. Vollant of SPECTRUM Technologies110 argued for baseline testing six months prior to the operation’s beginning and for monitoring wells to be placed downgradient of waste application fields and lagoons. A KFTC member111 charged that the proposed monitoring requirements did not adequately protect public health:

108 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 32.
109 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 113.
110 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 91.
111 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 74.
[b]ecause of the limited range of the monitoring requirements. Groundwater monitoring of once every five years is far too infrequent. The contaminants to be monitored (nitrates and chlorides) are also too limited.

To his argument for more frequent testing, the director of the Kentucky Resources Council\textsuperscript{112} also asserted the necessity of analyzing zinc, copper, chlorides, nitrate, nitrogen, and phosphorous in groundwater. Another activist\textsuperscript{113} argued for testing for disease-bearing microbes.

Activists had a similar critique of the nutrient requirements. Nutrient management plans should be updated annually and, like groundwater, the Cabinet should require testing for more nutrients than planned, they said. The director of Kentucky Resources Council\textsuperscript{114} asserted that plans should be prepared by qualified personnel. Similarly, activists saw deficiencies in the criteria for waste lagoons. The Cabinet failed to provide an adequate distance from the liner base to the seasonal high water table,\textsuperscript{115} should have prohibited location “near parks, recreation areas, wildlife management areas; residences, or within the 100-year floodplain or flood fringe, and within affecting wetlands,”\textsuperscript{116} required covers on lagoons to reduce odors\textsuperscript{117} and berms to prevent waste from escaping,\textsuperscript{118} and should have required a synthetic liner and established a maximum depth of lagoons because the deeper the lagoon, the more likelihood that waste would seep through the soil liner.\textsuperscript{119} Activists also criticized failure to attend to regional and site-specific issues. Natter\textsuperscript{120} argued:

The threat of lagoons leaking or failing must be taken seriously. Lagoons should not be permitted where subsidence is threatened due to mining activity. Dams smaller than those required to be permitted should also be checked for structural integrity, both in design and through inspection as they are operated.

Even with synthetic liners, lagoons must not be allowed to be located in the saturated zone. They should not be permitted in regions with karst topography unless groundwater flow is fully characterized and a monitoring system is in place.

Although the regulations afforded some protection to active karst areas,\textsuperscript{121} a member\textsuperscript{122} of the state Attorney General’s office insisted that underground lagoons should be prohibited in karst areas. A report on Western Kentucky’s geology, prepared by Nicholas C. Crawford, Ph.D. (1998: 1), a geographer at Western Kentucky University, cited a sinkhole collapse under a hog waste lagoon in Warren County where, “in less than five hours, 2.5 million gallons of hog waste flowed into the karst aquifer. . . Hog waste lagoons do not have to experience catastrophic

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{112} Ibid.
\bibitem{113} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 74.
\bibitem{114} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 84.
\bibitem{115} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 48.
\bibitem{116} Ibid.
\bibitem{117} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 63.
\bibitem{118} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 61.
\bibitem{119} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 65.
\bibitem{120} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 67.
\bibitem{121} Karst topography is defined as “Distinctive topography formed in a region of chemically weathered limestone with poorly developed surface drainage and solution features that appear pitted and bumpy” (Christopherson 2000: A 20).
\bibitem{122} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 62.
\end{thebibliography}
sinkhole collapses to contaminate karst aquifers. Leaking can result in contamination. . . ” (Crawford 1998: 1). He charged that the regulations should require synthetic liners of hog waste lagoons in karst areas, hydrogeologic tests to identify receiving springs and periodic testing of springs.

Figures 2.4 and 2.5 indicate areas with potential for karstic development and groundwater sensitivity regions, respectively. A comparison with the map of existing CAFOs in Chapter One indicates that many CAFOs are located near areas prone to karst development. Synthetic liners would reduce the likelihood of contaminants leaching from the lagoon into groundwater, however, because land in karst regions is prone to subsidence, the construction of football-field-sized lagoons in such areas is problematic because of their weight upon an underlying geology prone to collapse.

![Figure 2.4. Areas with potential for karstic development based on material in Horwath et al. (1998). (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath.)](image)

Figure 2.4. Areas with potential for karstic development\textsuperscript{123} based on material in Horwath et al. (1998). (Map prepared by Richard Gilbreath.)

Figure 2.5, a map of groundwater sensitivity regions in the state, compared to Figure 2.4, indicates that karst regions are also areas of groundwater sensitivity. Groundwater sensitivity regions are defined as areas within which a contaminant can enter and move easily and quickly. The ease of transport across large areas is the basis of activists’ concerns about the construction of hog CAFOs in groundwater sensitivity regions.

\textsuperscript{123} According to librarians at the University of Kentucky’s Mining and Mineral Research Institute and Transportation Center, the state’s karst system has not been mapped.
Other participants expressed concern about siting lagoons in earthquake-prone areas.\textsuperscript{124} Dan and Barbara Weatherspoon and Donald Bishop\textsuperscript{125} argued that Western Kentucky’s position, “centered on top of the New Madrid Fault,” made lagoons “with millions of gallons of untreated waste” a potential disaster in the case of an earthquake. Some parts of western Kentucky have been in the epicenter of earthquakes that registered more than 3.0 on the Richter scale. Participants fear that even less severe earthquakes could release millions of gallons of hog waste into surface and groundwaters. Comparison of Figure 2.6, the location of the New Madrid seismic zone in western Kentucky, with Figures 2.4 and 2.5 indicates that the earthquake zone exists in areas also prone to karst development and in groundwater sensitivity regions.

\textsuperscript{124} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{125} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 63.
Activists were equally adamant that the proposed setbacks were insufficient to protect neighbors from odors, exposures to disease, and property devaluation. An attorney, farmer and member of KFB, could not understand KFB’s attempts to reduce the setbacks that activists found lacking. Natter argued that the setbacks from public water supplies had to be increased because “Kentucky has many small, under funded drinking water plants that lack the capacity to detect and treat disease organisms like crypto sporidium that can be present in hog waste.” A member of the Coalition for Health Concern maintained that inadequate setbacks would “produce a nightmare of legal actions by damaged neighbors.” The Executive Director of the American Cave Conservation Association, Inc., asserted:

The proposed setback of 75 feet from a karst feature for injections is woefully inadequate. Land use applications such as this can open up new subsurface conduits, which were not evident prior to the activity. The addition of liquid wastes to a karst region can easily lead to the development of new sinkholes and drainage flow routes.

126 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 87.
127 Bowling Green public hearing transcript, p. 92.
128 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 52.
129 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 92.
Such alterations in karst hydrogeology could redirect contaminated water into areas thought to be protected.

Activists argued that the Cabinet should require hog CAFOs to require best available technologies, such as “aerated storage tanks and lagoons, oxidation ditches, or other systems to contain manure in an aerobic condition,” and dry waste management systems. They maintained that soils should be tested annually for heavy metals associated with feed additives and that soil, water, sludges and wastewaters be tested annually and testing should include antibiotics, roundworms and viruses. The Chairperson of the state’s Environmental Quality Commission urged the Cabinet to develop a definition for saturated soils and add potassium, pesticides and bacteria to the testing list. The director of Kentucky Resources Council told the Cabinet to reinsert its original provision that land application plans monitor soil pH:

The assumption that normal agricultural practices (i.e. liming) will maintain proper pH presupposes that the land application is for legitimate agronomic purposes. For industrial scale operations, the land application is primarily for cheap waste disposal and agronomic purposes are nominal rather than genuine.

In other words, the altered agricultural practices of CAFOs render suspect the assumption that good stewardship of soil is in the farmers’ interests. Activists also argued for changes in the Cabinet’s plans to enforce the regulations.

**Enforcement**

The activist group was also skeptical about the Cabinet’s ability to enforce the regulations as written. Again, as shown in Table 2.4, among total number of participants, a larger percentage of women than men argued for sterner enforcement, calling for: maintenance of joint liability, bonds for closure and spills, liability insurance, consideration of permit applicants’ records of compliance, and ensuring that state officials had the right to enter property for corrective actions.

---

130 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 61.
131 Ibid.
132 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 105.
133 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 104.
135 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 64.
Table 2.4. Enforcement concerns broken down by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain joint liability</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require bonds for closure</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require bonds for spills</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require liability insurance</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t permit a company with an outstanding violation</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include right to re-enter for corrective action in leases</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the activists saw the provision that the corporate integrator and hog farmer be held jointly liable for pollution resulting from the operation as crucial. As indicated by the following comments, they saw joint liability as a social justice issue.

Those who control and profit from operations should be responsible for environmental compliance and liabilities. The Cabinet should hold the corporate integrator responsible for environmental compliance by requiring it to be co-applicant and co-permittee.\(^\text{136}\)

A man who did not identify himself with a group\(^\text{137}\) argued that the joint liability provision recognized the power relations inherent in the farmer-integrator contract:

The integrators that stand to profit from hog production should share the responsibility for protecting the environment. Integrators should not be allowed to offload their environmental risks onto contract farmers, especially since these same companies are dictating aspects of the hog raising operations to the farmer contractor.

Arguments for requiring bonds for closure and spills and/or requiring permit holders to obtain sufficient liability insurance to cover the costs of cleanup expressed similar recognition of the contractual power relations. Comments often stressed the fear that the public would be responsible for cleanup costs and/or that the state would not have sufficient funds to perform adequate remediation. A KFTC member\(^\text{138}\) argued:

There should be bonding insurance for large operations. The corporate owner, not the taxpayers, should bear responsibility for paying for cleanup or closure of these operations.

\(^{136}\) Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 41.
\(^{137}\) Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 30.
\(^{138}\) Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 17.
A bonding plan needs to be developed so that as farm operations close in the future, there will be some assurance that the cleanup will be adequate.

Then-CFA president Lynn Chaney stressed the group’s position that the Cabinet develop stringent closure standards:

Facilities should be required to post bonds to cover potential environmental damage and there needs to be stringent closure standards. Financial assistance is needed so that some funds will be set aside to assure proper closure of the facility and cleanup of any spill or release. Permits should not be approved for a confined hog facility without the posting of financial assurance that will cover the cost of the government contracting for a third party to do necessary remediation. If a bond lapses then the regulations should require that the operation cease within 30 days of a lapse. Self-insurance based on the alleged net worth of the facility should not be allowed.

A member of the Coalition for Health Concern, which supported the KFTC and CFA position, argued for a definition of closure.

The regulation should make clear that closure means removal of all waste material and deconstruction of all lagoons and facilities and returning the site to its original character, and not allow retaining of . . . buildings and other facilities for beneficial use. This would invite abuse, allowing companies to claim their lagoons are beneficial for waterfowl, for example, and forgo true closure activities and costs.

A Sierra Club member directed the Cabinet to other states’ requirements of bonding and operator certification:


Activists were equally adamant that the Cabinet perform background checks on applicants and deny permits to corporations with outstanding violations. A member of the Coalition for Health Concern asserted:

Any corporation that is out of compliance in other states should be refused a permit in Kentucky. A thorough search of the corporate layers and tentacles

140 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 88.
141 This definition was not accepted by the Cabinet.
142 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, pp. 33-34.
143 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 132.
should be made by the Attorney General. There are too many hog corporations
taking bankruptcy and fleeing from contaminated sites.

Many stressed the industrial nature of hog CAFOs. A CFA member\textsuperscript{144} argued that

\[\text{n}o \text{ operation that is judged as industrial should be issued a permit unless all}
unresolved violations are in compliance. No operation that is judged as industrial
should be issued a permit if it shows a tendency to follow in the pattern of
continued violations.\]

Patty Wilson and Karol Welch, magistrate of Hopkins County,\textsuperscript{145} argued for the Cabinet
to recognize, as does KFTC and CFA, that

\[\text{l}arge \text{ swine operators are not farmers; they are industrial factories. They should}
have to post a surety bond. Mining operations in Kentucky are required to post
bond, why not the factory hog operators?\]

Activists made a number of recommendations: cover “the cost of implementing the two
programs of background check for applicants and closure funds” through reinstatement of the
original $155 fee to submit permit applications,\textsuperscript{146} and prevent limited liability companies\textsuperscript{147}
from applying for permits.\textsuperscript{148} Reflecting concern that the regulations would not prevent pollution,
many of the activists maintained that the Cabinet should require that any leases related to
permitted CAFOs contain a clause allowing Cabinet employees and remediation personnel to re-
enter the property after lease expiration to oversee closure and/or perform cleanup.\textsuperscript{149}

**Social impacts**

The strongest language used by activists was found in comments that expressed social
and public health concerns. Social concerns primarily related to the effect of odors emanating
from hog CAFOs on tourism, residences, family farms, and property values. Again, as shown in
Table 2.5, a larger percentage of women than men raised social concerns.

\textsuperscript{144} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{145} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{146} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{147} Agricultural operations in Kentucky are classified as limited liability corporations under the state’s Agricultural
Exemption Act.
\textsuperscript{148} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{149} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 85.
Table 2.5. Social concerns by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL CONCERNS</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFO’s negative effect on tourism</td>
<td>65 12.9%</td>
<td>61 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit nuisance odors</td>
<td>155 30.0%</td>
<td>182 16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect family farm</td>
<td>89 17.6%</td>
<td>120 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased property values</td>
<td>70 6.2%</td>
<td>70 6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A letter signed by 125 people, who did not indicate group membership, equated dependence on out-of-state corporations with loss of tourist revenues, decreased property values, and loss of farms, leading to sharecropping:

Without stringent regulations, small farmers will be forced out of business, lakes and water will be polluted, property sales will drop, and Kentucky tourism will decline. All of this for the benefits of the narrow self-interest of out-of-state corporate swine operations. Corporate control will transform the independent small farmers into sharecroppers.

Fears about odors were among the most common expressed. A female CFA member described what happened at her house when a hog farm moved next door:

The air is so bad at our house, which is less than 1,000 feet to an open lagoon, it burns the nose and makes the residents sick to the stomach. This odor has gotten into the house, and nothing gets rid of it. What does this do to the health of those living there? Who would want to buy the home?

The director of Kentucky Resources Council called the Cabinet’s refusal to include odor control in the permit process an abrogation of responsibility:

The Cabinet indicated that “The Cabinet currently enforces an odor standard through the Division of Air Quality” yet the agency later admitted that no permit would likely be requested to control such odors. The Cabinet is well aware of the inadequacies of the current odor standard, and [of] the lack of prompt enforcement response by DAQ to odor complaints because of workload for permitted facilities.

The regulation should include a prohibition on nuisance odors. The regulation fails to provide a meaningful standard or responsibility to prevent odors causing a nuisance.

The Myers (1997), whose letter was referenced previously, wrote of fears for their future:

150 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 10.
151 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 12.
152 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 23.
My husband and I live in Calloway County on a 65-acre farm and my husband teaches at MSU [Murray State University]. We chose this isolated rural area because we wanted a healthy environment. Western Kentucky doesn’t have a lot to offer except clean air, water, and beautiful natural surroundings. If these things disappear due to factory hog farmers, then we will move to another state and so will anyone else who can. MSU will suffer because not many college students will be attracted to a place ruined by awful smells and polluted water. Spills from the lagoons are inevitable [she cites the experience of a friend in North Carolina].

I’m so afraid my beautiful land and house that my husband designed and built will be virtually worthless if a hog factory builds near us.

This is not progress! This is economic and environmental suicide! Please stop this from happening.

Others153 also questioned the Farm Bureau’s argument that industrial hog farming was a logical development and represented progress.

The Farm Bureau and the Pork Producers Association have told our elected officials and the general public that factory hog farms are the way of the future for agriculture in Kentucky. Family farms are not doomed in this state unless we force them out of business by adopting a regulating scheme that encourages the corporate model of vertically-integrated pork production and replaces existing family farms with the kind of capital intensive, mass production technology offered by the mega-hog producers such as Vall and Carroll Foods.

As indicated in many of the comments quoted here, those who argued for more stringent regulation, represented hog CAFOs as the outsider because their discourse focused upon the large out-of-state corporate integrators with whom local farmers farmers contract. This is not to say that activists assume that Kentucky farmers have not adopted industrial farming techniques. For example, a CFA member154 said,

Since not all ‘bad actors’ come from out of state, the state should not grant a company the privilege without taking care of current problems.

Despite the equation of CAFOs to the destruction of the family farm, KFTC and CFA members with whom I took a drive-by tour of industrial chicken and hog farms in Allen County in 1998, expressed no animosity toward family farmers who chose to adopt contract farming. Rather, when a woman who was running a farmstand we stopped at during the tour told us that she and her husband had just signed a contract with a large chicken corporation, people on the tour wished her well. Later, in the car, people expressed sympathy for the woman and other farm families who felt they had little choice.

The activists on the tour and many others who gave comments at the hearings and/or submitted correspondence, believe that both farmers and non-farmers need protection. Many fear

153 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 22.
154 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 73.
the proximity of CAFOs will decrease the values of their homes and local property. A KFTC
member\textsuperscript{155} said:

Neighbors are likely to experience a significant decrease in quality of life and
property values. Adjacent communities will face unfair burdens on roads and
water supplies meant primarily for human needs. No community should bear
these costs.

Activists see the most immediate and obvious effect on property values resulting from
odors and concomitant health concerns. A CFA member\textsuperscript{156} argued:

Odor control should be very stringent so the odor will not depreciate the lives of
those people who live hear these facilities. Odors do not stop at property lines or
boundaries. They devalue property and put peoples’ lives at risk.

**Health**

Women, again, constituted a larger percentage of those concerned about the potential
health effects of exposure to hog CAFOs. Although Table 2.6 indicates that activists expressed
corresponding to cancers, blue baby syndrome, spontaneous abortions, and non-Hodgkins
lymphoma, other activists (less than one percent of both men and women) also expressed
concern about other illnesses.

Table 2.6. Percentages of illnesses referenced by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH CONCERNS</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
<td>Number, percent of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancers</td>
<td>63 12.5%</td>
<td>61 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue baby syndrome</td>
<td>63 12.5%</td>
<td>62 5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous abortions</td>
<td>64 12.7%</td>
<td>62 5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkins lymphoma</td>
<td>63 12.5%</td>
<td>60 5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than one percent of men mentioned public health generally, as well as gastrointestinal and
respiratory illnesses, occupational hazards, and effects of odors on mood. Additionally, less than
one percent of women referred to headaches, dizziness and nausea, eyes, nose and throat
irritation, and pfiesteria.

The President of the Kentucky Medical Association\textsuperscript{157} argued for more stringent
regulation to protect human health from both hog and poultry industrial operations because
adverse effects would also impact “other aspects of the welfare of the state, including long-term
negative economic consequences.”

\textsuperscript{155} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{156} Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{157} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 37.
Natter\textsuperscript{158} warned:

Neighbors and those living downwind must be protected from health effects and devaluation of property caused by odors. Studies have documented increased respiratory problems such as cough, phlegm, chest tightness, shortness of breath, and eye, ear, nose and throat irritations in workers in confined swine operations. . . The health effects of these odors and gases is one of the concerns of citizens who live near these facilities.

A letter signed by 125 people\textsuperscript{159} warned of nitrate contamination:

Cancers, blue baby syndrome, spontaneous abortions, and non-Hodgkins’ lymphoma have been related to nitrate contamination of water.\textsuperscript{160}

In a letter to the Cabinet, Mark Hooks (1997), assistant director of the Division of Public Health Protection and Safety, advised the Cabinet to adopt restrictions on the application of swine waste to crops for human consumption because “known human pathogens [salmonella and camplyobacter] exist in swine manure.” One activist\textsuperscript{161} cited an existing illness related to exposures from hog CAFOs:

The Cabinet has failed to address odor and dust control, which is an acute health issue. One person is critically ill due to the dust and contamination from a nearby hog farm. They are suing.

Some activists had researched illnesses and cited specific academic research. Some\textsuperscript{162} referred to Schiffman et al.’s research (1998) into mood changes associated with exposure to odors from industrial hog farms and Donham’s (1998) research into occupational exposures. In a 1997 letter to the Cabinet, the director of Kentucky Resources Council cited a study published in the September 1996 issue of Epidemiology, a Wisconsin study of swine farmers, and an article on nitrate exposures in Morbidity and Mortality Weekly. A member\textsuperscript{163} of the Kentucky Coalition of Family Farms submitted a copy of a July 5, 1996 study on blue baby syndrome conducted by the federal Centers for Disease Control.

**Hearing comment analysis**

The hearing comments demonstrate that KFTC’s and CFA’s stances toward regulation were shared by an overwhelming majority of hearing participants who brought a broad array of

\textsuperscript{158} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p.67.
\textsuperscript{159} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{160} The spontaneous abortions that are correlated to exposure to sulfates in drinking water are examples of the gender-related differences in exposures to toxic substances that Warren (1997: 10) writes of: “Persistent toxic chemicals, largely because of their ability to cross the placenta, to bioaccumulate, and to occur as mixtures, pose serious health threats disproportionately to infants, mothers, and the elderly.” Buckingham-Hatfield (2000: 56-59) recounts a number of incidences of disproportionate affects of contamination upon female bodies.
\textsuperscript{161} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{162} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 39 and Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{163} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 38.
concerns about the impacts of industrial hog farming to the table. The comments of activists both challenged and reinscribed physical and categorical borders. Their representations of the mobility of contaminants through multiple media challenged the validity of property lines as a unit of analysis and posited the need to create new regulatory spaces constructed from larger components of the landscape such as river systems and watersheds. Importantly, the regulatory spaces proposed by activists undermined a tenet of capitalism, private property rights.

At the same time, by constructing arguments based upon Kentucky versus outsider control, activists reinscribed Kentucky borders. The outside integrators who offered contracts to Kentucky farmers were represented, like the pollution that was seen as a result of their ‘outside’ control, as matter out of place. Pollution was posited as an outcome of an unequal relationship between farmer and integrator. Additionally, activists’ defense of family farms over against industrial farms reinscribed the landscape of farmhouse, barn, silos, and fields or pastures depicted on CFA’s logo over large industrial buildings, lagoons of hog waste, and fields used as receptacles of waste. Activists want to preserve this landscape and concomitant social arrangements against what they see as industrial encroachment.

Although many activists who wanted to strengthen the regulations viewed industrial farming as an anathema, those who supported the regulations as proposed seemed more accepting of industrial practices if, through regulation, their existence would not threaten existing arrangements. These activists seemed comfortable with a kind of spatial détente in which ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ exist side by side in place very much like what Massey (1994: 63) calls the “succession layers” that occur when “a new form of division of labour will be overlaid on, and combined with, the pattern produced in previous periods by different forms of division of labour.”

Although there were frequent comments referring to the farming landscape as rural, none of the comments offered anything close to a definition of rurality. Instead, comments referenced aspects of rurality—small towns, local schools, family farms, and local autonomy. This confirms Jones’ (1995: 35) findings that lay discourses of the rural tend to be “spatially and conceptually complex” and rarely uttered in (academically) coherent constructions. None of the comments referred specifically to urbanity although it is possible to assume that some activists associate the lack of farmers’ and local autonomy that they attribute to industrial farms with urbanity. So, implicitly, some activists may be positing an urban/rural binary similar to Tonnies’ *gemeinschaft*/*gesellschaft* formulation.164

Activists’ comments also challenged a number of categorical spaces. Philo (2000: 9) describes such contests as “boundary-work.”

All sorts of boundary-work are involved in social struggles over which group has authority, and hence over which form of knowing is taken as legitimate, and the participants in these struggles obviously all portray themselves—and seek to persuade others to portray them—as the relevant ‘experts’ in the field.

By their challenges to the proposed regulations, activists effectively asserted their own expertise, undermining the authority of both the Cabinet’s and agricultural experts’. Additionally, by pointing to linkages between the Cabinet and agricultural experts, and agribusiness, activists called into question the knowledges that have resulted from this collaboration of ‘experts’. The activists’ challenge was intensified by their citations of the

---

164 I will discuss CFA’s constructions of rurality in the next chapter.
research of social and medical scientists that had been excluded or treated as externalities by the
Cabinet. Beck (1992) has written of the fragmentation of scientific knowledge and of the ways
in which that fragmentation has undermined its authority and legitimacy. Yet, in this debate,
many of the activists are trying to incorporate the knowledges produced by more scientific
disciplines (e.g., geology, hydrogeology, seismology), however fragmented, into the formulation
of the regulations. They are also stressing the need for a more inclusive notion of science, similar
what Harding (1991) describes as a “successor science”—a science that understands that its
practice is inherently a political project, accepts objectivity as a partial understanding, and does
not posit strict subject/object dichotomies.

The activist focus on the permeability of boundaries also contested technocratic
assumptions of control of the ‘natural’ world as well as the culture/nature and human/animal
divisions that have been a hallmark of Western thought since Linnaeus established his hierarchy
of categories (Mol 1999) and earlier (Philo 2000). The drive to control has manifested itself in
technology and politics, both of which have “worked on the assumption that the world might be
mastered, changed, controlled” (Mol 1999: 75). Many social theorists (Conley 1997, Doel 1999,
noted the reductionism, universalism, utilitarianism, and objectification of the ‘natural’ world
that underlies this assumption. In their criticisms of the Cabinet’s refusal to deal with the
particularities of hydrogeology and physical characteristics of Kentucky's geography, activists
are questioning the tenets of reductionism and universalism that guided the construction of the
regulations. In this respect KFTC and CFA are similar to other environmental justice advocates
who are also “critical of the tendency to compartmentalize and fragment ideas and knowledge of
the environment, environmental problem definition, and problem resolution” (Taylor 1997: 54-55).

Additionally, by their references to specificities of local geography activists contested a
reified notion of ‘the environment,’ and by their insistence upon human reliance upon the
‘natural’ world, they challenged what Plumwood (1993) has called the “backgrounding” of the
physical world. It is difficult, however, to determine an activist position regarding utilitarianism
and objectification.

Although some comments referred to fish and wildlife, these comments were often made
within the context of the need to protect natural resources for human uses such as tourism, and
for preservation of human life. This does not mean, however, that activists maintained strictly
anthropocentric positions. As previously mentioned, participants in the debate had to structure
their arguments in ways that would be credible to those who wrote the regulations and an
argument that challenged human supremacy would have been disregarded.

Activists’ attention to the movement of contaminants through water, air, and soil also
contested technocratic notions of control, as did their concern about karst landscapes and
potential for earthquakes. These comments represented the physical world as a site of activity—
water flows above and below ground, air moves, soil composition is altered and the altered soil
components make their way into groundwater, karst landscape formations change as water

165 I will discuss the Cabinet’s rationalities in the chapter that analyzes its discourse.
166 It is important to note that many scientists, e.g. Phillips (1990, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2001a), have rejected
the reductionist science espoused by the Cabinet and, instead, work with the notions of systems to research what
they view as complex interactions of physical systems.
167 In a subsequent chapter, I will discuss comments that attempted to incorporate the body of the hog into the
debate and indicate problems with the term ‘anthropocentric’.
erodes limestone, and earthquakes may occur. This focus on activity challenges what feminist theorists (Haraway 1991, Merchant 1992, Plumwood 1993) have described as a Western notion of the physical world as inert and thus easily controllable.

These representations of the earth as active also challenge human/animal boundaries. In activists’ representations, contaminants carried by air molecules penetrate drapes, carpets, and furniture upholstery, and human skin through nasal passages and pores. Similarly, contaminants are carried by surface and groundwater into drinking water supplies, and then into human and animal bodies and biota. And contaminants in soil are washed by rain and runoff into ground and surface water, and into drinking water supplies. The end result of these permeabilities is often human illnesses.

From genres studied, it is not possible to determine why a larger percentage of women than men called for more stringent regulation. Because, as noted in the first chapter, I am uncomfortable with ecofeminist analyses that assume women must be concerned about environmental issues, I am unwilling to assume that gender is the only subject position that might explain the gender differences in opinions about regulation. I theorize gender, like rurality, an “unstable and interactive reference point in the constitution of dynamic and contested social identities, values and alliances. . .” (Whatmore et al. 1994: 4).

There is, however, literature that indicates that gender performances are important in attitudes toward farming practices. Both Buckingham-Hatfield (2000) and Sachs (1996) report that women are more drawn to organic farming than are men. In the UK, only five percent of farmers using chemicals are women and almost 50 percent of organic farmers are women (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000). In the US, women hold key positions in the sustainable agriculture movement (Sachs 1996). The California women who Sachs (1996: 62) interviewed reported that they became involved in organic farming as a result of their concern over the toxic effects of pesticides, their desire to take care of land and preserve ecosystems, and their dissatisfaction with the organization of the food system. The respondents said they became involved with organic agriculture when it was a marginal occupation. They saw the evolution of organic agriculture into the mainstream as a mixed blessing, expressing concern that ‘large producers will squeeze out little people who are doing organic production because they believe in it’ and that ‘bigger farmers want to put their land into organic production to make a profit, but for me it is a commitment.’ These women worried that many of the social values associated with organic farming would disappear as production increased.

Sachs’ interviewees reported that they approached organic farming differently than men but did not offer an essentialist reason for these differences. Even when they referred to their roles as mother, they indicated a cultural basis for caring, and several rejected notions of feminine values (Sachs 1996). Buckingham-Hatfield (2000) notes that the gendered division of labor in the West, which delegates responsibility for food shopping, preparation, and cooking, might constitute a portion of the explanation for women’s involvement in food-safety issues.

The reasons that women organic farmers cited for their interest in sustainable agriculture could also be compelling for rural residents, male and female alike. As hearing comments indicate, both men and women expressed concern about air, water, and soil contamination and the effects of industrial farming on their localities. Peter et al. (2000) focus upon male
performances of gender as an important determinant in farming practices preferred. I am, however, troubled by the binary that they established to create Weberian ideal types of masculinity, which operates to erase other subject positions such as class, race, ethnicity, sexuality and religion. The use of an ideal type also establishes “general principles” which may not have been “present in the thought of the individuals whose concrete behaviour is nevertheless to be understood on their basis” (Foucault 1991b: 80).

The division of environmental labor into ‘grassroots’ and national and international, with women at the local level and men at the national and international evokes private/public and lay/expert binaries. Politics belongs to the public domain; the home is private. By extension, the site of the home, the locality, is more private than the national and international. Similarly, as environmentalism becomes more and more professionalized, leaders of mainstream organizations tend to be men and women tend to be associated with the denigrated lay domain (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000).

Because ecofeminists see a connection between the domination of women and of the ‘natural’ world and argue that the existence of pollution indicates an unjust society, many ecofeminists would argue that female activists must, of necessity, contest all patriarchal relations. Some ecofeminists (Shiva 1988; Warren 1987, 1990) assert that feminisms that do not address these linked dominations are flawed. Others who agree that both women and nature have been subordinated in the West do not argue that recognition of one form of domination necessarily implies recognition of the other. Other feminists (Conley 1997, Haraway 1991a, Mohanty 1994, Plumwood 1993, Spivak 1987, Stacey and Thorne 1993) have questioned the ways in which ecofeminist and other feminist theories, which are predominately produced by white middle-class urban Western women, have imposed a Western cultural bias on women from other cultures and failed to account for the complicity of the West in the maintenance of the hegemony of the ‘West’ over against what Stuart Hall (1992) terms ‘The Rest.’ To this critique, I would add that they also often fail to address the cultural hegemony of the urban over the rural that, since Marx wrote of the “idiocy of village life,” has tended to be equated with ‘backwardness’. Additionally, I argue that much ecofeminist literature is problematic because of its uncritical acceptance of an essentialized ‘woman’ and its failure to come to grips with Butler’s (1990) theorization of gender as socially constructed and performative and thus always already subject to alteration by changes in iteration. Finally, I am troubled by the all-too-frequent acceptance of the categories ‘nature’ and ‘natural’ as unproblematic in ecofeminist literature (Conley 1997, Haraway 1991, and Whatmore 1999).

A number of researchers (Barry 1999, Brown 1991, Brown and Ferguson 1995, Sachs 1994) have found that women are frequently more involved in environmental issues when health, especially the health of children, is involved. Massey (1994: 9) cautions against relying upon the simplistic argument that women’s involvement is the result of their leading “more local lives than do men” because this argument reinscribes both a public/private boundary that has been used to keep women in place and an untenable local/global dichotomy. Additionally, this argument must be problematized to account for the numbers of men who are as concerned with environmental protection. For the reasons cited above, I maintain that in-depth interviews with

168 It is important to note that although she is critical of the universalization and limited notions of what constitutes a “friendly body and political language,” Haraway (1991a: 174) gives this literature more latitude as “oppositional ideologies,” ideologies that are struggling to oppose the organic to the technological.
169 I will address problems related to this acceptance in a subsequent chapter.
170 I will discuss KFTC’s and CFA’s position on gender in the next chapter.
women who argued for more stringent regulation would be necessary to determine why they took this position. So, although I will provide a gendered analysis of this debate, I will not theorize about the motivations of individual women.

It is noteworthy that although KFTC and CFA had invested great amounts of energy in the battle for regulation since 1997, many participants who did not indicate affiliation with either group expressed themselves in stronger and more emotional language than that used by CFA and KFTC members at the hearings. Thus, although both groups’ comments and discursive strategies at the hearing are exemplars of KFTC’s and CFA’s positions, they do not provide a sufficient basis for analysis. To deepen my analysis, in the following chapter, I examine the groups’ other textual productions focusing upon the ways in which the hearing process both disciplined participants and created subjects within a particular institutional milieu. I then locate the differences between comments made within that milieu and within other genres.
CHAPTER THREE

Environmental justice: gender and religious imaginaries

As the form of rationality represented in the Rational Economy appropriates all the remaining space on the earth, living things, beings who move to their own rhythms, who follow the urgency of their own messages rather than those of the Rational Economy, are denied space and place. The Rational Economy will pay for and allocate space . . . only to what it can use or what participates in it. Increasingly it withdraws access to resources from unassimilated others. . . .

In this chapter I examine KFTC’s and CFA’s textual productions in other genres—newspaper stories, editorials, and letters to the editor—to further contextualize arguments that members made at the hearings and to locate differences among genres that will indicate the ways in which the Cabinet’s hearing process disciplined actants. I am interested in identifying the matrices of lived experiences that inform group members’ constructions of corporate farming as inimical to farmers, farming and rural Kentucky, as well as their ambivalent relationships to state agencies.

Although I am focusing upon the groups’ newspapers in this chapter, another genre exists. Both groups have web sites that are updated daily when the state’s General Assembly is in session. Because the sites are available to anyone who logs on, the language in this genre is, like most members’ hearing comments, measured. Both groups also use email to notify members of crucial moments when the expression of members’ opinions to legislators might make a difference. These emails tend to be terse and to assume that members are aware of bill numbers and the importance of bills to membership. Both groups have placed their mission statements, brief histories of the organizations and information about current campaigns on their web sites to educate newcomers to their campaigns. In addition, because farmers, who are increasingly working longer days, often find it difficult to attend organizing meetings, CFA is now using its web site as an organizing tool also.

The groups’ newspapers, however, are produced for members who will likely read them at home. Both groups use their publications to educate and keep members abreast of issues of interest and, when the General Assembly is in session, to tell members of the status of bills, the composition of legislative committees, and supply the addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses of legislators. Reflective of the assumption that readership consists of members with similar views, the language in both publications is more relaxed and often more intense than were comments made at the hearings. Both publications tend to express more criticism of state officials than did hearing comments. Additionally, unlike the seriousness of hearing comments made by members, both publications often deploy humor against their opponents and policies with which they disagree.

In 1981, KFTC began to publish its newspaper, balancing the scales, as six pages on letter-size paper. Since January 1985, “to increase circulation, lower costs, diversify layout and make better use of pictures,” the publication has been printed in tabloid newspaper form on

173 balancing the scales, 21 November 1991, p. 11.
recycled paper. The paper, which is published eight times a year, runs editorials, letters to the editor, photographs, cartoons, reports from county chapters, and articles on subjects of interest to members. Typically, the newspaper consists of 12–16 pages, although it tends to have more pages when the state General Assembly is in session.

The *CFA News* has been published since 1986. Although its publication schedule has varied somewhat from year to year, it is generally issued bi-monthly. The paper is printed in soy-based ink on 8 1/2 x 11” maize-colored stock and mailed to members. The difference in newspaper page size is important because the larger dimensions of the tabloid page allows KFTC to print more copy than CFA even when both publications have the same number of pages. The content of *CFA News* is very similar to that of *balancing the scales*. When the General Assembly is in session the *CFA News* consists of 16 to 20 pages; otherwise it runs 8 to 12 pages.

The different missions of the groups are reflected in the types of issues covered in both newspapers. Table 3.1 indicates the dominant thematics and numbers of stories, letters to the editor, and editorials with these thematics that ran from 1991 through March 2002 in both groups’ newspapers. 174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATICS</th>
<th>KFTC</th>
<th>CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial farming</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax reform</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign finance reform, ethics legislation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care reform</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice (economics, racism, sexism)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco farming, settlement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy farming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global linkages</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of government agencies</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of economic development</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, KFTC’s environmental thematics are more inclusive than CFAs, which tend to focus more on the environmental effects of agriculture. Within this difference, however, there are still common thematics. For example, generally KFTC’s stories about mining, logging and industrial farming and CFA’s stories about sustainable agriculture176 also incorporated critiques of corporate practices and the state economic development policies that facilitated what both groups represent as unfair practices.

174 I coded by dominant thematic stressed in the headline and first few paragraphs but many stories, letters to the editor and editorials incorporated more than one of the thematics identified.
175 I included the numbers of stories that CFA published about dairy farming and the tobacco settlement to stress the importance of farming to the group.
176 “The term sustainability was first advanced in 1980 by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. Prior to the mid-1980s the term had achieved its widest currency among critics of what was viewed as ‘industrial’ approaches to the process of agricultural development” (Ruttan 1994: 4).
Industrial farming

Both groups devoted a great deal of space to industrial farming and printed their criticisms of the proposed regulations in depth.\(^{177}\) Although both critiques of the emergency and proposed regulations were similar (and addressed in concerns expressed at the hearings), there were significant differences between that which both groups covered in the newspapers and between newspaper coverage and hearing comments. For example, as a result of its membership strength in farming locales, \textit{CFA News} first brought news of industrial agriculture-related problems to its members in the July 1997 issue. The group, which had been asked for assistance by Allen County residents, ran a letter to CFA expressing residents’ concerns about increasing concentration of hog and poultry operations in Allen County on page one and a story with detailed information about the proposed hog operations in Graves and Hickman Counties on pages seven and eight of the July 1997 issue. The paper also reported a shooting incident\(^{178}\) in which an employee of a 5,760-sow operation under construction in Graves County shot an opponent of hog CAFOs in the shoulder and head in a dispute on the Graves-Hickman County line about one-quarter mile from the construction site.

Another significant difference in coverage related to the groups’ audiences can be seen in the criticism of KFB in \textit{balancing the scales}. For example, a story about the Hopkinsville hearing\(^{179}\) described KFB as “an insurance company and lobbying group” that led opposition to the regulations. This description, which focused upon KFB’s business interests, challenged the group’s representation of itself as the voice of the state’s farmers, as did statements\(^{180}\) made by KFTC and CFA members who charged the group with “amassing a lot of power while trying to come across as just a bunch of small farmers.” The same story, which was headlined “Farm Bureau role questioned,” charged:

\ldots Farm Bureau requires you to pay a membership fee if you purchase insurance with them. That makes you a ‘member’ but it doesn’t necessarily give you any say in the organization.

Similarly, a story about the Bowling Green-Paducah hearings\(^{181}\) reported that

\[\text{[m]any who commented at the Paducah hearing challenged the Kentucky Farm Bureau’s role in attacking the emergency regulations. Some, who identified themselves as Farm Bureau members, said that Farm Bureau officials never asked for member opinions before taking their present position.}\]

Speakers also asked how the Farm Bureau could claim to be supportive of small farmers but promote a mega-hog industry, which helps drive small farmers out of business.

\(^{177}\) KFTC printed its critique in the 2 April 1998 issue of \textit{balancing the scales} and referenced the critique in subsequent stories. CFA published its criticism of the emergency regulations in its October/November 1997 issue and included critiques of the subsequent drafts of the proposed permanent regulations in stories about the hearings and legislative maneuvers.

\(^{178}\) \textit{CFA News}, July 1997, p. 9. This incident was not reported in \textit{balancing the scales}. Again, this difference likely results from CFA’s closer ties to these farming communities.

\(^{179}\) \textit{balancing the scales}, 11 December 1997, p.8.

\(^{180}\) \textit{balancing the scales}, 2 April 1998, p.2.

\(^{181}\) \textit{balancing the scales}, 5 February 1998, p. 10.
A *Multinational Monitor* report (Monks 2000) criticized the Farm Bureau for similar reasons.

The vast majority of the Farm Bureau’s members . . . are either policyholders of one of numerous insurance companies affiliated with state Farm Bureaus or are customers of other Farm Bureau business ventures. Such members have no say in establishing or carrying out Farm Bureau policies and, in most cases, have no particular interest in agriculture. (Indeed the U.S. Department of Agriculture says there are only one million full-time farmers left in the United States.) (Monks 2000: 16).

In 1998, after the General Assembly failed to ratify the proposed regulations, *balancing the scales* placed the blame squarely on KFB:

As a result of the efforts of the Kentucky Farm Bureau, Kentucky is at least temporarily without protection from mega-hog operations.

In *CFA News* stories about the debate, KFB’s role in leading the opposition to the regulations was rarely mentioned. On the few occasions the Farm Bureau’s participation in the debate was noted, the reference was expressed as a neutral statement rather than as explicit criticism. The following is typical of these few references:

Taking the opposing viewpoint is the Farm Bureau, the Kentucky Pork Producers, and at least one individual from the University of Kentucky (a UK swine expert who works at the Princeton farm). Supporting an industrial model of hog production, they have publicly voiced their contention that the emergency regulations are ‘excessive’.

CFA’s coverage of the debate about regulation focused primarily upon the content of the regulations and the group’s mission of sustainable agriculture because “CFA and Farm Bureau members on the local level are often the same people.” Because it sees its strength in numbers, although CFA is adamantly opposed to the Farm Bureau’s position on industrial farming, CFA does not want to represent the debate as a CFA-KFB dispute for fear of alienating CFA members who also belong to KFB. Additionally, because both groups’ primary interest is agriculture, CFA deals with KFB on a daily basis and sometimes, as was the case with the state’s agricultural water quality act, works with KFB. Because, KFTC had not been involved in agricultural
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issues prior to the dispute about CAFOs, it was not as constrained in naming the Farm Bureau as opponent.  

Unlike hearing comments and KFTC’s newspaper coverage, CFA’s newspaper coverage explicitly linked the role of the state’s land grant university’s knowledge production to the industrialization of agriculture and the state’s economic development policies. In 1990, members of CFA met with some faculty members from the University of Kentucky’s College of Agriculture to express the group’s concerns that “some of the research currently conducted does not benefit family farmers.”  

The group sought more “family farmer input into the setting of College of Agriculture and Extension Service research priorities.”  

CFA’s dissatisfaction with the dean’s responses to questions resulted in a full-page story questioning the College of Agriculture’s research priorities and its accountability to taxpayers. The story chronicled the group’s attempts over 16 months to determine:

What research projects they [College of Agriculture staff] support; What the objectives of those projects are; What has been achieved so far; and What their budget is.

After months of questioning, the group was told in late 1992, that it had to file a request under the state’s Open Records Law to get the information it sought. The month after CFA printed the saga of its attempts to learn that state taxpayers pay $53 million a year for agricultural research, the group printed a letter from the chair of the college’s Plant Pathology department who noted that he had provided “substantial information” about his department’s finances, functions and research projects. He urged members to visit his department and speak with individual faculty members to dispel what he charged was “a very distorted view of the research activities of this department.” In response, CFA asked two questions:

... how do you and other UK researchers decide how you spend taxpayer’s money?

Do you have any formal mechanism for farmers—especially those experienced in sustainable agriculture—to help you decide what research you do?

The issue at hand is not one of a debate about research projects but rather “improving the research system to help Kentucky farms become more environmentally and economically sound,” CFA replied. Toward that end, because “[m]any researchers have lost touch with rural Kentucky,” “farmers and rural people must help determine UK’s agricultural research direction.”
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Although the College of Agriculture was unresponsive to CFA’s desire to participate in the setting of research priorities, in 1996, in order to comply with a mandate in the 1990 Farm Bill, the University of Kentucky’s Cooperative Extension Service developed the university’s first strategic plan for sustainable agriculture. Working with roughly 500 people, the Extension Service plan summarized sustainable agriculture priorities as: 1) a need for marketing, diversification, and value-added farm products, 2) attention to public policy around regulations, taxes, land use, and zoning and urban encroachment, 3) a need for credit and measures to contain the departure of youth from agriculture, 4) attention to production, labor, corporate competition, and problems of part-time and limited resource farmers, 6) a need for inter-farm cooperation, and 7) information, education, and technology transfer to both farmers and consumers. Both the inclusionary process and the priorities established conformed to CFA’s vision of sustainable agriculture, which differs dramatically from the university’s practice of allowing ‘experts’ to determine research priorities.

The Extension’s plan, however, did not resolve tensions between CFA and the University of Kentucky because the plan applied only to the Extension’s sustainable agriculture project; other university research priorities continued to be directed toward the less sustainable large-scale technologically-oriented farming practices that CFA charged benefited large farmers only. The university’s ties to agribusiness became a public issue in 1998 when the Louisville Courier-Journal reported that a University of Kentucky swine expert had provided free technical and public relations advice to pork producers, and lobbied the governor’s office against the emergency regulations (Malone 1998). University officials quoted in the story maintained that the swine expert’s activities were legal in light of the university’s Extension mission. The journalist appeared unconvinced, writing,

The university’s interest may be linked to a nearly $2 million swine research center: for which it had applied for an $870,000 matching grant from the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). An associated story reported that the university had received $43,450 from the national Pork Producers Council and $114,000 from other agribusinesses during the same year.

This tension surfaced during my participation in a CFA-KFTC “Swine Safari” in Allen County in 1998. As I pulled into the driveway of the home where we were meeting, I noted the cessation of conversation and stiffening of the bodies of activists who had been chatting on the deck when I pulled up. I quickly realized that they had reacted to the University of Kentucky seal on the side of the car I had borrowed for the drive to Western Kentucky. Tension abated when I indicated that I also questioned the environmental and social effects of industrial farming.

CFA’s fears about the land grant’s research priorities were exacerbated when in February 2001, Governor Patton announced that he had hired Dr. Ray Goldberg, a Harvard University faculty member, to develop a long-term plan for Kentucky agriculture. The story, which was written by the Democracy Resource Center, that ran in the CFA News described Goldberg, “who coined the term ‘Agribusiness’ in the 1950s,” as “a leading figure in the promotion of biotechnology and corporate control of agriculture.” CFA saw Goldberg’s ‘new’

198 CFA News, July/August 1996.
biotechnological revolution as a continuation of the ‘green revolution’ that endorses the industrial farming practices that the group opposes.

Roger Blobaum, a founder of the World Sustainable Agriculture Association and current member of the board of International Organic Accreditation Service which accredits organic and sustainable agricultural certifiers in 60 countries, told CFA members that Goldberg’s appointment “is bad news and a threat to your organization’s efforts to influence state government.”\(^{201}\) Blobaum, who was the guest speaker at CFA’s 2001 annual meeting, advised the group “to insist on public disclosure of whatever it is that Professor Goldberg advises your governor.”\(^{202}\)

**Economic development**

KFTC had not taken issue with the research policies of the land grant university but it had developed a critique of the state’s economic development policies similar to that of CFA. Although criticism of the state’s approach to development was implicit in some hearing comments, both groups’ newspapers charged state officials, in particular the Cabinet of Economic Development, with encouraging unsustainable forms of development. In 1995\(^{203}\) KFTC published its vision of economic development that would consider “appropriate scale,” “long-term costs/benefits,” “sustainability,” and “human needs” and be accountable to taxpayers. The group’s notion of development was inclusive, calling for protection of family farms and local culture, living wages, local decision-making, safe workplaces, and the right of labor to organize.

Unlike the language in hearing comments, both groups’ newspaper critiques of the state’s development policies often contained strong language. For example, in a 1996 story about the federal Farm Bill, a *CFA News*\(^{204}\) story asserted:

> The ‘Freedom to Farm’ approach\(^{205}\) . . . will primarily promote the kind of corporate welfare that the Republicans claim that they want to eliminate. It will force smaller farm operations to bear the brunt of the cuts, while maintaining existing loopholes for the largest farms and agribusiness.

CFA’s opposition to corporate welfare centered about the use of public funds to subsidize private corporations whose activities were oriented to the accumulation of private wealth at the public expense (beyond tax revenues). For an example, in a story critical of corporate agriculture and the state’s economic development policy, CFA charged:\(^{206}\)

> CFA opposes public financing of Cagles because: The poultry industry offers farmers one-sided and unfair contracts. . . . Workers are not protected. . . .

\(^{202}\) Ibid.
\(^{203}\) *balancing the scales*, 4 September, p. 4.
\(^{205}\) The Freedom to Farm movement valorized large-scale industrialized agriculture by protecting such agriculture with subsidies closely associated to scale and, in Kentucky, established farming as limited liability operations, protecting agriculture from legal action challenging agriculture-related pollution.
environmental consequences to water and soil. . . We need policies that put people first, not Corporate Welfare.

Similarly, in a letter to the editor in balancing the scales, Earl Wilson wrote:

Why are they [CAFOs] moving into Kentucky? Perhaps it is because Kentucky has a reputation for passing regulations full of loopholes in other areas (mining and oil regulations). Perhaps it is because Kentucky has a reputation for weak enforcement of current laws (dumping sewage from houseboats into lakes and rivers—a violation of the federal Clean Water Act). Perhaps they are expecting to be visited by inexperienced inspectors that were hired from a tavern.

Also, they can expect a warm reception from many business and political leaders in Kentucky. (I sometimes believe that some of the leadership in Kentucky would have welcomed Hitler in Kentucky as long as he called it economic development and promised to hire a few people at minimum wages.)

In 1999, an editorial in balancing the scales criticized secrecy in economic development decisions. The same year, in a 12-page insert about the myths and realities of industrial agriculture in the CFA News. The group criticized the Kentucky Economic Development Cabinet for giving away “millions of dollars worth of incentive packages to both the Industrial Swine and Industrial Poultry Industry.” In October 1999, CFA News featured a two-page story in which it printed its research into tax incentive packages totaling $38,559,367. In the following issue, the paper reported on a workshop called “Economic Development Incentives—Tricks or Treat” that it and KFTC conducted as members of KEJA. The CFA editor headlined the story, which charged that the Economic Development Cabinet had promised in excess of $3 billion in tax incentive programs, “Kentucky’s Economic Development Philosophy ‘Cadillac Incentives—Foodstamp Wages’.” In May 1999, balancing the scales printed a “Kentucky Corporate Welfare Quiz” along with two stories critical of economic development. In the following legislative session, KEJA supported a bill that mandated standards for tax incentives including requirements that: 1) companies pay a living wage and health insurance; 2) maintain good environmental and worker safety records; 3) be equal opportunity employers, forgo incentive payments during layoffs, and 4) receive no more than
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$35,000 in incentives for each full-time job. The bill also guaranteed public disclosure of tax incentive packages. The bill was defeated in the house Economic Development Committee.

Environmental issues

Many of both groups’ environmental concerns are related directly to their campaigns for sustainable development. KFTC’s greater number of stories related to environmental issues can be explained in part by its involvement in other natural resource management issues, e.g., mining, forestry, oil, and gas. As previously noted, since its inception KFTC has fought the state’s tax policies on minerals as well as its regulation of mining-related practices and pollution. Those struggles have continued through the present. The group has been equally involved in forestry issues, waging a campaign to reduce logging-related environmental degradation in Floyd and Leslie Counties, and to develop sustainable forestry practices that will benefit local residents rather than logging companies. KFTC has also been involved in disputes about oil drilling-related problems in Floyd County, oil and gas drilling-related problems in Knott and Letcher Counties, gas drilling and storage problems in Leslie County, and solid waste management issues in Floyd and Knott Counties. In addition to its work with natural resource issues, KFTC has worked on conflicts about landfill–related pollution in Greenup and Hopkins Counties, landfill siting/expansion in Greenup and Pulaski Counties, hazardous

218 The Economic Development Cabinet had maintained it was exempt from provisions of the state’s Open Records Law and had refused to allow the state Attorney General to view documents related to tax incentive packages related to Alliance Research and Nine West. The Kentucky Court of Appeals subsequently upheld the Attorney General’s office (CFA News, May 2000).
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223 An analysis produced by the state Auditor of Public Accounts in August 2001, confirmed KFTC’s critique of the impacts of state-sanctioned development upon the environment and of lax enforcement by Cabinet agencies. I will discuss this report in a later chapter.
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225 balancing the scales, 16 October 1995,
227 balancing the scales, 5 April 2000,
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229 balancing the scales, 31 January 2000.
230 balancing the scales, 3 June 1993,
231 balancing the scales, 15 September 1994, 2 March 1995, 20 April 1995,
232 balancing the scales, 20 April 1996, 1 May 1997,
waste facilities in Floyd, Union, and Johnson Counties, and a power plant in Perry and Knot Counties.

In contrast, most of CFA’s work with environmental issues has been oriented toward developing sustainable agricultural practices. Of the 137 stories that I placed into the environmental issues category, most were related to the group’s vision of sustainable agriculture. This vision is an important component of the group’s work on tobacco settlement funds and is the driving force behind the group’s campaign for the legalization of hemp as an alternative crop for tobacco. Law enforcement agencies in the state are opposed to legalization because, although hemp, which is a member of the marijuana family, is not a drug, law enforcement officers surveilling in helicopters for illegal marijuana crops claim that they cannot differentiate between hemp and marijuana.

Many of the stories in the environmental issues category involved CFA’s linkages to other sustainable agriculture groups, in particular to groups to which the CFA belongs such as the Southern Sustainable Agriculture Working Group and the Kentucky Leadership for Agriculture and Environmental Sustainability. Other stories involved water quality issues, including CFA’s participation in the development of the state’s agricultural water quality regulations and a student project designed both to educate students and to improve water quality. CFA’s focus on organic agriculture resulted in a number of stories about the environmental impacts of pesticide and growth hormone use and the need for food safety that the group sees as integral to maintaining public trust in farmers. CFA takes the public trust seriously and maintains that farmers need to earn that trust. In the group’s supplement, “Industrial Agriculture Myths and Realities,” the need for public confidence was expressed in terms of public support for farmers.

Farmers have been awarded special privileges, exemptions and variances under a whole host of public policies—from taxation to environmental regulations—because they were trusted to behave in the public interest. Support of ‘family
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farms’ has been an important part of the rhetoric of every farm bill that has passed congress. Farmers have also enjoyed a special status ‘as people,’ apart from any monetary benefits. They have been respected and trusted. However, bad publicity surrounding large-scale corporate production is using up the farmer’s stock of public confidence and good will at an alarming rate. . . .Family farms will be paying for this loss of public trust for decades if not forever.

One member’s concern about pesticides led him to produce a film, “Green Blood, Red Tears,” that explored linkages between farmer suicide and pesticide use.249 “Green Blood” refers to a farmer’s love for farming; “Red Tears” to the moisture that seeps from the eyes of laboratory rats after exposure to organophosphate-based pesticides. Because CFA is opposed to the type of pesticide use encouraged by green revolution technologies, unlike KFB, it did not resent growing public concern about pesticides and industrial farming practices. Rather, like KFTC, it was critical of government’s failure to provide adequate protection to citizens.

Criticism of government agencies

Most of the stories, letters to the editor, and editorials related to industrial farming and other environmental and economic development issues in both groups’ newspapers are critical of governmental failure to afford adequate protection to residents. Although the need for protection was also a theme in hearing comments, in both groups’ newspapers, the criticism is sharper than that expressed at the hearings. For example, prior to the debate about the regulation of industrial farming, KFTC members were fighting to ensure that existing environmental laws were enforced.250 They had also met with representatives from the Cabinet of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection,251 and asked the state Office of Surface Mining,252 county officials253 and the state legislature,254 sometimes bringing forward bills, for more protection from the environmental impacts of corporate activities.255 The group has been equally critical of the federal government’s failure to enforce existing laws.256

KFTC’s frustration with government agencies can be seen in these headlines that ran in balancing the scales: “‘Represent the people’, KFTC members tell federal lawmakers,”257 “Citizens demand that the forest service listen,”258 “It’s simple, just enforce the law, citizens tell OSM,”259 “Mining law ignored,”260 “State officials come up with a novel plan—enforcing mountain removal law,”261 “Making the illegal legal: OSM recommendations makes violations
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model for new policies,” and “Federal government will not protect 30,000 families.” In response to a statement by the vice-president of the Kentucky Coal Association that the industry has improved the land, an editorial replied:

It is hard for anyone—other than someone blinded by greed—to believe that what the coal industry has done to the land and people in Kentucky’s coalfields is an ‘improvement.’ And excuse us, Mr. Caylor, if we forget to thank you for the destruction your industry has caused to the land and people. It’s just that the dust kicked up by your blasting keeps us from seeing the beauty of the scarred hillsides and rust-colored streams.

CFA’s frustration occasionally surfaced, although to a lesser extent, Stronger language was occasionally deployed in headlines, such as the headline on a story about the tax incentive package that the state gave to Cagles’ Inc. which read, “Corporate Agriculture in Kentucky and an Economic Development Policy Gone Wrong” and the headline on a front page story about the legislature’s failure to establish the legislative oversight committee that was mandated in the bill that established the process for disbursement of the tobacco settlement funds that read, “Legislative Oversight Committee—P.O.W. or M.I.A.” The language in headlines could simply reflect a common journalistic practice of writing headlines in strong language to attract readers’ attention. The strongest criticism of government agencies expressed by CFA occurred in another genre—reports generated by CFA in tandem with KFTC and the Democracy Resource Center.

For example, an undated position paper on state subsidies to agribusiness charged:

Does our state really want to help run family farmers out of business, erode our rural communities and economies, pollute our natural resources, create low-wage, dangerous jobs in processing plants, implement racist policies, and produce a situation in which contract growers get all the profit? Tax dollars are given away to large corporations like those listed below with little or no say so from the public—people like us!

CFA also prepared a fact sheet titled “Big Money, Little People” with equally strong language. Also, unlike hearing comments, both newspapers targeted specific elected officials as impediments to the groups’ agendas. KFTC accused Democrats in the state Senate of being “intent on giving a tax break to the coal industry,” gave the “Most Rude Legislator Award” to
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state Senator Richard Roeding,271 charged the Cabinet of Natural Resources and the Environment with trying “to circumvent a federal law requiring the proper reclamation of mountain-top removal sites,”272 and a letter to the editor from Pauline Stacy273 criticized Governor Paul Patton’s stance on mountaintop removal:

I was in Letcher County when Governor Paul Patton made his campaign stop. He stated that he was for mountaintop removal. He said we needed the flat land for industry.

This doesn’t surprise me, seeing that Governor Patton was surrounded by coal officials. I guess because Governor Patton was in the coal business, they knew he would back the coal industry.

U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell, a Republican, has been targeted by both groups. For example, CFA News274 ran this cartoon criticizing McConnell’s ties to agribusiness.

![Cartoon critical of McConnell’s relationship to agribusiness.](image)

Figure 3.1: Cartoon critical of McConnell’s relationship to agribusiness.275

KFTC has charged McConnell with refusing to meet KFTC members,276 criticized his failure to support a bill that would have increased the time that welfare recipients had to attend colleges or vocational schools before work requirements were imposed,277 and targeted McConnell and other members of Kentucky’s Congressional delegation for accepting campaign
contributions from corporations whose practices create environmental problems.\textsuperscript{278} Campaign finance reform and ethics legislation are other components of KFTC’s social justice issues.

**Social justice issues**

Because KFTC has placed so much stress on campaign finance, ethics, and tax reform and CFA on health care reform, I made separate categories for these issues and grouped both groups’ other concerns under the broader category of social justice. From its origin, KFTC had fought for taxation of unmined minerals and reduction of mining-related pollution. After successive defeats in the legislature and the courts, in 1988, KFTC finally got a victory when nearly 83 percent of Kentucky voters approved its referendum that provided protection from “unwanted strip mining.”\textsuperscript{279} In January 1995, KFTC began to consider comprehensive tax reform,\textsuperscript{280} and in December 1995, attacked the state tax commission’s reform proposals as unfair to poor people.\textsuperscript{281} In 1996, KFTC fought off an amendment that would have repealed the unmined minerals tax it had finally won.\textsuperscript{282} Two months later, Senate leaders again tried to repeal the tax\textsuperscript{283} but their efforts failed.\textsuperscript{284} In 1997, KFTC found the unmined mineral tax program was not working as effectively as the group had hoped,\textsuperscript{285} and was challenged by two bills that called for a constitutional amendment to be placed before voters to exempt unmined mineral property from taxation.\textsuperscript{286} In 1999, KFTC filed a lawsuit against the Kentucky Revenue Cabinet to assure that unmined mineral property was fully assessed.\textsuperscript{287}

In 1995, KFTC began to explore “big money connections to political power.”\textsuperscript{288} The group saw the campaign finance system as “an impediment to progressive reform.”\textsuperscript{289} In 1997, to illustrate the need for reform, KFTC initiated “Fat Cat Theater” and “Dogshops,” a column that examined the role of money in politics, and formed a Public Campaign, holding conferences to promote “clean money reform.”\textsuperscript{290} The campaign connected corporate money, especially that from “coal, forest and utility interests” to specific political campaigns.\textsuperscript{291} KFTC mounted a sustained assault.\textsuperscript{292} In 1998 the group published a graph of forestry industry campaign donations to the Kentucky Congressional delegation’s 1996 campaign, along with a story headlined “Plutocracy vs. democracy” that reported the results of a study that correlated access to Congress with campaign contributions.\textsuperscript{293} Campaign reform has been part of KFTC’s platform since 1997. In the 2000 legislative session the group tried unsuccessfully to pass a campaign finance reform
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bill that mandated that candidates file their campaign finance reports electronically to make the information available to the public. A less stringent campaign finance reform bill was passed in the 2000 legislative session. In 1996, after reporting that “Kentucky taxes poor families more than any other state,” KFTC initiated a campaign for income tax reform. In 1999, the newspaper published another study that found Kentucky’s working poor were one of the highest taxed groups in the nation. KFTC linked poverty in Kentucky to poor wages, the need for welfare reform, and the right to education. In March 1999, KFTC’s Welfare, Economic Development, Justice Committee held three meetings to learn about “the needs and struggles of low-wage workers and welfare recipients.” According to Doug Hall of the Kentucky Youth Advocates, in 1999, 80,000 Kentucky families were living in poverty despite the presence of a working parent. Hall called for an Earned Income Tax credit to reduce the tax burden on the working poor, increases in the state’s minimum wage, health insurance coverage to parents living in poverty, expanded state assistance for child care, and public health insurance initiatives for eligible Kentucky children. In 1999, KEJA developed a “Poverty Despite Work” media campaign, and worked to pass an earned income tax credit bill and increase the state’s minimum wage in the 2000 legislative session. KFTC also initiated a campaign to obtain living wages for workers, low-income housing, lower utility bills, and access to education for people on welfare who were being moved into workfare programs. Along with CFA and other members of KEJA, KFTC also supported an economic development reform bill that tied wages and benefits, sustainability, worker safety, environmental protection and public disclosure to tax incentive packages. 

While KFTC worked on living wage, access to education campaigns and welfare reform, CFA continued a campaign for health insurance reform that it had undertaken in 1991. CFA
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pressed for reform through 1992 and 1993, when a special session on health care reform collapsed.\textsuperscript{310} The group insisted that:

\begin{quote}
[g]uaranteed issue of insurance for individuals and small groups, as well as guaranteed renewability, and community rating are absolutely essential to genuine health care reform in Kentucky... and can become a solid foundation on which to build a cost-effective system of universal coverage... Community Farm Alliance holds that a specific plan for achieving universal coverage needs to be part of any reform measure that is enacted—and that the ‘time table’ for reaching universal coverage should be three years or less.\textsuperscript{311}
\end{quote}

CFA fought the legislature until the 1994 session when a health care reform bill, which did not include CFA’s call for universal coverage, passed.\textsuperscript{312} But, just as KFTC learned when it had to fight off attempts to repeal or weaken its unmined minerals bill, CFA had to ensure that the health care reform bill was not weakened.\textsuperscript{313} In 1997, CFA successfully fought off a bill that would have created a “high risk pool” that CFA charged was discriminatory because it would have jeopardized renewability and prevented people with health problems from getting medical attention.\textsuperscript{314}

From their beginnings, both KFTC and CFA have fought racism and sexism. KFTC’s multi-issue approach was designed to allow members to work on each other’s issues as a form of education, and to attract poor and working class people and people of color (Szakos 1993). KFTC developed alliances to accomplish its goals (Szakos 1993). For example, working with African-Americans in Louisville, white members discovered common interests.

\begin{quote}
... through their activities in KFTC, urban blacks working on utility rate reform and rural whites pushing for landowners’ rights discovered they had a lot in common when the legislature killed all their bills behind closed doors. Making the legislative process more open and democratic and pushing for long-term institutional change became their common goal (Szakos 1993: 108).
\end{quote}

Along the way, KFTC members discovered more in common with other groups in the state. In 1991, a Bridges and Barriers workshop conducted for members confronted a number of systems of differentiation: racism, sexism, classism, anti-Semitism, ageism, sizeism, ableism, and heterosexism that operated to marginalize Kentucky residents.\textsuperscript{315} In 1992, KFTC worked with Louisville residents to pass a bylaw that made discrimination against gays and lesbians illegal.\textsuperscript{316} Although, confronting systems of oppression was a major component of the group’s agenda, ironically, in September 1999, two African-American KFTC members experienced racism while checking into a hotel in Hazard.\textsuperscript{317} The incident prompted an editorial and a request

\begin{footnotesize}
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315 \textit{balancing the scales}, 12 December 1991.
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for members to report incidents of discrimination and ideas for dealing with them in a constructive manner.

We are NOT asking all of us to note these things so that the ‘Diversity Police’ will then come after us and shame us all! We are all human and make mistakes. We are doing this so that we can talk about these behaviors with each other during our chapter meetings, committee meetings (whether it be our committee or another appropriate committee) and come up with real solutions, real actions, that will continue to bring an end to this kind of treatment.318

In 1997, KFTC worked with residents in an African-American neighborhood in Fayette County who felt that “race is behind the neglect of their area,”319 and the following year, worked with residents of African-American neighborhoods in Hopkinsville who charged that the city was discriminating against them.320 In 1998, having recognized multiple systems of oppression, the group extended its social justice campaign to include overcoming racism, classism and other forms of discrimination in its Strategic Plan.321 The following year, KFTC members were urged to attend a Democracy Resource Center workshop on Undoing Racism.322 Although steering committee members understood that some white members may be resistant to confronting “white privilege,” African-American member Lamar Keys said,

Some of the things are going to make some people angry—we might lose some members.

Which is more important, for us to lose a few members to adopt this racism issue, work in it and bring some closure to it in our organization and the state?323

Keys also supported Reverend Louis Coleman’s recommendation that the group ask the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to investigate the treatment of poultry plant workers, especially Latinos, in Kentucky plant.324 Because many Latino workers are not yet citizens, they are targets for abuse in the workplace and in local communities, Keys said.325

We should pull all our resources together to ensure that they have affordable housing and a safe work environment. We need to organize326 them to know their rights and let them know how they can become citizens so that they can exercise rights as citizens.

318 Ibid.
319 balancing the scales, 30 January 1997.
320 balancing the scales, 5 February 1998, 2 April 1998.
321 balancing the scales, 12 August 1999.
322 balancing the scales, 24 June 1999.
323 balancing the scales, 12 August 1999, p. 8.
324 balancing the scales, 24 June 1999.
326 Although the group’s agenda is inclusive and although Keys is himself a member of a minority, this discourse is paternalistic and may erase ongoing resistance among the Latino workers.
In 2000, KFTC’s Central Kentucky chapter began to work with Citizens Against Police Abuse (CAPA), an African-American group that was pressing for a citizen police review board in Louisville.\textsuperscript{327} CAPA and the Central Kentucky chapter maintain that racial profiling and police abuse such as that experienced by Adrian Reynolds, a young black man who died as the result of a beating administered by four guards in the Louisville jail, “is not an isolated problem. . .but a problem with the criminal justice system itself.”\textsuperscript{328} In addition to CAPA, KFTC began to work with other Louisville residents who were struggling within a nexus of oppressions, including racism and classism.\textsuperscript{329} In October 2000, the chapter’s Law Enforcement Injustice Work Team held a forum to address law enforcement issues in Lexington and begin to develop a community response.\textsuperscript{330}

Since the first African-American members were recruited in CFA’s early years, the group’s membership and board have been biracial. As a result, the group is sensitive to and works to address the needs of particular African-American farmers in Kentucky\textsuperscript{331} and, on occasion has reached out to African American groups, such as the Congressional Black Caucus.\textsuperscript{332} As a member of KEJA, CFA has worked against racism in the state.\textsuperscript{333} During the tobacco settlement debate, CFA argued:\textsuperscript{334}

As black ownership of farmland has dropped precipitously beginning black farmer programs are of special importance. Black farmers are losing land at a rate two and one half times that of other Americans. Black farmers have suffered discrimination from traditional lending institutions and so credit is a serious impediment to success. Lack of technical and management assistance, as well as lack of reliable and fair markets, tend to impact black farmers disproportionately.

According to a 1991 24-page special report on the USDA published by the \textit{Kansas City Star} (McGraw and Taylor 1991: 15), the agency has helped to nearly eradicate black farmers through decades of racism in its farm agencies.

Under the department’s watch, the number of black farmers has plummeted 97 percent from the 1920s, from 925,000 to fewer than 23,000 today.

\textsuperscript{327} The campaign was successful. In 2000, the Louisville Board of Alders overrode the mayor’s veto and established a civilian oversight board (\textit{balancing the scales}, 30 July 2000). Despite the vote, another instance of police violence occurred in January (\textit{balancing the scales}, 31 January 2001).

\textsuperscript{328} \textit{balancing the scales}, 5 April 2000, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{329} \textit{balancing the scales}, 25 May 2000.

\textsuperscript{330} \textit{balancing the scales}, 4 December 2000.

\textsuperscript{331} Historically, significant numbers of other minority groups have not farmed in Kentucky. The group’s agenda, however, seems sufficiently inclusive to encompass members of other minority groups should they enter Kentucky agriculture. As indicated previously, CFA members have expressed concern about the treatment of employees, often Latinos, in industrial farm situations. The group also reached out to Native Americans, members of the Beaver Creek Nation in Clinton County (\textit{CFA News}, October/November 1997).

\textsuperscript{332} \textit{CFA News}, August 1993.

\textsuperscript{333} \textit{CFA News}, April/May 1999.

McGraw and Taylor cite incidents of racism, from 1965 through the present, taken from reports by the US Commission on Civil Rights and interviews with black farmers struggling to retain their livelihoods.

Even after black farmers began emerging from the South’s sharecropping culture and began buying farms, white farmers took control of the USDA county offices. Many of the offices became bastions of racism, independent of supervision from Washington (McGraw and Taylor 1991: 16).

The pattern of racism is opposed by William Payne, the USDA’s deputy associate director for equal opportunity in the Office of Advocacy and Enterprise, who said, “Sometime in the future we will see in a museum an exhibit called ‘The Black Farmer.’ I think that dramatizes the failure of the department in civil rights programs better than anything else.”

Struggling to protect black farmers in Kentucky, CFA asserted that the state’s settlement funds should be used to develop specific programs for African-American farmers. When the tobacco settlement bill was passed, CFA won the inclusion of a requirement of racial and gender equity on the local committees that will administer tobacco settlement funds.³³⁵

Both groups have also taken strong stances against sexism. In 1996, CFA created a “Women’s Project”³³⁶ designed to develop an understanding of “the structural factors underlying poverty and wealth, examine local issues, analyze the connections between issues, and put together strategies for continued action.” CFA held that women had direct interests in the family farm system:

While the American farming system has not traditionally been a realm of women’s empowerment, the strong trend away from family-scale agriculture represented by corporate agriculture has sparked much needed action among rural women.

Rural organizing is increasingly an area of women’s empowerment. . . becoming a way for women’s voices to be heard in communities and in government.³³⁷

Increased violence among men who were losing their farms had resulted in increases in both spousal and child abuse. CFA officer Lynn Chaney located the increased violence toward women and children within a general system of gender inequalities:

As every woman knows, however—and some experience it harshly—power in the United States is anything but equitably distributed. We also know that in the last decade the gap between the rich and the poor has been increasing and that women single heads of households, workers and African-American women make up a disproportionate percentage of those living in poverty. CFA believes women know a great deal about economic forces, especially those women who are most directly affected by the policies benefiting the privileged.³³⁸

The project consisted of a series of workshops on “Women, Economics, and Poverty,” What is Sexism and Who Benefits?” “Analysis of the Makeup of the State Legislature and Current Policies on Women,” and two sessions entitled “Women and Men Confronting Sexism–Dialogue with Role Playing.” Later that year, CFA addressed a women’s conference. One member explained how important the group had been to her as a woman in this way:

CFA has been such an important part of my life. We work hard but we have the power of an organization behind us. CFA has validated me as a farmer and as a woman and for that I will always be grateful.

Fighting sexism has been part of KFTC’s platform since 1998. The group sponsored a Pay Equity bill requiring that all state employees receive equal pay for equal work, despite their gender. Although KFTC has not mounted a campaign specifically geared toward sexism, some female members saw the welfare issues that KFTC was tackling as directly related to sexism. For example, one woman wrote about workfare abuses:

I have a sister that is raising a 16 year old [sic]. She is putting her through school. She also has to work 30 hours a week in order to draw a small welfare check and food stamps.

Don’t get me wrong. I’m not against women working. But I am if the man is a dead-beat dad. All these men need to be brought to justice and support the kids they helped bring into the world. This is what’s hurting the health and welfare system.

Another female member wrote:

This present welfare system is another way for men to control women. They are losing control (women are filling jobs that used to be for men only) and they don’t want to have any of the drudgery associated with raising children and keeping a house.

State Rep. Mark Anderson of Arizona wants to use $2 million in state tax dollars to fund Bill 2620 to provide women on welfare with the ‘skills required to succeed in the marriage market.’ Among the skills to be taught are ‘positive thinking and attitude adjustment techniques’ and ‘understanding economic and personal benefits of marriage.’

Does anyone else find this as insulting and demeaning as I do? Men would love to go back to the era when they were in total control. If we are not careful, they will achieve their ends.

---
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Both groups have adopted inclusionary policies and work frequently with groups with similar agendas. Women and African-Americans play active leadership roles, setting policies, organizing, lobbying, holding press conferences, and fundraising. Neither group has given any indication that it would not welcome other minority groups that move into the state. Both groups have also become involved with activist groups across the globe and have articulated critiques of development that indicate awareness of similarities between the Kentucky’s development priorities and those in less developed nations.

Global ties

In 1997, *balancing the scales* reprinted an editorial from the *Lexington Herald-Leader* that criticized Governor Paul Patton’s strategy of seeking branch plants to relocate in Kentucky. The editorial writer compared Kentucky to a South American country, writing:344

> In a former life, Gov. Paul Patton must have been a leader of small and poor South American country.

> Gov. Patton stood before the Kentucky Appalachian Commission and outlined a banana republic development strategy. If Patton sticks to his guns, there won’t be a Silicon Valley in Eastern Kentucky. There’ll just be a whole bunch of valleys filled with people living on low wages and limited futures.

Given the state’s history of cooperating with out-of-state corporations who exploited Kentucky’s natural resources and labor, the editorial writer’s analogy is apt. An argument might be made that Kentucky suffered from what McClintock (1994: 295) has called internal colonization which occurs when a “dominant part of a country treats a group or region as it might a foreign country.” This history is evoked in the concern about corporate integrators who KFTC and CFA have criticized for paying low wages and in the environmental damage that they, like the mining, timber, and gas companies who preceded them into Kentucky, have been charged with causing. Further, in the case of CFA, the loss of control experienced by farmers who contract with corporate integrators evokes the Southern experience of sharecropping with its attendant classism, sexism and racism.

KFTC’s newspaper indicates that the group feels an affinity for workers and poor people in less developed countries. For example, one of the films recommended as a leadership resource examines connections between the chemical disaster in Bhopal, India and West Virginia’s Kenawha Valley,345 a film festival fundraiser featured *From the Mountains to the Maquiladoras* which considers the connections between plant closings in Tennessee and the plight of women workers in Mexican plants, a letter to the editor advocated forgiveness of ‘third world’ nations’ debts to the World Bank and International Monetary Fund,346 and the group has hosted delegates from less developed nations, including a Hungarian activist.347 Long-time member Daymon Morgan, who had hosted Guatemalan activists, took up the study of Spanish at the age of 65, and

---
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later, sponsored by the Commission on Religion in Appalachia, visited Nicaragua. In a report to KFTC, Morgan wrote:  

I found I had a lot of things in common with these people. We agreed on the need for us all to go back to organic farming. We shared the experience of living in an area where big corporations have power, control the resources and the land, and can do pretty much what they want to. I believe in the principles that these people live with—all they want is to be left alone so they can get a start in the world. The campesinos, the farmers were so damaged by the war. Now they just want a chance to maintain their cultures and their lifestyles.

The United States government doesn’t have a very good image as far as our actions toward the Nicaraguans. I don’t think we get the whole picture when we live in this country about what the U.S. has done in Nicaragua or how we contribute to the conditions there.


KFTC gives awards to members who go to jail, lose a job or face other major adversities because of their work for social justice. In 2000, KFTC took a stand against sweatshop labor when it presented a group of University of Kentucky students with the social justice award for being willing to put their own well-being and safety on the line to support the work they believe in, resulting in their arrest in April at a sit-in for sweatshop reform at UK.

CFA locates itself within a global system of agriculture that it sees as threatened by agribusinesses’ practices. The group was adamantly opposed to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and to the inclusion of agriculture in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) on the grounds that “farmers need more than low-priced exports.” In response to what it saw as NAFTA’s threat to food safety, CFA maintained, “The time is now and the place is Kentucky to establish the link between consumers and farmers.” The group made alliances with labor groups fighting the trade agreements and with French farmers who also opposed GATT. CFA did not see the trade agreements as a partisan political issue: President Clinton’s version of NAFTA was no improvement over that of President Bush’s, the group

348 balancing the scales, 9 December 1993, p. 3.
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Members also gave various reasons for their opposition. For example, one female member charged:

A free market might be an answer if it were really free. The large corporations have manipulated the market so it is not free. Family farmers must receive the cost of production and a return of their investment.

The key issue is food for all people. Corporate farms jeopardize the food supply. Unfair competition jeopardizes the family farmer who is the best hope for a stable food supply.

Then-director Hal Hamilton maintained that CFA was not opposed to free trade but wanted “freer trade”:

The supporters of NAFTA are primarily big corporations. In agriculture the list of pro-NAFTA forces includes all the agri-business companies, grain companies, chemical companies, the Farm Bureau and many of the commodity groups. The environmental groups that support NAFTA are all corporate-funded. The groups that oppose NAFTA are grassroots.

I’ll side with the grassroots. But let’s not see this as protectionism versus free trade. Let’s urge our politicians to go back and negotiate a new NAFTA and a new GATT, trade agreements that expand jobs and production in a way that truly benefits everyone, with jobs in Mexico that pay well and include the right to organize. Let’s raise instead of lowering standards for pesticides on food. Let’s make sure that companies instead of taxpayers clean up the waste stream from factories.

Let’s not be opposed to free trade. Let’s be forward thinking and propose freer trade in the interests of people. Let’s be wary, however, when it’s a bunch of big companies that just want to be free to move across borders, exploit cheap labor, and dump their wastes in the river.

CFA opposed GATT because it:

Would drive up the federal deficit by $28 billion, . . . eliminate over one million textile and apparel jobs, . . . put more family farmers out of work, . . . undermine our environmental laws, . . . jeopardize food safety (U.S. forced to import food that doesn’t meet our pesticide residue laws and the European Union has identified our new nutritional labeling laws as a ‘non tariff trade barrier’ to be repealed), GATT would give a new international organization, the WTO [World Trade Organization], the power to rule our federal, state and local laws illegal, GATT would allow more exploitation of child labor.

356 *CFA News*, October 1993, p. 3.
The group also had contacts with Nicaraguan farmers and a Hungarian agriculture student, and ran a story about the crisis of farms in post-Communist Poland.

**Differences across genres**

The major differences (other than the content indicated in Table 3.1, newspaper format and KFTC’s campaign against heteronormativity) occur in the intensity of language, the ranges of thematics, in the identification of specific government agencies and politicians as impediments to the types of social change that both groups advocate, and in the use of humor, particularly satire. As indicated previously, especially in the case of KFTC, the language in newspapers tends to be stronger than that used at the hearings or on the groups’ web sites. Additionally, the groups’ frustrations often surfaced in the newspapers as well.

Where members of both groups alluded to concerns about enforcement of the regulations at the hearings, both groups’ newspapers delineated a very specific history of problems resulting from corporate activities that were often supported by government agencies and officials. Members’ experiences with less-than-zealous government agencies and politicians who both groups maintained were too close to corporations were articulated in the adamant insistence that the regulations contain a joint liability provision. Because government agencies were viewed as unlikely to enforce any regulations passed, the joint liability provision was necessary to discourage integrators from locating in Kentucky. Thus, residents would not be placed at the mercy of what they assumed would be lax or negligent enforcement of the regulations.

Although neither group deployed humor at the hearings, both regularly use humor, sometimes differently, to make a point and engage members in their newspapers, at organization gatherings, and at protests. For example, KFTC held a “Cookies for Cleanup” bake sale “to publicize the Kentucky Waste Management Task Force’s failure to recommend sufficient funding for the state’s Waste Management Fund” which is used for cleanup of the state’s hazardous waste disposal sites, staged mock funerals for Lake Cumberland and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, burlesqued corporate campaign donations to politicians with the “Fat Cat Theater,” and stressed odors associated with industrial farming on a KFTC-CFA “Swine Safari” in Allen County, and, with the Sierra Club and Ohio River Valley Watch, on a “Tour de Stench” related to poultry farms in Hopkins County.

CFA’s use of humor differs stylistically from KFTC: CFA regularly prints humorous cartoons in its newspaper. Figure 3.2 is a cartoon drawn by *Lexington Herald-Leader* cartoonist Joel Pett, which the group has reprinted on T-shirts sold to raise funds.
CFA also staged a “moo” protest during a dairy farmers’ dispute with national dairy cooperative representatives. CFA supplied attendees at a meeting with “moo cow” toys that were used to “moo” disapproval of cooperative representatives’ statements.371 A CFA member who had attended the meeting reported happily that meeting officials “said they felt that the CFA members (and dairy farmers from across the nation) who used the ‘mooers’ were not showing ‘proper respect’ when they filled the air with low ‘moos. . . .’”372

**Similarities across genres**

Both groups’ stances on sexism and racism are consistent across genres. Also, Christian beliefs are important components of both groups’ imaginaries.373 Nineteen of the 36 groups that contributed to KFTC are affiliated with organized religions and 18 of that 19 are Christian. Of the 18 Christian funding groups, eight are affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church that, especially through the participation of Sister Marie Gangwish, a Roman Catholic nun and long-term KFTC member who had worked in eastern Kentucky for 26 years, has played an important role in the construction of the group’s social justice imaginary.374 Another female member, using the Jubilee 2000 discourse,375 framed her call for forgiving less developed nations’ debts in terms of the Bible.376

370 Ibid.
373 Horwitz (1998) refers to the importance of church groups in rural activism in the Midwest. He (1998: 35) reports on a 1994 sermon, “Community, Church and Large-Scale Hog Production,” in an Iowa Catholic Church and a conference session titled “The Theology of Hog Confinement.” He also notes the importance of coalitions of Methodist, Baptists Catholics (especially under the leadership of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference), and academic-agnostics.
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If the tradition of forgiving loans every 50 years was followed as in Leviticus of
the Old Testament, the poor countries could start back on the road to recovery.
This would benefit the whole world by lessening conflicts that arise from
poverty, drug and arms trading and environmental exploitation by international
logging, mining, and oil corporations.

Like KFTC, CFA also sought alliances with existing agricultural groups but, because
CFA’s local orientation differed from other agricultural groups, “[c]hurch activists proved more
important to the early development of CFA” (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 134). The director of
Kentucky Catholic Rural Life, leaders of the Christian Church and the Kentucky Appalachian
Ministry played crucial roles in the CFA’s early years, as did a staff person loaned to the group
by the Quaker American Friends Service Committee “who recruited CFA’s first significant
numbers of African American members” (Hamilton and Ryan 1993: 134). CFA has maintained
close ties to many religious groups. For example, in 1994, the group held an appreciation dinner
for Sister Gayle Brabec, the director of the Rural Life Office of the Archdiocese of Louisville,377
the Kentucky Appalachian Ministry and Lexington Seminary conducted a number of workshops,
called the Tobacco Church, “to help seminarians understand the tobacco culture,”378 and CFA
members have hosted students from the Appalachian Ministry Experience Resource Center.379
Additionally, the group has had members who are ministers.380 The Christian imaginary frames
this female member’s outrage about industrial farming practices and her sense of betrayal by a
farmer friend:381

The plague has again come to the Earth but this plague is not sent by God but by
rich corporations, politicians unwilling to stand up for the people, and
bureaucrats willing to look the other way for a few gold coins, and the supposed
friend [who she later refers to as ‘Judas’] who will do anything to pad his own
nest.

Since Marx382 declared, “religion is the opiate of the people,” leftists have tended to be
suspicious of religion, treating religious beliefs as indicators of an affinity for ‘tradition’ that is
represented as antithetical to ‘progress’. Yet, as Cloke (1993) notes, religious beliefs can also be
the basis for calls for more egalitarian practices and policies, as is the case with liberation
theology in Mexico (Evans and Long 1997). The Christianity of both groups is expressed in their
social and environmental agendas. As indicated here, both groups are committed to challenging
hegemonic social hierarchies of class, race, gender, rurality (and KFTC has also targeted
sexuality), and both assert the necessity of a form of stewardship of the land and careful
husbandry of natural resources.

This notion of stewardship can be based in biblical notions of the natural world as part of
God’s creation.

378 CFA News, August 1994, p.7. Notice of other such workshops ran in the December 1991, October/November
380 CFA News, June 1996 and October/November 1997
382 Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right. Introduction. 1844.
In the Christian Bible one can trace some of the roots of how the environment has been viewed and treated within Western society and social theory. Typically, people point to the passage in Genesis in which God orders Adam and Eve to ‘dominate and subdue’ the Earth and ‘go forth and multiply’ which demonstrates the extremely anthropocentric character of Christianity. This anthropocentrism within Christianity is an attitude to the nonhuman world in which the environment is viewed and valued instrumentally (Barry 1999: 38).

Barry (1999) chronicles the Christian adoption of the “Great Chain of Being’ theory, which, like Linnaeus’ categories, posited a hierarchical chain of life forms in which humans were ranked the highest.383 Regardless of the hierarchy posited, in this view, because humans had not made the world, it was not theirs to use solely as they wished; they had to answer to the creator. To honor the creator, the world had to be maintained as is or ‘improved’. But, by the beginnings of the industrial revolution, the legitimation of natural resource uses by the notion of “God’s Creation”, with its implicit limits on what humans could do to the environment, had been replaced by an Enlightenment-derived “non-moral, economic” (Barry 1999: 43) instrumental approach to natural resource use.384

Many environmentalists who hold that the Judeo-Christian religions have sanctioned abuse of the environment have appropriated indigenous religious beliefs that they assert were more protective of the environment. In the US, Earth First! has adopted American Indian spirituality (Milton 1996). This is troublesome for three reasons. First, it is a form of continuing white colonialism of American Indians in the form of white cultural appropriation of Indian belief systems that sustains continued white dominance (Alexie 1994). Second, it maintains a primitive/civilized or West/non-West binary through a romanticization of the ‘primitive’ and ‘non-West’ (Milton 1996). Thirdly, it fails to interrogate the category ‘natural’ (Whatmore 1999).

Other environmentalists have rethought their relationships to the natural world within Christianity. Process theology, which began at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, was retrieved from theoretical philosophy (and the influence of Alfred North Whitehead’s thought) in the 1960s when it became a justification for human liberation (Cobb Jr. 1994). From human liberation, process theologians moved into consideration of inter-faith dialogue, ecology, feminism, and pastoral work (Cobb Jr. 1994). Although there are no references to process theology in any of the genres studied, the Christianity that motivates KFTC and CFA members’ calls for social and environmental justice fits more comfortably within the tenets of process theology than within the more mainstream forms of Christianity.385

Across genres, both groups view Kentucky as a site in need of protection from government-sanctioned corporate abuses. KFTC’s representation of Kentucky is that of a natural resource colony whose land and people have been exploited by out-of-state corporations and by government agencies and politicians who have cooperated with the exploiters. A KFTC editorial

---
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384 Christian theology was not antithetically opposed to what Barry (1999) calls non-moral economic thought. For example, although his study was flawed by Enlightenment assumptions of rationality/irrationality and Occident/Orient and notions of a unitary subject, Weber (1992) examined the linkages between the rationalization of Protestant thought and capitalist accumulation.
385 I will discuss the more traditional Christian approach to human/environment and human relations generally in my analysis of KFB.
equated Appalachian and Central American political struggles: “More than a century after
gaining their national independence, Central Americans still struggle for democracy and freedom
from outside domination (much like the struggle to free the Appalachian coal fields from outside
domination).”

CFA’s representation is focused more upon out-of-state agribusinesses and the role of the
state’s land grant university and state and federal agricultural agencies. In a letter to members,
then-CFA President Lynn Chaney described the effects of this collaboration:

The associations that farmers have historically relied on to promote the
commodities we grow, such as the Pork Producers and the Cattlemen’s Beef
Board now use our money to promote agribusiness at the expense of family
farmers. The government agencies charged with protecting and promoting family
farming, such as USDA and Farm Services Agency likewise protect agribusiness
while throwing inadequate lifelines to farmers.

Both groups’ foci upon the ways in which government agencies and politicians have
collaborated with outside corporations challenges representations of Kentucky as subject solely
to outside invasion. Both groups assert that Kentucky can be a more democratic locale. Through
the councils established by the tobacco settlement agreement, CFA also sees Kentucky as a site
in which a new model of sustainable agriculture can be developed.

Also across genres, as previously mentioned, both groups represent Kentucky as rural
without defining what constitutes rurality. KFTC’s focus upon mining and logging has involved
the group in rural locales since its inception but it has also made alliances with urban groups,
especially groups in Louisville and Lexington. Because KFTC sees that rural and urban residents
have much in common, it is unlikely that the group would treat each category as a separate
bounded entity.

Because of CFA’s agricultural mission and because farming takes place within rural
areas, CFA has focused almost solely upon the rural. As evidenced by CFA’s fight against
consolidation of rural schools, the group thinks that local schools are an important component of
rurality. CFA’s vision of community-supported agriculture and its efforts to make
connections to urban food consumers posits agricultural products as the link between rural and
urban sites. In this vision, the borders between the rural and urban are permeable and each is
dependent upon the other. In both visions, rural areas struggling to become viable entities, are
hampered by a lack of local revenues that has resulted from governmental support of large, often
multinational, urban-based corporations.

Across genres, both groups maintain strict borders between ‘traditional’ and industrial
farming. Motivations for this representation are complex. Some view traditional farming with
nostalgia for a past that is represented as preferable to the present. For example, one female
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390 CFA’s notion of community-supported agriculture consists of a marketing initiative through which consumers
who become members receive a supply of fresh, organic locally-grown produce at below-market prices and, at the
same time, farmers are guaranteed an income (CFA News, October 1999).
KFTC member warned farmers considering contracting with an integrator: “Farmers may be saving their grandfather’s farm but a confined animal feeding operation is not your grandfather’s farming. . . Our grandfathers’ farming was a wonderful balance of the use of land, water and product.” Unquestionably, as indicated by Ufkes (1995, 1998) ‘traditional’ and industrial hog farming practices differ dramatically, however, traditional farming has also replied upon technologies and the speaker’s representation of a ‘wonderful balance’ is open to interrogation. Certainly, prior to industrial farming practices which are not dependent on maintenance of soil quality, farmers were motivated to maintain environmental conditions on their farms. There is, however, substantial evidence that many had not achieved that goal (Reichelderfer-Smith 1994). There are other reasons to maintain a traditional/industrial border.

At the 1998 annual meeting, a CFA member told me that it was crucial to maintain the distinction between traditional and industrial farming because, unlike farming, industries are subject to anti-monopoly laws. Thus, if classified as industrial, corporate integrators might be subject to lawsuits. Additionally, because the notion of traditional farming encompasses a broad array of social relationships that KFTC and CFA members (and, as previously indicated, some academics) assert are jeopardized by industrial farming practices, the valorization of traditional farming is also a privileging of the types of relations based on autonomy discussed earlier.

Overlooked in this argument, however, is that the sustainable farming practices advocated by KFTC and CFA is not ‘traditional’ in terms of American farming practices for the past 50 years. American agriculture, since the American green revolution of the 1950s, has been primarily intensive and heavily dependent upon petrochemical inputs—pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides (Cochrane 1993). Tradition is temporally bounded. If tradition constitutes the last 50 years of American agriculture, sustainable agriculture is a discursive shift.

Also across genres, neither group attributes their struggles to ‘market forces’ nor do they see them as a temporary aberration resulting from ‘progress’. Instead, both groups maintain that ‘market forces’ are not the results of neutral laws of supply and demand but are actively constituted by power relations that can be changed. As previously indicated, both groups see power relations maintained by systems of differentiation and practices that benefit some at the expense of many. In reply to the question of why small family farms are being replaced by industrial operations, citing Thu and Durrenberger (1998), CFA said:393

The industrial agricultural industry is not at the mercy of the market pressures of supply and demand, they are in fact, creating it and small-scale farmers are suffering as a result.

A quotation from Frederick Douglas appears in the same issue of CFA News:394 “Power concedes nothing without demand, It never did, it never will.”

Through KEJA, both KFTC and CFA, have focused upon development policies as one of the primary means by which hegemonic relations are sustained in Kentucky. KFTC sees corporate tax incentive deals as “a part of an unfair pattern of redistributing taxes from corporations to individual taxpayers.” KFTC was equally suspicious of the motivations behind a 1995 debate about state budget priorities and cuts. An editorial about a statewide budget debate

392 balancing the scales, 5 April 2001, p.1.
395 balancing the scales, 30 July 2000, p. 7.
in 1995 in *balancing the scales*\(^{396}\) was headlined: “Seeing the budget debate for what it is: Policy-making being done under the guise of budget reform.”

Additionally, across genres, KFTC and CFA are challenging the epistemologies of agricultural ‘experts,’ government agencies, and agribusiness corporations by inserting the competing discourses of social scientists, ecologists and environmentalists into the debate. Though their representations of the natural world as active and insistence upon the permeability of human-environment borders, they are arguing that the technocratic control asserted by their opponents is at best questionable. Although KFTC and CFA assert the need for more stringent regulation to govern industrial farmers, they are also arguing the regulations should be sufficiently stringent to account for the complexities of biophysical systems. By extension, they are arguing that what scientists understand as requirements that facilitate ‘healthy’ processes of complex natural systems should also be considered as agents of governmentality.

It is significant that the hearing comments referred continually to hog waste yet the actual hog itself was not mentioned. Again, this may be the result of the constraints inherent in arguing in terms that the Cabinet could accept, or from a centuries old understanding that livestock exists to produce meat and other products for humans. Animal rights groups tend to be urban- rather than rural-based. Yet, while waiting on the porch for the “Swine Safari” to begin in 1988, one of the tour members\(^{397}\) said that he had been told by a person who had worked at an industrial hog farm that undersize shoats were routinely ground up, alive, to be fed to the other hogs. The fact that the story could have been apocryphal notwithstanding, everyone who heard the story was revolted. Also, in a letter to the *CFA News*, a man\(^{398}\) wrote of the three wishes he would make if he encountered a genie in a bottle. His first wish was that people would “understand the importance of farms, farmers, and farm communities to the realization of our national ideals,” and his third wish was that “the real farmer will continue to exist, and to keep alive the faith in nature and themselves. . . .”\(^{399}\) His second wish was:

> By some means, when we leave this room tonight, every confined pig and sow, broiler and breeder, cow and calf, confined on factory farms and feed lots in concentrations in excess of the numbers deemed appropriate by the wise leadership of CFA of KY, will have been by inexplicable means liberated from their bonds and buildings. These genetically engineered and indiverse [sic] creatures will then proceed to the fields of industrial farmers and the warehouses and storage facilities of agribusiness and over the next several days will consume all the existing stock of genetically engineered crops and seeds. They will then expire.\(^{400}\)

The horrified author would likely agree with Watts’ (2000: 300) use of the phrase “Frankensteinian enclosure”\(^{401}\) to describe confined animal feeding practices. I will discuss the cyborg nature of genetically altered hogs in a later chapter but for now it is important to note

---

396 *balancing the scales*, 16 October 1995, p. 2.
397 I do not know if the person was a KFTC or CFA member.
398 I cannot say with any surety that the man is a CFA member.
400 It is not possible, from the letter alone, to determine if the author’s concern about industrial livestock practices entailed a denial of hybridity.
401 Watts, however, was writing about industrial chicken operations.
some participants attempted to insert the body of the hog into the debate. I will discuss their comments in Chapter Seven.

KFTC and CFA are asserting a counterhegemonic discourse that relies upon alterations in both intra- and interdiscursive dependencies. Members of both groups (as well as the majority of participants in the debate) have supported the Cabinet’s inclusion of ecological and public health discourses into the discursive formation of science asserted by the Farm Bureau and agricultural experts.\textsuperscript{402} This addition has changed the relationship between elements of the discursive formation of science as well as the relationship between science and agriculture that had formerly been based solely upon the knowledges produced by agricultural scientists. Thus it has challenged the generalizations assumed by the Cabinet and precludes what KFB maintains should be agricultural alternatives. Further, these additions have also created space for KFTC and CFA to develop a counterhegemonic discourse of sustainable agriculture, living wages, and elimination of discriminatory practices. Despite this new space, however, the Cabinet has tended to valorize other modes of discourse over the descriptive mode used by CFA and KFTC (as well as other activists).\textsuperscript{403}

Through the medium of the hearings, CFA and KFTC were able to extend the spaces in which they articulated their counterhegemonic discourse, circulating it throughout a larger number of locales in Kentucky than they had reached prior to the onset of the debate. The additions of ecology and public health discursive formations threatened the existing hierarchy of agricultural scientists. CFA and KFTC were also able to articulate a critique of the technocratic and economic imaginaries posited by the Farm Bureau. Those imaginaries and their underlying epistemologies are the subject of the next two chapters.

\textsuperscript{402} The majority of participants have argued that the discourses of ecology and public health should be weighted more heavily by the Cabinet.

\textsuperscript{403} I will describe these other modes of discourse in Chapter Six.
INTERPOLATION #2

Sow

Here we enter a world in which capital does not merely appropriate nature, then turn it into commodities that function as elements of constant and variable capital (to use Marxist categories), but rather a world in which capital remakes nature and its products biologically and physically (and politically and ideologically) in its own image.404


Tired, very tired. Can barely move back to cage.407 Sleep.

Out of the cage. Walking. Another building,408 another cage, a little larger.

Tired, very tired. Another needle.409

They’re crowding me. Too warm. Cramped, no space to move. Constant baby noises.

Teats hurt. They’re tugging on me, walking on me. How many are there? They squirm, can’t tell.

What’s that smell? Baby diarrhea. On them. On me.

One isn’t moving. They’re taking him away.

Babies are gone.410 Relief. Stretch, sleep.

405 Gestation room where sows are artificially inseminated.
406 The number of litters per year vary, however “USDA reports that over the past decade sows have been having more litters per year (2.3 vs. 1.9) and that more of the pigs in those litters were weaned successfully, especially on larger farms” (Horwitz 1998: 92).
407 Into original crate where she will stay until pregnancy is determined until she is ready to deliver when she is transferred to a farrowing house.
408 Farrowing house where birthing and nursing takes place.
409 Antibiotics.
410 In the commonly used early weaning system, piglets are taken from their mother at 7-21 days and moved into a nursery. Early weaning is popular because, the sooner the litter is weaned, the more quickly the sow will re-enter the breeding cycle. By reducing “the number of ‘non-roductive days’—when a sow is neither pregnant nor lactating can effectively increase the size of the herd. You get more litters per year without investing in more facilities,
Moving again. Weak and wobbly. Another cage. Noise. Others are screaming. Tired, must sleep.

No, not *that* room again. No more needles.


thereby also decreasing the costs of shelter per sow and removing a potential bottleneck at the farrowing house” (Horwitz 1998: 83).

411 Back to the general population.
412 “. . .there is widespread agreement that early-weaned pigs are more profitable by something like 5 to 15 percent. An enthusiast . . . calculated that a typical new operation (starting with 465 sows and a 96-crate farrowing house) could increase efficiency and herd size sufficient to accrue an additional $93,000 per year” (Horwitz 1998: 83).
413 Her body will be taken out of the farrowing house and dumped on a pile of other dead animals for disposal.
CHAPTER FOUR

KFB and knowledge-producing institutions

For what the male imaginary has difficulty in conceiving, or fears to conceive, is that his base, the earth/woman, might turn, and turn on her own axis. 414

Through an analysis of KFB’s discourse and strategies in the debate, this chapter explores the linkages between “capital, state and science institutions and practices” (Whatmore 1991: 305) that have encouraged the technologies that are altering sociospatial relations in many of the state’s agricultural locales. Although members of other groups, including the Kentucky Pork Producers, Kentucky Corn Growers’ Association, Kentucky Hog Marketing Association, and farmers who have contracted with agribusiness firms, also argued to weaken and/or eliminate the regulations, my analysis will focus upon KFB because the group is an important participant in the debate—it has existed longer than any other group involved in the debate, its ties to knowledge producing institutions have helped it amass considerable political clout at the state and national levels and self-identified Farm Bureau members constituted the majority of those who took the positions analyzed in this chapter. I am seeking the group’s thematics, in particular, its construction of environmentalists as enemy.

In this chapter, I examine the conditions under which the group formed, tracing institutional ties to knowledge-producing organizations and indicating how the group has deployed these knowledges in its argument to weaken the proposed regulations. The histories I cite here are representations of KFB prepared for a broad audience, including KFB members, government officials, and members of the general public. The group’s Policies, Resolutions and Recommendations are produced annually for members and, because they are the basis for the group’s lobbying efforts, for state legislators and state and federal agricultural agencies. Importantly, although the KFB’s president has described the group’s policy development process as occasionally contentious,415 there is no indication of dissensus; policies, recommendations and resolutions are presented as unanimous. Comments made at the public hearings were designed to influence Cabinet personnel and show KFB members that the group was working to protect their interests, which were assumed to be freedom to pursue industrial farming practices without governmental interference. I analyze hearing comments within context of the positions taken in the histories.

KFB histories

The cover of Stanford’s history, titled History of the Kentucky Farm Bureau, features a line art drawing of a white male standing at a podium from which he is addressing a large crowd of (also white) men. The absence of women in the cover art is indicative of the group’s tendency to maintain a division between the public as male space and private as female. The 1969 history,


415 All Around Kentucky, November 1999, p.2.
Progress and Promise: Kentucky Farm Bureau After 50 Years, features a full-color photograph of a large Kentucky farm on the cover. Inside, in a section headlined “The members decide,” there are two photos of men presumably discussing policy—in one photo a group of shirt-sleeved white men seated at a table are engaged in lively discussion; in the second, suited members of the group’s executive board are seated around a large conference table (there is only one woman seated at the table416). There is also only one woman in the formal photograph of the board of directors on a following page.

The ways in which KFB became institutionalized is important because it has contributed to the development of the group’s hegemony in the state. I argue that its institutional ties to land grant universities and state and national government agricultural agencies were crucial because they contributed to the group’s hegemony which has been based upon knowledges produced by land grant universities and agricultural agencies and then transferred through Extension agents to farmers. The current ties between the national and state Farm Bureaus and agricultural knowledge producing institutions are longstanding.

U.S. land grant colleges were formed as a result of the 1865 federal Morrill Act and 22 years later, the Hatch Act established funding mechanisms for agricultural experiments at the state level to augment the USDA’s research program (Cochrane 1993). In 1911, the USDA forged cooperative agreements with state agricultural colleges to initiate and run demonstration farms (Stanford 1957). The new cooperative agents, who sought a farmers’ organization to help them to transfer new farming methods to individual farmers, were aided by passage of the 1914 federal Smith-Lever Act that allocated funds for each agricultural county in the U.S. to hire a county agent, stimulating the growth of County Extension (Stanford 1957). Once agents were in place, they began a campaign to seek local farmers’ groups to assist them with the process of technology transfer (Stanford 1957). Stanford (1957: 12) reported that the local Chamber of Commerce was instrumental in establishing the first county Farm Bureau to work with ‘rural’ issues in Broome County, New York in 1914. Although Stanford (1957: 12) noted that the “name ‘Farm Bureau’ was not a particularly fortunate one, especially in view of today’s criticisms and protests against excessive government bureaucracy,” the organization was sufficiently successful that:

... soon a number of states were requiring a county organization of farmers before a county agent would be appointed or approved. It also was required that this organization be formed on a membership dues basis and that it must pledge a certain amount of financial support, as well as assist the county agent in working out a program (Stanford 1957:12).

KFB was initiated in 1919 and chartered under state law in 1921. Stanford (1957: 14) attributes the desire for a state organization as emerging from “the practice of inviting the Farm Bureau presidents to attend conferences at the state agricultural colleges in connection with the farmers’ work program or as part of the annual meeting of county agents.” He (13-14) reports that

[t]he setting up of Farm Bureau association was a natural and logical development that grew as county Farm Bureaus became numerous and active.

416 She does not appear to be a secretary. Like the men at the table, she is looking at papers in front of her.
The idea of centralization was already established through the existence of state leaders and specialists, usually located at the land grant college. Thus, from the outset, KFB was intimately connected to land grant knowledge production.

Members of KFB attended the 1914 Chicago meeting at which the American Farm Bureau was formed (Stanford 1957). Currently, KFB reports a membership of 400,000 families enrolled in county Farm Bureaus in all 120 counties in the state, a number that places the Kentucky group in the top “two or three state Farm Bureaus for the last decade.” Memberships range from $20 for an individual to $30 for a family across the state. Although each county Farm Bureau acts autonomously in choosing its own leaders and establishing its own policy, the network of individual county Farm Bureaus is connected to the state and national Farm Bureau through dues, a portion of which is allocated to the state and national organizations, and delegates who are elected to serve on the state and national level.

KFB has an elected board of directors and employs an executive vice president who serves as administrator and chief executive officer, conducting programs and managing the professional staff. The group has formed four major divisions: public affairs, information-public relations, organization, and operations. Currently the group employs 40-45 people in its Louisville office. Another 300 people are employed by the group’s statewide insurance program that was established as the Kentucky Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company in 1944.

KFB’s policies are established by delegates, who have been elected by county Farm Bureau members at KFB’s annual meeting. Similarly, delegates elected by roughly 2,800 state Farm Bureaus in the U.S. establish the policies of the American Farm Bureau at its annual meeting. The American Farm Bureau, which claims a membership of more than five million families in 50 states and Puerto Rico, has a Board of Directors which consists of the president, vice president, 29 directors who must be state Farm Bureau presidents, and the chairs of both the women’s and young farmers and ranchers committees. The American Farm Bureau and state Farm Bureaus are among the most powerful lobbying groups in the US.

Surveys by Fortune magazine regularly rank the Farm Bureau as one of the top 25 most potent special interest groups in Washington, D.C. The organization is no less a formidable presence in state capitolns, county seats and rural communities. And its influence extends into business and financial circles to which it has major and profitable ties (Monks 2000: 16).

Because, as will be discussed later, KFB immediately differentiated itself from previous agricultural movements, some historical context is helpful to understanding the context in which KFB, and many other Farm Bureaus across the U.S., formed. Although the image of the yeoman farmer has been incorporated into American mythology (Berry 1975, 1981, 1995; Browne et al. 1992; Bunce 1994), this narrative obscures a history of agrarian radicalism in the U.S., a history that strongly influenced the policies subsequently adopted by local, state, and national Farm Bureaus.

417 KFB does not keep records on the numbers of people in families which it represents as father, mother, and children.
421 Ibid.
According to the yeoman narrative, the yeoman farmer was a family man who owned the land that he cleared from wilderness and cultivated to earn a living for himself and his family (Browne et al. 1992, Bunce 1994). The yeoman farmer and his family were tied to small communities through their participation in a variety of Christian churches and town activities, including schools. This rural ideal, which bears a strong resemblance to Tönnie’s notion of *gemeinschaft* and the British rural idyll (Bunce 1994), consists of a cozy domesticated landscape studded with the farmhouses of hardworking families and peaceful livestock, much like a painting by Grant Wood. The history of U.S. agrarian radicalism, however, stands in sharp opposition to the yeoman narrative.

Bunce (1994: 30-31) writes: 422

In the early part of the nineteenth century agrarianism was a term used to described populist farmers’ movements campaigning for the subversion of the prevailing landownership structure. Even Jefferson had no sympathy for those ‘agrarian and plundering enterprises’. . . .

Although Bunce references the activities of the Farmers’ Alliance, the Grange and southern agrarianism, he ignores substantial regional and political differences between the groups and omits the Non-Partisan League, arguably the most radical of agrarian populist movements. For example, Goodwyn’s (1978) research into the Farmers’ Alliance in Kansas, Texas, and other Midwestern states, presents a far more radical agenda (including the demand for agriculture currency and credit, government ownership of railroads, telephone and telegraph lines, a graduated income tax, shorter hours for labor, single terms for the U.S. president, direct election of U.S. Senators and “free silver” [unlimited coinage]) than the agenda of Southern populism which was shaped by racism that resulted from the region’s history of slavery and plantation agriculture (Howe 1986). Howe (1986) notes that regional differences on race between midwestern and southern Alliance members caused divisions that weakened the group politically. Shortridge (1989: 126) also reports regional differences:

Students debate the extent to which the Populist, Non-Partisan, and similar protest movements were environmentally caused, but they agree that the plains farmers of this period were distinct from those further to the east.

Bunce also ignores the important role that the Alliance and Populist Party played in national politics, especially during the 1892 and 1896 elections (Goodwyn 1978, Howe 1986).

The Non-Partisan League, founded in North Dakota in 1915, was arguably more radical than the Alliance whose platform was largely based upon farmers’ cooperatives and some government operation of relevant infrastructural components. Because the League’s platform incorporated more socialist goals, including state ownership of “elevators, banks, utilities and

422 Bunce’s analysis is flawed by his failure to note substantial evidence (Goodwyn 1978, Toole 1972, Shortridge 1989) that contradicts Jefferson’s characterization of agrarian radicals. Additionally, in his discussion of the linkages between agrarian radicalism and Christianity, Bunce subsumes very distinct geographically dispersed and different forms of Christianity (often practiced by different ethnic groups) under one broad category: fundamentalism, a pejorative term that characterizes ‘rural’ dwellers as ‘backward.’ This characterization of farmers in particular as ‘backward’ both reinscribes the traditionally Marxist notion of peasantry that has not yet ‘developed’ sufficiently to become enrolled in a revolutionary proletariat and American social science diffusion research devoted to convincing ‘backwards’ or ‘recalcitrant’ farmers to adopt new technologies.
other industries” in North Dakota, it ran into heavy opposition from the banks, grain houses, implement dealers, lumber companies and mail order houses who saw the group as a threat to “the very foundations of the private property system” (Howe 1986: 129). The group was successful in North Dakota where it controlled the state legislature until 1922 and spread out into other plains states.423

Additionally, Bunce ignores women’s activism in agrarian politics (Haney and Miller 1991). Women who belonged to the Alliance and Populist Party participated in conventions (occasionally holding state, but not national, offices), spoke, wrote and, with their children, devoted countless hours of voluntary labor.

Alliance women emerged as particularly effective commentators on the economic discontent of farmers in the 1880s and 1890s, not only because they used easily understood modes of communication—novels, poems, songs and letters to the editor—but because reformers saw the money issues in moral terms and women as moral arbitrators (Haney and Miller 1991: 116).

Because the Non-Partisan League also “advocated women’s direct involvement in politics by supporting women’s right to vote and continued schooling of farm women in agrarian politics by integrating women into the organization structure” (Haney and Miller 1991: 116), it also came under attack as a threat to the family.

I stress this history of radicalism for three reasons: 1) in many states those who opposed agrarian radicalism became founding members in state Farm Bureau organizations (Kenney et al. 1989); 2) because it challenges the hegemonic construction of farmers and the ‘rural’ as backwards and conservative; and 3) because it provides a historical context for women’s participation in agricultural politics as seen in the previous chapters.

### Systems of differentiation

From its inception, KFB constructed systems of differentiation from which it could advance itself. It has consistently asserted itself as ‘non-political’ and ‘bipartisan’ over against adversaries who it has represented as ‘political’ and ‘self-interested’. On the first page of Stanford’s (1957: 1-2) history, he distinguished the Farm Bureau from other agricultural groups by asserting that the other groups’ involvement in “politics” and “selfish interests” were primary reasons for their failures. Stanford (1957: 8) reported that the Farmers’ Alliance, which operated during the last quarter of the 19th century, was harmed by differences between “a strong element from the West demanding independent political action which was met by a conservative force from the South which considered this move unwise and untimely.” He (Stanford 1957: 8) cited the Alliance’s “loosely organized and poorly operated business ventures” as a second reason for failure.

Although the Farmers’ Educational and Cooperative Union, which was built upon the remains of the failed Farmers’ Alliance, initially tried to avoid “the errors” of the Alliance, it too succumbed to political involvement, according to Stanford (1957: 10):

---

423 In Montana the League formed an alliance with the Montana Labor League, an urban-type labor association but even this unusual cooperative effort could not withstand the control of the state by the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, Jim Hill’s Northern Pacific Railroad, and lumber companies (Toole 1972).
During recent years there has been a constant increase in the political activity of the Farmers’ Union leadership and the organization has been noted in later years for its close partnership and active cooperation with organized labor, particularly the CIO.

Unlike the Alliance, the Farmers’ Union’s cooperatives, at the time Stanford wrote the book, were “prospering under what appears to be capable management” but their affiliation with organized labor made them suspect (Stanford 1957: 10). The only group endorsed by KFB was the National Grange, which had adjusted its principles “along more conservative lines” (Stanford 1957: 6) and maintained a good relationship with KFB.

In this self-representation, KFB is successful because it operates democratically by drawing its base from county Farm Bureaus and independently ‘outside’ of politics and maintains a strong central organization with close ties to the national Farm Bureau. Stanford (1957: 3) described KFB as:

... a non-political and non-sectarian organization, composed of people of all shades of political affiliation and thought that are American in nature and its members come from all religious denominations. Farm Bureau must deal with politicians concerning political matters affecting agriculture, but its policy is to do this on a non-political or bi-partisan basis.

This representation simultaneously valorizes the group’s position as ‘American’ and represents differing positions as un-American. Before identifying the categories that constitute the group’s notion of properly ‘American’ political thought, it is important to note that which the group has excluded. Given Stanford’s discussion of the ‘failures’ of the Farmers’ Alliance and the Farmers’ Union as a result of their ‘political’ activities, the group is clearly demarcating a territory in which critiques of capitalism are ‘un-American.’ In his discussion of other groups’ failings, Stanford is critical of the Farmers’ Alliance’s call for the abolition of national banks, prohibition of agricultural futures markets, equal taxation, and demands for government ownership of “the means of communication and transportation” (1957:8). Although, in his critique of the Farmers’ Union, Stanford notes that the Farmers’ Union was the forerunner of the American Populist Party, he does not reference the Populist platform which included a graduated income tax, shorter hours for labor, single terms for the U.S. president, and direct election of U.S. Senators (Goodwyn 1978). Apparently these demands were deemed too radical to be worthy of mention.

Nor does Stanford specify the ‘radical’ activities of the Farmers’ Union. In his representation of the American West as a site of ‘radical’ thought and his failure to mention the Non-Partisan League, which was founded in North Dakota in 1915 and agitated for more socialist measures than the Farmers Union (Howe 1986), Stanford places agricultural sites in the American West outside of the Farm Bureau’s ‘America’. This is interesting because, at the same time, the national Farm Bureau contained representatives from these ‘unAmerican’ spaces.

KFB’s ‘America’ of 1957 was represented as “non-political or bi-partisan” over against the partisan political activities of ‘radicals’, both agricultural and industrial. “In effect, the Farm Bureau, largely a creation of the land grant universities and the Extension Service, came to play an important role in defusing the potential for agrarian unrest as a sort of legitimized farmer’s
advocacy organization” (Kenney et al. 1989: 138). This representation has not changed over
time: the group’s “Basic Philosophy,” published in 1982 states:424

In order to maintain and improve our capitalistic system and prevent further steps
toward socialism, we assert the following beliefs: (a) We believe in the American
competitive system with every man entitled to own property and to the fruits of
his labor. We are opposed to monopoly in any form and we believe that the
individual search for progress should not be inhibited by false promises of
security.

The group’s conflation of capitalism with democracy is articulated through consistent
representations of social programs (other than those that assist farmers) as radical threats to the
inherently competitive risk-taking male subject of capitalism (Irigaray 1981a), through its
valorization of entrepreneurial activities, and through the deployment of a number of binaries
including public/private, objective/subjective, scientific fact/biased opinion, and
rational/irrational. The group has consistently represented farmers as entrepreneurs over against
government bureaucrats and environmentalists and then conflated entrepreneurial activities with
private property. The primacy of private property has been asserted throughout the debate across
all genres. At the 1997 Hopkinsville hearing, a swine producer who did not identify himself as a
KFB member, argued against the proposed regulations, charging that they constituted a public
assault on private rights:425

The farmer and his innovation have made this country; not the bureaucrats in
Frankfort or Washington. They are the ones who have created these problems,
created this hysteria with no basis. It’s another example of where the government
is taking away more rights and using any excuse to infringe on individual
freedoms.

The binary between entrepreneurial farmers and over-reacting bureaucrats is noteworthy.
Also importantly, although the speaker referred to the role played by agriculture in the
development of the U.S., he did not reference the expenditures of publicly raised tax revenues for
government programs that aided farmers.

KFB and the national Farm Bureau have consistently struggled to find a middle line
between farmers’ contradictory needs for government assistance and the group’s preferred self-
representation of farmers as entrepreneurs. The group has maintained that farm programs have
been necessary to assure that people in ‘rural ‘areas have qualities of life equal to those of people
in ‘urban’ areas, carefully representing farm programs as governmental attempts to level the
playing field rather than as essential financial bailouts. In 1986, in an article titled “Farm Bureau
to ‘lift gloom’ from agriculture”426 in the group’s newspaper, KFB President Ray Mackey
criticized the publicity that had accompanied the previous year’s Farm Aid concert because it
“portrayed farmers as little more than destitute paupers, looking for the nearest bread line.”
Mackey argued that the representation of farmers to “the 97 percent of Americans who don’t
farm is vitally important,” and farmers should be “viewed in light of their successes, energies

425 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 3.
and competitive spirit” so “that reservoir of respect which farmers have enjoyed from the vast majority of their urban cousins can be retained and strengthened.” Consistent with the group’s self-representation as entrepreneurs (and to avoid an increase in operating costs) the group has consistently opposed attempts to unionize farm workers and to make farm workers eligible for minimum wages and unemployment insurance. KFB has also consistently opposed unionization of public employees, easing of federal and state rules governing the employment of migrant labor, increases in the state’s minimum wage law, and advocated for right-to-work laws to cover all of the state’s labor.

The group’s leaders have also maintained that government programs that assist farmers are simply indicative of state and federal government recognition of the importance of agriculture to national security. The group’s current position has not changed since 1961.

With the steady and rapid increase in the nation’s population, which must be fed and clothed by products of the farm, it is apparent that the nation owes a debt of gratitude to farmers of America for their initiative and energy in producing abundant supplies of food and fibre.

KFB has consistently asserted the primacy of its carefully bounded notions of what constitutes proper ‘Americanism’. Over the years, the group has asserted the primacy of patriotism. For example, during the anti-Vietnam War demonstrations, the group added the following recommendation in its Policies, Resolutions, and Recommendations:

We are deeply concerned for the apparent lack of patriotism on the part of many Americans. The burning of draft cards, the desecration of the American flag, the threats of violence to our elected leaders, and the growing disregard for law and order show an attitude that is most regrettable. We recommend that all Farm Bureau leaders in their Farm Bureau meetings and elsewhere, take the lead in stressing such things as allegiance to the flag and devotion to our country.

427 I will address this conflation of rurality and agriculture in a discussion of the group’s representation of rurality later in this chapter.
430 December 2000 All Around Kentucky,
431 January 1993, Kentucky Farm Bureau News
432 April 1992, Kentucky Farm Bureau News, October 1991 Kentucky Farm Bureau News
433 October 1991 Kentucky Farm Bureau News
The group’s nationalism is closely tied to Christianity. In 1967, *Policies, Resolutions and Recommendations* asserted:436

Our national life is founded on spiritual faith and belief in God. Christianity is the dominant force in the religious life of this country and Democratic form of government.

References to a Christian god occur across all genres. In its 1967 Resolutions, however, the group sought to place boundaries about the activities of churches:437

The proper role of the churches, and organizations of churches, in this regard is to provide guidance on the moral and spiritual aspects of economic and social problems, rather than to lobby for, or otherwise promote, specific government action. We urge Farm Bureau members to be alert to, and to exert appropriate influence in, social action programs in their churches. We recommend that the American Farm Bureau make information available to state Farm Bureaus with regard to the legislative and political positions advanced and promoted by organized religious groups.

The group mediates its faith in science and a Christian god by transforming farmers from stewards of the land into improvers of the ‘natural’ landscape.438 This stance is strikingly similar to that which Wittig (1980s: 433) describes as a “discourse of heterosexuality” which assumes a masculine subject who exercises authority through a religion that assumes a male god. The discursive move from stewardship to improvement was facilitated by the notion of stewardship as control and cultivation of ‘nature’ that positioned the ‘rural’ “as a space of production in the service of human progress” (Woods 1998: 1220). For example, an August 1993 policy development article on sustainability asserted:439

Agriculture is by definition set in the earth’s environment. Farmers are of, in, by and for the environment. As for farming and the environment, sustainability of one depends on the sustainability of the other.

Five years later, in the midst of the fight about regulation, in his column in the group’s newspaper, Sprague440 wrote about an encounter between a preacher and a farmer, concluding with, “The Lord gave us a wonderful land but we have the responsibility for improving it.” The solution, he wrote, was “science and technology” that would allow expanded yields while protecting ‘natural resources’.

The science and technology upon which KFB relies is produced by University of Kentucky agricultural professionals and by agricultural scientists working at numerous

438 I will return to this representation of the ‘environment’ as passively awaiting improvement in my discussion of the group’s cosmography at the end of this chapter.
439 *All Around Kentucky*, August 1993, p. 16.
experiment stations across the state and at the USDA to support ‘modern’ (industrial) farming practices. In his criticism of industrial farming practices, Sessions (1997: 190) notes that, despite disputes about “the extent to which Judaism and Christianity are ‘salvageable’ as environmentally benign, . . . even if one takes a negative position in this debate, the views of farming in Judaism and Christianity are environmentally more desirable than those that undergird agribusiness.”

Because these institutionalized ties to the knowledge production activities of the land grant colleges and USDA are important, I am following Foucault (1980) in analyzing the relationships between power and knowledge production and the ways in which that linkage produced rationalized knowledges that were deployed to produce a specific form of governmentality of farmers and farming practices that has been advocated by KFB. Specifically, I am focusing upon the ways in which the group has used rationalized knowledges produced within specific institutional contexts to define and achieve its goals and to legitimize its position within the state.

**Power/knowledge and hegemony**

KFB’s connections to knowledge producing institutions have allowed the group access to ‘scientific facts’ and regimes of truths that it has deployed successfully in the past to shape regulatory policy. KFB has consistently called upon the University of Kentucky to produce the research that the group sought. Since 1969, when the group first insisted that agriculture be represented “at all meetings where regulations and standards are being established,” the group has closely scrutinized the development of environmental regulations. In 1986, warning members that the federal EPA was studying groundwater pollution resulting from agricultural runoff, the group published “A special policy development article” in its newspaper. The article asked members to think about four questions: 1) How can farmers “assist in better informing the public about pesticide usage, as well as defining the problems concerning groundwater”; 2) “How can farmers encourage the establishment of sound scientific guidelines for health effects before we lose state control of groundwater resources”; 3) “How can farmers preserve water quality and still maintain the rights of private ownership”; and 4) “If a national

441 For example, in the group’s Policies, Resolutions, and Recommendations, in 1961 members sought expanded research on insecticides, fungicides and chemical growth inhibitors and construction of an Agricultural Science Center at the University of Kentucky, in 1962, they asked for intensified research on tobacco, and in 1969 asked for permanent full-time Extension personnel in each county. The group’s newspaper published stories calling for: more agricultural research in January 1982, increased funding for agricultural research programs in January 1986, research into a uniform system of grading and marketing farmers’ hay in September 1987, more funding for research departments at the University of Kentucky in July 1988, for the College of Agriculture to attract more processing plants to Kentucky to process horticultural crops in January 1988, larger maintenance budgets for research farms and an Extension Center in January 1992, $38 million for a new Plant Science building at the University of Kentucky, improvements at regional university research farms, animal diagnostic laboratories, and new construction at the research center in Woodford County in December 1997, and a $19.2 million bond for completion of the Animal Research Center at the University of Kentucky, an $8.5 million bond for the Plant Science facility at the University of Kentucky, $1.65 million for animal diagnostic laboratories and $2 million a year for programs and improvement at various state university research farms in January 2000. Because of its relationship with the Extension Service and land grant researchers, KFB has acted as a facilitator for research funding for the land grant. Sometimes, however, the group has asked for specific types of research from the land grant.

442 Policies, Resolutions, and Recommendations, p. 20.
groundwater policy were adopted, what should be the respective roles of the federal and state government?” The group’s strategy was clear: to mobilize members to press for KFB’s participation in the regulatory process to ensure that the group’s position that agriculture was not responsible for groundwater degradation in Kentucky and that farmers’ voluntary attempts to control farm runoff would provide sufficient protection would be included in the regulatory regime.

In 1990, the group’s director of governmental affairs, said KFB “should take the lead in fashioning a remedy” for groundwater protection because “at some point the state or federal government is likely to step in and mandate testing of agriculture’s impact on groundwater.” The strategy adopted by the group was to use participation to ensure that regulations did not adversely affect farming practices. Three years later, the newspaper reported ongoing negotiations about the Cabinet’s proposed groundwater quality regulations. Laura Knoth, the group’s director of natural and environmental resources, complained that the state did not have the necessary data to develop regulations and said that the negotiation process would likely take a long time.

While the group attempted to limit the scope of the groundwater regulations, it sought federal funding to “establish test sites on Kentucky farms for novel farming practices that curb soil loss and water pollution.” The group sought up to $25 million “to elevate Kentucky’s status as a Water Quality Model of Excellence.”

In a preliminary concept statement, the plan’s architects said: ‘Farmers want to adopt practices that minimize pollution and will do so if the funding and technical expertise are available to them.’

The following July, the newspaper reported success. The group found the state’s final regulations satisfactory because they: 1) focused on preventing pollution rather than penalizing polluters; 2) allowed two years for the establishment of a peer group that included farmers to evaluate farmers’ plans to meet the new groundwater standards; 3) gave farmers five years to implement environmental practices; and 4) did not mandate monitoring wells or liners in most livestock waste lagoons.

I discuss this process because it explains several important factors in the current debate about regulation. First, because the state’s groundwater regulations, which, as indicated earlier, had initially been discussed in 1969, were not passed by the legislature until 1994, the Governor’s emergency designation may have been a political tactic both to ensure rapid development of regulations for hog farming and to give the Cabinet latitude to include provisions, such as mandatory compliance and liners for lagoons, that KFB had fought during development of groundwater regulations. Additionally, the Cabinet’s decision to hold public hearings to gather comments from the public at large made it more difficult for KFB to contain the process. Many who argued for weaker or no regulations referenced KFB’s “cooperation”

446 I will discuss the significance of a woman holding this position later in this chapter.
448 Ibid.
449 Ibid.
450 All Around Kentucky, August 1993.
during the development of the groundwater quality regulations and argued that, since they did not go into effect until 1998, the Cabinet had not allowed sufficient time to determine if they would provide adequate protection. The following comments, made at public hearings, are typical of this perspective.

Existing water quality regulations are sufficient and right-to-farm laws need to be upheld.452

Farmers, the Cabinet, and others worked with the Kentucky Agriculture Water Quality Plan. It has not even been given a chance to work before the Division comes in and writes new regulations. These should be changed.453

KFB’s history of following the technological innovations developed by land grant and USDA researchers has likely contributed to the group’s belief that control and improvement of the ‘natural’ world is possible and that technological intervention is both inexorable and represents ‘progress’. Throughout the debate, the KFB has argued this position. The following excerpt from one of Sprague’s newspaper columns, which are written to explain the group’s positions to an audience of members, is typical of this argument:454

The science and technology are available to allow for expansion in our pork industry and at the same time protect our natural resources. It is our hope that sound judgment will prevail as those permanent regulations are debated.

The group has consistently asserted the message of the ‘Green Revolution’ that technology equals ‘progress’.455 Nothing in the group’s discourse has changed since 1962 when, in the preamble to that year’s Policies, Resolutions and Recommendations, it declared:456

We are in the midst of an agricultural revolution, and progress calls for the adoption of more and better machinery, new and improved varieties of field crops, better bred and fed livestock, better farm management practices, and cooperative association as a means of reducing marketing costs and purchasing of farm supplies.

This notion of technology as progress has a number of critics including Beniger (1993), Ellul (1964), Marx (1993), McDermott (1993), Shanin (1997), and Winner 1993). Shanin (1997: 65) notes that this idea of progress is derived from an Enlightenment notion of linear ‘development’ from “poverty, barbarism, despotism and ignorance to riches, civilization, democracy and rationality, the highest expression of which is science.” This notion of progress, with its concomitant valorization of an instrumental rationalized science “penetrated all strata of contemporary societies to become popular common sense, and as such resistant to change” (Shanin 1997: 66). Although those arguing for stronger regulation do not subscribe to this notion

452 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 29.
455 For an academic explication of the same assumptions, see Cochrane (1993).
of progress, many of KFB’s complaints with the regulations assert the primacy of ‘science’ in the service of ‘progress’. This version of science is represented as (insider) expert knowledge that is ‘objective’ and thus above ‘politics’. One KFB member complained:457

No farm organization was consulted in drafting these regulations. There is also no evidence that they worked with the Land Grant University, or the Farm Bureau, or the Kentucky Department of Agriculture, or any other knowledgable organization.

Not surprisingly, a faculty member from Western Kentucky University made the same argument.458

The Cabinet should pay attention to the Farm Bureau and get good advice from them in revising these regulations. The Agriculture Extension Service in western Kentucky has done an outstanding job in helping to educate farmers over the years. It has worked hard to have a sound environmental program. They should have more input in developing the regulations.

Notably, at the same hearing, after a number of speakers had argued for stronger regulation, the same faculty member prefaced his call for weaker regulation by saying, “We’re talking about real farming here.”459 ‘Real’ farming is industrial farming conducted with the technologies developed by the land grant and transferred through Extension agents to KFB; other farming practices are not legitimate. The defensiveness of the faculty member’s statement speaks to Buttel’s (1985) discussion of the tensions that often result when more critical knowledges, such as those produced by environmental and social scientists, challenge those produced by agricultural scientists and economists.

Ironically, in light of KFB’s attempts to fix the definition of ‘real’ farming as industrial only, the group’s public affairs director argued against provisions that restricted the application of hog waste onto land by claiming the provisions would hurt organic farmers, a group whose practices have been denigrated by land grant professionals and KFB.460

Applying animal waste to crops is a practice as old as agriculture itself. . . .Natural fertilizer goes to the very heart of organic agriculture. This policy would unnecessarily impede the organic food production which is a highly viable niche industry in Kentucky.

Importantly, because the belief in technology as progress typically assumes that everyone benefits equally (Bradford 1991, Johnson 1993, Mumford 1991), the power relations that inhere to decisions about what technologies should be produced and who should have access to them have been erased. Thus, KFB has consistently maintained that technologies benefit Americans as a whole. The valorization of instrumental rationalized science and technology has been an

459 Ibid.
important tool in the group’s attempts to fix systems of differentiation, as has the research produced by land grant professionals.

Many of those who argued to weaken or eliminate the regulations used arguments similar to those of KFB. The farmers who took this position may be generally described as “skeptical farmers” (Ward and Lowe 1994), who believe that farm-related pollution is exaggerated and the proposed regulations go too far in constraining activities on the farm. During the course of the public hearings, 71 individuals signed in and identified themselves as KFB members. Of that total, 57 were men; 18, women. In dramatic contrast to members of groups who supported the regulations or argued for stronger regulation, only four KFB members, all men, submitted oral and/or written testimony. This reliance upon few voices reflects the group’s organizational structure.

Although the KFB president’s column in the bimonthly newspaper is headlined “Kentucky Grassroots” and county Farm Bureaus develop their own agendas, at the state and national levels, policies are developed by state and federal board members. Policies appear to have already been developed when they are presented to KFB members in “policy development articles” published in the group’s newspaper. The pre-forming of questions simultaneously frames issues as leadership wishes them framed and directs readers’ attention away from solutions less desirable to the leadership. The text under each question carefully directs readers to the leadership’s solution of choice.

KFB’s policies are voted on by elected delegates at annual meetings. There is no published record of debate over policies; instead they are presented as ‘the Farm Bureau’ position. Additionally, the president’s column is usually the only identified voice in the group’s newspaper. So it is not surprising that two of the four people associated with KFB who submitted comments were the presidents of 1997 and 1998. The third speaker identified himself as an officer in the organization and the fourth only as a KFB member.

**Hearing comments**

I will present separate breakdowns of those who wished to weaken the regulations and who opposed them, to demonstrate the similarities in comments made by both groups. Twenty three people advocated weaker regulations: 461 of those did not indicate membership in any group; one identified himself as teaching animal science at Western Kentucky University; two, as members of Kentucky Pork Producers; one, Kentucky Corn Growers’ Association; and three, KFB. Of these 23 people, 21 were men, one was a woman, and one person’s gender could not be identified by first name. Forty-nine participants—42 men and seven women—opposed regulation. Of these, only eight people referenced affiliation with a group: one with an agribusiness firm, two with state offices, one with the Kentucky Hog Marketing Association, one with a local bank, and three with KFB. Using the results of the content analysis, I grouped the comments into the five most common strategies deployed by both groups: 1) represent the regulations as a threat to family farmers; 2) question the legitimacy of the regulations; 3) weaken parts of the regulations; 4) reduce public input; and 5) assert the primacy of economic rationality.

461 I used participants’ statements to differentiate between those who argued for weaker regulations and those who saw no need for regulation. If a participant stated that he or she was opposed to regulation, I placed that person in the opposed to regulation group. If a participant did not directly state that he or she was opposed to regulation, I placed that person in the weaker regulation group.
As previously mentioned, farming, hog waste, environmental protection, and economic rationality were nodal points in the debate. Those who advocated weakening or eliminating the regulations generally stressed two nodal points: farming and economic rationality. The chain of signifiers that constituted the nodal point of farming included the family farm, the Jeffersonian ideal of the yeoman farmer, the farmer as steward of the land, ‘rurality’, and productive use of ‘natural’ resources. Table 4.1 indicates the frequency of comments stressing the need to protect the family and/or independent and small farm made by those who argued to weaken and those who opposed the regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAKEN</th>
<th>ELIMINATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Protect family farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Protect independent and small farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protection of family and small independent farms was argued through assertions that the requirement for buffer zones between CAFOs and neighbors would stifle expansions, constrain farmers from bringing family members into the farm business, and hinder “contracting relationships between companies and individual farmers and cooperative relationships between farmers and other farmers.” Sprague said KFB was concerned for future expansion of family operations. The family farm must be allowed to grow and expand if that is what will allow them to continue to operate as a family farm. If this section was not intended to prevent a father from passing his operation to his son or daughter, without forcing the operation into the regulation, it needs to be stated clearly. Also, if the regulations were not intended to prevent a farmer from bringing his son or daughter into the operation and expanding it to support them both, it needs to be stated clearly.

Others, as illustrated by the following comment, complained that the regulations would hurt small farmers more than the large farms that were the targets of regulation.

These regulations came about because of some large hog operations. But they are not going to regulate the large hog operations, they’re going to keep the small operators from having hogs.

Although KFB carefully avoided stating that regulation was not necessary, as Table 4.2 indicates, many arguments that called into question the legitimacy of regulation made by members of KFB bore a striking resemblance to those made by participants who said that they were opposed to regulation. The only major difference between the two resulted from the argument that the existing permit discharge permit program is sufficient, which was made by those who argued that additional regulations were necessary.

463 Ibid.
464 The reference to a daughter is interesting in light of the group’s masculinist orientation.
Table 4.2. Arguments against the need for regulation.\textsuperscript{466}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAKEN</th>
<th>ELIMINATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidentiary requirements for regulation are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uphold Right-To-Farm Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Agricultural Water Quality Act is sufficient protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regulation’s definitions contradict other agencies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The regulations are not rational, are an overreaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of scientific data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Setbacks should apply to people who move next to farms, not to farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farmers are conservationists; regulations not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduce governmental intrusion into individual activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many maintained that the regulations are an emotional response to a misrepresentation of the hog industry. As previously indicated, some charged that the Cabinet had not given the state’s Agricultural Water Quality Act a chance to solve any agricultural environmental problems. Others argued that the Water Quality Act was sufficient so the new regulations were unnecessary. The governor’s use of the term ‘emergency’ was hotly challenged. Hog farmer Maurice Heard insisted:\textsuperscript{467}

There is no real emergency. The hogs\textsuperscript{468} are leaving the state and not coming in, as some would lead to believe.

USDA figures discussed previously bear credence to Heard’s representation of declining hog numbers across the state. But Heard does not consider the geographical concentration of the hogs that remain that is the Cabinet’s and environmentalists’ concern. Data to the contrary, including the Cabinet’s figures of CAFO-related environmental damage and the evidence from North Carolina’s and other states’ experience with hog farms brought to the fore by the activist group and academic researchers cited previously, was generally dismissed as emotional fiction or simply ignored, as in the following comment.\textsuperscript{469}

There is no purpose, no useful reason for the new emergency regulation. A state of emergency does not exist. The emergency is in peoples’ minds and in their minds only.

\textsuperscript{466} I did not total the comments because many individuals comments fell into more than one category.
\textsuperscript{467} Frankfort public hearing transcript, 1998, p.27.
\textsuperscript{468} Although the image of thousands of hogs taking to the interstates to march out of Kentucky is amusing, it is important to note that Heard, who was not the only hog farmer to speak, was the only person in this group to refer to the actual hog.
\textsuperscript{469} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 1.
Dennis Liptrap, a pig farmer and former University of Kentucky Extension specialist, charged that the Cabinet was responding to two crises.\textsuperscript{470}

The first, perceived one, is an emotional issue. It is the mega hog operation and its potential for polluting the waters and water quality. The second crisis is real water crisis. There are 234 miles of rivers that are declared non-swimmable. No hogs drain their waste into these rivers. The problem is with improper sanitary sewers, especially in rural areas, 60 percent of municipal waste treatment plants are in violation. Ninety-nine percent of the major municipalities were in violation for permit levels that they can discharge into the waters. That is a major problem. There were 31 fish kills in Kentucky in 1994-95. Two were attributed to agriculture.

Mike Oveson of the Kentucky Pork Producers’ drew a line between ‘facts’, assumedly produced by the hog industry, and bias resulting from unspecified concerns that he charged have nothing to do with the environment.\textsuperscript{471}

While much has been written and said in recent months about water quality concerns related to the pork industry, many of the reports on which this discussion is based have lacked the perspective needed to make fact-based decisions about important industry issues. Many of these reports have been one-sided, inflammatory and driven by concerns unrelated to the environment. The effect of these reports has been to mischaracterize the pork industry as unregulated, unsustainable, and uninterested in the proper utilization of manure as a fertilizer. This could not be further from reality.

Several speakers set a similar boundary about ‘science’ as the only legitimate source of knowledge, charging that the Cabinet had insufficient ‘scientific facts’ to justify regulation. For example, Kentucky Agriculture Commissioner Billy Ray Smith asserted lack of scientific data to justify compulsory monitoring wells and KFB member Glenn Cox made a similar complaint about manure spreading provisions in the regulations.\textsuperscript{472} Arguing that farmers must be good stewards of the land, Sprague maintained that ‘scientific analysis’ has demonstrated that industrial farming is not an environmental threat.\textsuperscript{473}

Anyone is welcome to fully scientifically analyze what’s happening in agriculture and with the large animal units. Large animal units are taking care of the environment. Studies have been done in North Carolina where hog production has increased 500 percent, yet the Black River, the water quality is twice as good as it was before that time.

There is no pollution in the seven counties covered by the commentator. The hog farms have to take care of the land, because the land takes care of them.

\textsuperscript{470} Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{471} Frankfort public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 25. I will return to the situatedness of knowledges later in the chapter.
\textsuperscript{473} Cadiz public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 16.
Liptrap of IPKY, Inc., asserted\textsuperscript{474}

There’s not an environmental problem in Kentucky. The only environmental documentation of lagoon construction problems was by Hank Graddy of the Sierra Club. There were two lagoons documented 10-15 years ago. Both lagoons were fixed with minimal problems and are in use today.

Although, unlike other speakers, Liptrap referenced recorded instances of industrial farm-related environmental impacts, he simultaneously denigrated the evidence assumedly on the ground that documentation provided by a member of the Sierra Club was biased rather than ‘scientific’.

Comments repeatedly pointed to inconsistencies between the regulations and those of other agencies that also regulate farming, often valorizing the USDA and land grant practices. A participant who is a member of both the Kentucky Agriculture Water Quality Authority, which oversees water quality laws, and the Kentucky Division of Conservation argued that the Cabinet should use Animal Unit Equivalents\textsuperscript{475} rather than Swine Units\textsuperscript{476} to define numbers of swine.\textsuperscript{477} Sprague, joined by a hog farmer, charged that the inconsistency could lead to an error for which the farmer would be fined:\textsuperscript{478}

The formula used to establish swine units is not consistent with the EPA and NRCS [National Resource Conservation Service] formula for defining animal equivalents. It is very complicated; farmers may inadvertently compute their swine numbers wrong and be out of compliance without knowing.

Sprague, like the British farmers researched by Ward and Lowe (1994:180), “does not differentiate between accidental and deliberate pollution incidents.” Sprague implies that failure to comply would be the result of miscalculation rather than a deliberate attempt to compute numbers of animals conservatively to avoid falling under the regulatory threshold. Similarly, discharges of contaminants into the environment have been represented as accidents that are, as Liptrap implied, easily corrected and do not pose a long-term environmental threat. This representation of minimal risk (which ignores the figures cited by the Cabinet) provides the space from which to argue that the regulations are unnecessarily stringent.

Table 4.3 indicates the six provisions of the regulations that KFB members wanted to weaken or eliminate.

\textsuperscript{474} Cadiz public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{475} One Animal Equivalent Unit consists of 1,000 pounds of live animal weight (Hopkinsville hearing transcript, p. 35).
\textsuperscript{476} The regulations define swine units as equal to \((0.1xN_n) + (0.4 x N_f) + (0.65xN_{gs}) + (1.0xN_{sl}) + (0.83xN_b) + (3.7xN_s)\) where \(N_n\) = the number of nursery swine, \(N_f\) = number of finishing swine, \(N_{gs}\) = number of gestating sows, \(N_{sl}\) = number of sows with litters, \(N_b\) = numbers of boars, and \(N_s\) = number of sows, farrow to finish (draft regulations, p.3).
\textsuperscript{477} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{478} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 35.
Table 4.3. Numbers of KFB members opposed to specific regulatory provisions.\(^{479}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAKEN</th>
<th>ELIMINATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opposed to joint liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fees in emergency regulations are excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raise numbers of swine at which the regulations set in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monitoring requirements are excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduce setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decrease time frame for permit review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KFB vehemently argued to eliminate the provision that established joint liability for both farmer and the contracting corporation. Sprague represented this provision as the Cabinet’s attempt to subvert the will of the state Legislature: “Language similar to this was offered during legislative meetings on House Bill 709 during the 1998 legislative session, and it was soundly defeated.”\(^{480}\)

KFB’s heated challenge to this provision was likely a result of the group’s fears that its long-standing hegemonic relations with the legislature would be eroded if other state agencies were allowed to expand the decision-making process to include a broader segment of the public. It is easier to influence a 138-member General Assembly than large numbers of people. Given that the regulations needed legislative approval, Sprague may have also had doubts that KFB could mount a successful legislative campaign against this provision, doubts that were proved justified when in the following year alternative bills sponsored by the group that did not contain the joint liability provision subsequently died in committee.

Sprague and the group’s Public Affairs Division Director J. Ronald Pryor argued that the provision would affect family farmers negatively by threatening their ability to farm competitively. Sprague charged that\(^{481}\)

[j]oint liability will have its most negative effect on small family farms. This policy will discourage contractors from locating in Kentucky, thereby denying producers the economic option of contract growing. The economic advantage for both sides of the contracting arrangement disappear under this requirement. Additionally, if the contractor is held equally liable for the management of all of the contract operators, the contractors will now have an incentive to buy out the small operator, thereby displacing him. Also, it is becoming a common practice for family farmers to contract with other family farmers for the production of animals. Kentucky producers who have chosen this method of production and marketing should not be penalized.

This provision dictates the size, ownership, and market structure of animal agriculture. It is not the Cabinet’s role to dictate agricultural policy, but to protect Kentucky’s natural resources.

\(^{479}\) Again, I did not total the comments because many comments included more than one category.

\(^{480}\) Cadiz public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 31.

This provision is the most devastating provision in the proposed regulation. This policy has very little to do with protecting the environment and much to do with dictating market structures for Kentucky’s farmers.

Again, Sprague argued against the provision through the trope of the family farm, and again, the farmer is assumed to be male. Sprague’s argument that the provision would leave small farmers without the option of contract farming erased differences among farmers. Some farmers do not have sufficient capital to undertake contract farming; others do not want to exercise this option. Additionally, his representation of the provision as a threat to Kentucky farmers’ ability to survive hinges upon the assumption that industrial agriculture is inevitable and those who do not farm in this way cannot be competitive, and, as a result, Kentucky’s agricultural production will lag behind other states that do not have similar regulations. Also, although Watts’ (1994) research into contract farming in Africa indicates that farmers fare far less well than the contractors in such arrangements (a position argued by those who advocated retaining the provision), Sprague erased the power imbalances in the contract by positing economic advantages for both sides. The imbalances, however, surfaced in his assertion that contractors would have incentive (and capital) to buy out smaller farms.

Glen Massengale, a member of the Kentucky Pork Producers Association, charged that joint liability was an idea of environmentalists “to ensure monetary payment for violations and discourage contracting.” The concept, he said, was “ridiculous” and discouraged farmers from taking responsibility for their actions:

Individuals must be responsible for their own actions and their commitment to follow permit standards, regardless of the business arrangement. This requirement holds no logical or legal credence and should be removed.

It is not clear why, given that farmers are still responsible in part for any environmental damage that results from their operations, they would be less responsible than when they were solely responsible. This argument contradicts the group’s insistence that farmers must be good stewards of the environment. The only difference is that fines would be shared between farmer and contractor, reducing the economic burden of the farmer, a burden that KFB attacked in its campaign to reduce siting and non-compliance fees.

The fees, which were established initially by the regulation, came under heavy attack. Sprague charged that the federal CAFO regulation, “passed over twenty years ago” exempts agriculture from permit fees because of the inelasticity of food products.

Farming is the only industry that cannot pass the cost of a permit on to the consumer of their products. All other industries can pass the cost along or recover it through increased production. A farmer can only hope to recoup through additional production (which this regulation penalizes) and in many instances is not feasible due to weather and other natural conditions.

482 Cadiz public hearing transcript, 1998, p. 36.
483 Ibid.
484 The fees were eliminated in subsequent revisions of the regulations.
485 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, 1997, p. 60.
486 Ibid.
Inelasticity of food crops and livestock notwithstanding, Sprague did not mention that many farmers have adopted industrial farming practices to dramatically reduce risks related to “weather and other natural conditions” (Ufkes 1995). Apparently, the group wants to maintain farming’s privileged status even though the risks that were the partial justification for that status have been reduced by industrial farming practices.

The state agriculture commissioner charged that engineering fees would constrain start-ups and expansions and fees for noncompliance would cause bankruptcies, “leaving the Commonwealth of Kentucky faced with the financial burden of closing existing lagoons.” If the commissioner is correct and non-compliance fees are sufficient to cause bankruptcies for existing farmers, his argument about engineering fees can be turned around. Non-compliance fees would not be such a concern if, despite assertions to the contrary, there were not some fear of environmental impacts from CAFOs. If environmental impacts are indeed a concern and fees for non-compliance will put farmers into bankruptcy, saddling the state with the costs of cleanup, and the fees reduce the numbers of farmers initiating or expanding CAFOs that may go bankrupt, the higher engineering fees are justified.

Contradictions in this line of reasoning notwithstanding, many participants tried to gain latitude to expand or to avoid regulation altogether by arguing that that the threshold for numbers of hogs at which operations became subject to regulation should be higher and that setbacks (the buffer zones between CAFO’s and neighbors and aquifers) should be decreased. Two participants, one of whom was an officer of the Jackson Purchase Credit Union, argued that, because it is not uncommon for a western Kentucky family farm to have a 500-sow operation, the regulatory threshold be raised to at least 2000 swine units or 540 sows, farrow to finish. Two males, who did not identify themselves as farmers, deployed the trope of the small farm to challenge the setback requirement:

If the setbacks were as much as 5,000 feet, as has been suggested by commentators at the hearing, a hog farmer would have to be a multimillionaire just to own the land to put the hog operation on.

Sprague also maintained that the setback requirements would threaten small farm operations that could not afford to purchase additional land to comply with setback requirements. Additionally, he complained that the regulatory setbacks were higher than those in the state’s water quality laws.

These proposed setbacks are unrealistic and do not comply with setbacks established by the Agriculture Water Quality Authority and approved by the Cabinet. The setbacks must be reduced to at most the levels that were in the previous proposed regulations.
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Sprague and Coleman also pressed to reduce the 180-day time frame allowed for the Cabinet to review permits that they said would create hardships for farmers. Sprague argued for a 30-day review period; Coleman for 60 days. This argument was directly related to their attempts to reduce public involvement in siting and expansion decisions because a longer review gave the public more time to influence the Cabinet’s decisions.

As indicated in Table 4.4, public involvement was challenged by numerous strategies.

Table 4.4. Numbers of comments about public involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAKEN</th>
<th>ELIMINATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Decrease public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Delete public notification for changing land application areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delete public notification for permit renewals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restrict involvement in siting to abutters only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with agricultural organizations to develop regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Massengale asserted that the Cabinet’s provision for a 30-day public comment period was too long, and should be 14 days only: “This time period is only acceptable for bureaucratic activities, and not for individuals trying to establish a business enterprise.” His comment delineates different territories for industrial farmers, who consider themselves entrepreneurs, from bureaucrats and simultaneously represents bureaucrats as less pressed for time than farmers. This is a variation of the private/public binary.

Sam Moore, KFB vice president, said, “There is a problem with the notification of the whole nation.” Similarly, pork producer Maurice Heard asserted, “Farmers ought to tell the neighbors next door about a new permit application, but not have to tell the world.” Sprague maintained that adjacent landowners only should be notified of permit renewals, and, with farmer Adam O’Nan, argued that

[p]ublishing notices of intent in the paper opens a farming operation to uninformed, emotional responses from citizens or groups from anywhere in the state or out of state that will not be impacted and may have other agendas for opposing the operation. A business planning to open in an area does not have to publish a notice of intent to apply for a permit. They must comply with zoning requirements and other regulations. An agricultural business should be treated the same. If the operation meets the setbacks and the permitting requirements for the protection of the environment then they have a right to apply for a permit without outside obstructions.
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Unlike Sprague’s former statement about the exceptionalism of agriculture, this comment erases differences between industrial farming and other business ventures. Sprague and O’Nan also reinforce the attempts of Moore and Heard to spatially delimit public involvement to abutters. This strategy is related to the argument quoted earlier that the regulations are an inappropriate governmental intrusion into individual rights of property owners. In both cases, the rights of the operator and the spaces of ‘legitimate’ public comment are computed from surface boundaries. The spread of contamination through the media of air, surface and ground water, however, is not restricted by abstract property lines imposed on the earth’s surface. Additionally, despite the fact that many residents in the four counties the Cabinet has identified as most affected by industrial farming are opposed to industrial farming and/or are farmers themselves, Sprague conflates opposition to industrial farming with what the group has represented as an extreme form of environmentalism. Thus he situates environmentalists outside of the localities in which CAFOs are operating, and charges that their complaints are abstract (placeless), “uninformed” (not based on a very specific form of agricultural ‘insider’ knowledge) and “emotional” indicators of a plot against farmers. This characterization simultaneously erases those farmers who disagree with KFB’s position and represents those who disagree with the group as irrational, which reinforces the argument that the Cabinet should have worked with agricultural organizations only to develop the regulations.

Again, ignoring the failure of property lines to contain environmental impacts, the president of the Christian County Farm Bureau asserted that

[t]he issues are farm related, and it should be farm people to solve the problems. The Cabinet should be very sensitive as to the things that the farmers speak of due to the fact that they are the people that pay the taxes on the land and should have the right to use it. It is an in-house problem; agriculture should have a very vital part in solving this.

The reference to taxes alludes both to the private property argument and to notions of economic rationality. The group has valorized the discourse of economics as much as it has that of science. Table 4.5 indicates the arguments mounted that asserted the primacy of economic rationality over against other forms.

Table 4.5. Arguments asserting economic rationality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAKEN</th>
<th>ELIMINATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regulations will put hog producers out of business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regulations stifle growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regulations constrain innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regulations pose an economic risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regulations constrain farm expansions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arguments for innovation rely again on technology. A swine producer argued that the regulations micro-manage the farm and take away a producer’s ability to use innovative ideas and ways to accommodate his situation to support his family and further his enterprise.

Liptrap objected that the regulations made no provision for technological innovations: “The proposed regulations make the application of alternative and innovative technologies more difficult.”

Sprague’s charge that the 10 percent expansion threshold in the regulations would restrict growth, creating an economic disadvantage was echoed by another man who argued that the family farm needs to be able to grow to make a living. Forty years ago, all it took was 15-20 pigs. Presently, the commentator raises 1,600 to 1,800 sows, boars, pigs and all, and markets about 3,000 or 3,600 a year. What will it take for a family farm 10 or 20 years from now? What will his grandsons need to produce in order to have a viable income to live on the farm?

Within the hearing comments genre, KFB leaders were careful to oppose specific provisions only. Although their discourse positioned those who called for more stringent regulation outside of the boundaries the group tried to maintain around ‘expert’ knowledge and repeatedly represented outsiders as ‘emotional’, leaders did not question the need for regulation. In the next chapter, I turn to other genres to contextualize hearing comments.
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CHAPTER FIVE

Performing capitalism: Growth, deanimalization, gender, and Christianity

The Father will seal over the mystery, draping it in the authority of his incontestable law. Such assertion of power should not be brought to account. And it only repeats the same thing over and over again: the absolute identity to self, without any possibility of contradiction for/in that sovereignty.504

In this chapter, I examine texts produced in KFB’s newspaper, web site, and press releases and radio spots. KFB began to publish a monthly newspaper, called the Kentucky Farm Bureau News in 1938. In 1994, the name was changed to All Around Kentucky and the group adopted its present bimonthly publication schedule. The newspaper’s audience is primarily members who will read it in homes and offices, however, because the publication is also available on the group’s web site and in many libraries across the state, non-members may read it also. Although newspaper accounts of the group’s position strove for the carefully modulated statesman-like discourse that KFB employs in previously referenced genres, the language in columns is often more passionate and strident than that in other genres and the group’s construction of environmentalists as enemy is more fully developed than in other genres.

Press releases and radio spots are also produced for a wide audience who may read the newspaper or hear the radio spot in a variety of sites. Both releases and spots are characterized by carefully modulated language and radio spots feature neatly packaged sound bites. KFB also uses its web site to highlight the group’s positions. Because it employs lobbyists, the group does issue the types of member alerts seeking phone calls and letters to legislators employed by KFTC and CFA.

I locate thematics in KFB’s newspaper, press releases, and web sites to discuss them within the context of the other previously referenced genres, and I interrogate the thematics to identify the relationships between the group’s economic, scientific, and agricultural discourses. I am particularly interested in KFB’s temporal and spatial strategies and in the gendered nature of its discourses relating to the hogs and the environment.

Growth and deanimalization

Across all genres, growth is KFB’s goal. The theme of the 1982 annual convention was “A Good Thing Growing,” a word play on crops and markets. The focus on growth, which was reflected in comments quoted from the hearings and will be discussed further in this chapter. Since the early 1960s, the group has referred to ‘growing’ rather than ‘raising’ livestock. This discursive shift effectively delimits animal agency. Whereas the term ‘raising’ evokes a parent or steward who cares for independent young children or animals during their young years and helps them make the transition into adulthood, the term ‘growing’ evokes plant life, a life form that, since Linnaeus (Haraway 1989, Philo and Wilbert 2000), has been represented as having less animation and agency than children and animals. This deanimalization occurred as farmers who
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were adopting Green Revolution technologies began to believe they were able to control the ‘natural’ world. Calculations performed in Swine Units or Animal Unit Equivalences also deanimalize by categorizing animals as utilitarian production units defined in terms of their distance from slaughter; the Animal Unit Equivalences also erase differences between types of livestock, e.g., cows, hogs, chickens.

The technologies that are deployed against animals in industrial livestock farming—confinement and 24-hour-a-day surveillance, artificial insemination, and alterations of the hog’s interior geography (Ufkes 1995)—have increased the illusion of control. References to livestock farmers as ‘producers’ who, by their agency produce hogs, implying that (re)production would not occur without human interventions also enhance the illusion of human mastery. Yet, simultaneously, farmers’ control over a man-made economic system has decreased.

In its search for foreign markets, KFB has endorsed a free trade policy, lobbying for passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), tariff reductions under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the opening of markets in China. A press release dated Dec. 1, 1997 declared:

An expanding world economy is propelling American agriculture into what could be an unprecedented era of prosperity, a prominent agricultural marketing specialist said here today.

KFB and its allies have argued that the rosy future that awaits in foreign markets is threatened by the economic risks the regulations pose. Massengale argued:505

The organization is supportive of regulations that are technically sound and reasonable. . . . This is an attempt by a regulatory agency to micromanage an industry for which it has no understanding or expertise. This is not an appropriate way to regulate an industry based on a free market enterprise. The atmosphere in a free market enterprise often dictates production changes within a short time frame to maintain an operation’s profitability. This type of regulation would severely restrict the flexibility of swine operations within the Commonwealth.

“Technically sound and reasonable” regulations are those that do not interfere with on-farm practices and economics; unsound and unreasonable regulations change farming practices, create costs for the farmer, and hamper timely response to events that the speaker represents as external forces on farmers. Similarly, the following statement by Sprague506 combines an argument for economic rationality to respond to ‘market’ changes with the need for technologies to control the ‘natural’ world while stressing the importance of farming to the nation.

Agriculture is changing every day, and very quickly in the swine industry. Economic considerations have made it necessary for swine producers to confine their animals in rather large units. This has caused much concern among the general public because of the potential problems of pollution and the odor that comes with concentrated animal operations. Swine producers realize this concern and are working very hard to look for innovative technologies and better

management approaches that can reduce these environmental risks and greatly improve the odor control in their operations.

The regulations that are developed should take into consideration the most economical way to develop these environmental techniques. They should be designed first, to protect the environment, but then to look for ways that can be done, so that Kentucky farmers can be competitive with other farmers across Kentucky and the nation.

The Cabinet should look at these regulations in the light of making it possible for existing farmers to continue to produce hogs. The regulations should be amended to assure the public that the environment is protected, and at the same time allow family farms to expand and produce the food and fiber that this country needs.

In his argument, Sprague represents farmers as passive; a reified economy is the agent in this formulation. According to Sprague, farmers have no alternative other than to comply with market demands to expand in order to compete. Ironically, the entrepreneurship that is so prized by the group consists only of responses to outside forces.

Across genres, KFB represents Kentucky both as threatened by the restructuring that is occurring in American farming and as a site of possibility from which to penetrate foreign markets. Although the group is arguing against regulations that prevent further consolidation of hog production, in 1999, American Farm Bureau President Dean Kleckner said restructuring “within the livestock and grain industries . . . could result in inadequate market access.” Kleckner expressed unease about the potential impact of the Cargill Inc./Continental Grain Company merger on export markets because together the firms “accounted for approximately 35 percent of total US grain and oilseed products” the previous year. Kleckner said, although the “merger warrants review,” the American Farm Bureau “does not want to assume the proposed merger is either ‘good or bad.’”

We recognize and acknowledge that the world is shifting to a dynamic global environment. . . . Just as farmers have had to grow and consolidate to remain efficient competitors, so do other businesses.

The group’s stance on growth, free trade, and the development of technologies is oddly ambiguous. On the one hand, the group optimistically declares that all three will provide a secure future for farming. On the other hand, it sees ‘market forces’ as beyond farmers’ control and unsettling, even threatening. Yet, likely as a result of this ‘common sense’ notion of progress that is so tied to the Green Revolution rhetoric of agricultural experts, the group sees no solution other than to call for more of the same. The group’s stance is equivalent to that of an alcoholic who awakens with the shakes after a binge and grabs another drink to calm his nerves.

Although the group’s representation of ‘rurality’ as a category distinctly separate from ‘urbanity’ ignores the complex linkages between both, ample social science literature supports KFB’s representation of ‘rurality’ as a site of struggle that has been overlooked as a result of the
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privileging of ‘urban’ concerns (Massey 1991, 1999; Whatmore 1999). KFB has consistently asserted the primacy of ‘rural’ concerns. In 1995, Sprague wrote that Kentucky has always been a traditionally rural state; and unlike the nation as a whole we remain so today.

At least half our population lives in small towns, in rural areas or on farms . . . a plus for agriculture.

The ‘rural’ landscape is being altered by more than the adoption of industrial livestock farming practices. Dependence upon agriculture for income has decreased and demographics have been changing (Browne et al. 1992): agriculture is playing a less prominent role in many areas of Kentucky and the US (Browne et al. 1992). The maintenance of the notion of rurality as a site of agriculture enhances farmers’ claims to state and federal farm programs because it implies that farming is the primary source of income for rural residents and represents threats to the economic viability of agriculture as threats to the abilities of rural areas to survive. In this framing then, agricultural subsidies, like technology, are erroneously assumed to benefit all rural residents and all farmers.

Additionally, non-farmers, in some cases, people who are not familiar with farming, are moving into farming communities. The suburbanization of former agricultural locales has created some tension between newcomers who object to livestock odors of ‘traditional’ as opposed to industrial farms. This concern prompted one farmer to suggest that buffer zones be applied to new housing developments to protect farmers from complaints.

The group’s representation of farmers as entrepreneurs posits ‘modern’ farming as a large-scale highly technological industrial operation, which operates to capture economies of scale and is thus the only rational farming method.

A striking similarity across all genres is an absence of humor. Unlike activists’ texts, all of KFB’s texts are unremittingly somber and frequently pedantic. This is likely the result of the group’s worldview and self-representation. KFB’s imaginary posits a fiercely competitive struggle to survive in hostile world governed by inexorable economic and technological forces, which is not conducive to humor. Rather, it fosters an attitude that “life is real, life is earnest.” Further, the group’s insistence that members are objective and rational statesmen who are responsible for the development of important public policies that preserve their particular notions of ‘American’ values—capitalism, individualism, patriarchal nuclear families, Christianity—necessitates a sober demeanor. Sprague’s 1999 column headlined “Policy review process sets us apart,” is typical of the group’s sense of self-importance.

. . . I am as confident as ever that Farm Bureau will prevail on most of its issues, and I make that prediction in large measure, because of our policy development creed.

When a senator or representative hears from a Farm Bureau spokesman, that legislator knows full well that standing behind that individual’s message is the collective strength and wisdom of Kentucky’s agricultural producers.
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Much of the group’s claim to wisdom has resulted from its ties to knowledge producing institutions. And much of the group’s animosity toward the regulations stems from its fear of competing knowledges. Although there are few differences in representations of Kentucky, rurality, and farmers across genres, the representations of environmentalists, organic farming, regulatory agencies, and democratic procedures in the group’s newspaper differ dramatically from that in other genres.

**Environmentalists and other enemies**

Although the group sponsors agriculturally-related Earth Day events and holds an annual contest for the farmer who practices the best stewardship of his/her land, the coverage of environmental issues during the past 40 years indicates hostility toward both environmentalists and regulators. Whereas environmentalists are unnamed adversaries in other genres, in the group’s newspaper, specific groups have been targeted. To its members, the group has represented environmentalism as a conspiracy that threatens the ‘American’ way of life. Members of the environmental conspiracy have changed over time. KFB first targeted animal rights activists in 1981, charging that they were creating an “anti-meat bias” by their “attempt to humanize animals and ascribe human thought processes to animals.”

In the following year, vegetarians drew the group’s ire. In February, the newspaper ran a story critical of a pamphlet produced by the Humane Society of the United States for elementary school children: “Among the objections which KFB has raised to the guide, the most basic has to do with the Humane Society’s implication that ‘humans and animals share equality.’”

In 1984, the paper ran three stories critical of animal rights activists. In June, the paper ran a story based on research conducted by the USDA which asserted that farmers treated livestock compassionately in order to counter “animal rights crusaders [who] are intent on mandating major reforms in livestock production practices by using emotional arguments to fabricate problems where ones do not exist.”

In September, the paper ran a story critical of a Massachusetts referendum initiative to ban CAFOs. The following year, the group endorsed a law proposed by Senator Jesse Helms that would have protected egg production facilities from animal rights attacks, ran a story critical of animal rights groups who opposed CAFOs, and reported that the Livestock Congress had placed animal rights terrorism in its program.

In 1990, KFB’s newspaper ran a front page story about state delegates’ adoption of a policy proposing “that an aggressive educational program covering animal and poultry production be presented to the public . . . to head off efforts by animal rights activists who want

---
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to curtail meat consumption.” The following October, the group stated its opposition to “legislation that would give animal rights organizations or any public agency the right to establish standards for the raising, handling, feeding, housing or transportation of livestock, poultry, aquaculture and fur bearing animals.” In November, under a headline that declared “Fighting extremists,” the paper ran a story about a new group, Putting People First, which included members from Kentucky, and had formed to defend the use of animals.

In 1991, KFB attacked “a proposal by a pro-vegetarian physician’s committee to eliminate meat and dairy products from being listed as two of four basic food groups.” Three months later, the paper reported that the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles were being used in anti-meat anti-farmer campaign in an unspecified book published by Random House. In January 1992, the American Farm Bureau hired a public relations consultant to speak at its annual meeting about the animal rights movement which she charged, “is a proxy for vegetarianism.” The following month, the paper reported that delegates to the American Farm Bureau’s annual meeting “urged swift prosecution of individuals and groups who release or steal research animals.” In 1993, the paper reported an increase in animal rights attacks on food producers.

Simultaneously, the paper ran stories critical of environmentalists who wished to reduce the use of pesticides in foods and research that advised people to eat less red meat. The paper ran stories that attacked medical concerns about cholesterol, charged that the anti-veal campaign was a smear campaign against farmers, criticized “sensational stories that fan flames of food phobia,” ran three stories lambasting press coverage about the use of Alar on produce, and attacked a program produced by Bill Moyers that was critical of pesticide use.

To counter the threat, the paper ran stories charging: “Food faddism, quackery cost elderly billions,” “Pesticides in food are weaker than aspirin,” “Most chemicals on food pose no threat, scientist reports,” “Scientists say BST no threat to humans,” “Tests show most foods residue-free, according to FDA report,” “UK says worry over pesticide residues may be misplaced,” and “Worms or apples: Butz says chemicals are vital to good supply.”
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The paper praised a “20/20” program about the research of Bruce Ames who has claimed that carcinogenics are naturally occurring in produce,\textsuperscript{538} reported on a California referendum that would have established the nation’s strictest pesticide regulations,\textsuperscript{539} and ran a story about a \textit{Newsweek} science editor who advised farmers to alleviate “consumer fears on an emotional level.”\textsuperscript{540} Stories warned that the “Public’s fear of chemicals may lead to new rules,”\textsuperscript{541} and that “chemical fears threaten a century of progress,”\textsuperscript{542} advised farmers to use pesticides and antibiotics responsibly,\textsuperscript{543} and discussed “environmental myths.”\textsuperscript{544}

Some of the group’s harshest and most strident criticism was directed at environmentalists who supported wilderness preservation and the Endangered Species Act. In a 1990 column, Kleckner implied that environmentalists were pagans, the nemesis of the group’s Christianity.\textsuperscript{545} “Some environmentalists practically worship the land. I worship God and respect the land.” In the president’s column in January 1991, then KFB President Ray Mackey wrote:\textsuperscript{546} “While recognizing the value of some wetlands to our ecology, we strongly oppose giving up good farmland to provide a haven for snakes and mosquitoes.”

Related stories included: “Obscure animals, plants threaten jobs,”\textsuperscript{547} “Owl tax boosts cost of new home,”\textsuperscript{548} the American Farm Bureau’s campaign to reform the Endangered Species Act to “restore balance, scientific integrity and common sense,”\textsuperscript{549} an assertion by the American Farm Bureau president that people should be put first,\textsuperscript{550} a demand for compensation for farmers whose operations are hindered by efforts to protect endangered species habitat,\textsuperscript{551} and a charge that environmentalists’ “Bambi syndrome” was responsible for the 1988 forest fires in Yellowstone National Park.\textsuperscript{552} The Sierra Club drew an attack from Kleckner, who complained that\textsuperscript{553}

[w]e have been targeted as the ‘enemy’ because we support efforts to pass state and national private property rights legislation. . .

The Sierra Club has accused us of ‘cynically trading on our nation’s traditional beliefs’. If protecting our property rights is ‘anti-environment,’ then we are in the company of our founding fathers. . .
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But the harshest criticism was directed at the EPA and other governmental agencies. The group attacked the EPA’s wetlands policies, pesticide regulations, air quality regulations that the group termed “polluted thinking,” and attempts to reduce lead in gasoline. The EPA’s plans to regulate CAFOs resulted in charges that such regulation “is nothing more than a blatant attempt by EPA to regulate well beyond congressional intent.” In 1999, the newspaper announced: “Recent developments in Washington regarding a new pesticide law are illustrating, in stark terms, the threat posed to agriculture from an out-of-control politicized Environmental Protection Agency.”

Since 1961, KFB has criticized government agencies and researchers examining the health effects of smoking. One of the group’s 1961 recommendations asked “the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Cancer Society, and others, to refrain from the use of propaganda based on inconclusive research regarding the effect of cigarettes on human health.” In 1989, the group began to critique research on the effects of second-hand smoke.

KFB’s hostility is understandable. The onslaught of surveillance by environmentalists and government agencies combined with a steady decline in tobacco revenues as a result of a growing body of research that indicated health effects from smoking, chewing, and second-hand smoke created very serious economic hardships for many farmers in Kentucky who relied upon income from tobacco production to maintain their farms. The group’s first response was to call upon agricultural scientists and economists to supply information to rebut the claims of environmentalists and government agencies. The group seemingly felt secure in its ability to influence regulation in Kentucky but was less secure about its political clout in Washington, DC. Thus, from the onset, it expressed more hostility at federal agencies and environmentalists than it did at the state level.

The governor’s declaration of emergency prompted a rapid response from both the group and land grant professionals who took the emergency regulations as criticism of practices that had previously been accorded respect within the state. The regulations not only presented a clear and present danger to their hegemony; they also challenged the group’s assertions that it spoke for farmers and Kentuckians. Further, because the group associates particular policies—those that uphold neoliberal economic and political thought and valorize positivist science—with democracy, it sees environmental regulations as a challenge to the group’s notion of the ‘American way of life’. The regulations, which are imposing a new regime of truth and a new form of governmentality on the group, also call the group’s notions of what is properly ‘American’ into question.

In his study of the National Front in Britain, Billig (1978:287) notes that “[i]nternal democracy is . . . no guarantee of a democratic attitude towards political power in general.” Although KFB has always asserted that the group’s policies are more valid than others because its policy development process is so democratic, Billig’s discussion of coteries, elite groups within the larger group, who alone are ‘in the know’ and direct the other group members, may be relevant to analysis of KFB. If, as discussed in a previous chapter, KFB members were not asked to vote on the group’s position on regulation of industrial hog farms, and the decision to oppose
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regulation was made by a small group of ‘insiders’, the group’s claims to democratic procedure are suspect. Additionally, the group’s response to criticism of farming practices has been less than democratic. As previously indicated, during the public hearings the group deployed the strategy of attempting to limit participation by asserting the superiority of agricultural over against other knowledges and by attempting to limit public notification and comment to abutters of CAFOs. The group’s strategies to exclude other voices, however, were more extreme than those undertaken during the hearings.

On 13 December 1997, KFB issued a press release that included “a detailed package of planned agricultural investments, farmer-friendly regulatory policies and tax reductions” to be submitted to the 1998 General Assembly. Near the end of the release, the group announced it would “[s]upport passage of anti-disparagement legislation that provides a legal cause of action against anyone who makes false claims about farmers or farm products.”

Clearly the group assumed that it would be the arbiter of ‘false claims’. And, given the group’s history of representing those who oppose their policies as ill-informed, emotional, and, in its representations of environmentalists and government agencies as ‘propagandists’ serving a ‘political agenda’, the subject’s of the group’s disciplinary intents are clear. The group’s notions of ‘democracy’ are bounded and include only like-thinking individuals and groups.

At its 2001 annual meeting, because the current regulations would expire in April 2001 if not approved by the legislature, the group endorsed a new CAFO regulatory package designed by KFB members and other commodity groups to replace the emergency regulations. In the same legislative request, the group said: “However, we expect that the Cabinet will continue to issue unauthorized, unreasonable regulations for Kentucky’s livestock and poultry industry.” A subsequent legislative request announced that Representative Mike Cherry had introduced a bill that would prohibit the Cabinet from imposing joint liability on contractors and farmers and assure that the state regulations cannot be more stringent than federal regulations.

Despite the threats to its hegemony, a page one story in the group’s online edition of its newspaper reported that President Sam Moore painted an optimistic picture at the group’s 2001 annual meeting:

Politically, we carry a great deal of influence. We’ve had some difficulties in Frankfort but that’s to be expected at a time when there are so many serious and complex problems to address and so many voices involved in the process. Politics is a tough game and everybody can’t be your ally.

With the emergence of so many special interest groups, especially in the environmental arena we encounter more opposition than ever before.

The group is maintaining its stance that those who disagree with its policies do so from ‘political’ and self-interested positions. The group, however, has modified its contention that it speaks for all Kentuckians. In the same story, Moore is reported as saying that the support of Kentucky’s Congressional delegation for KFB’s program “indicates that Farm Bureau’s thinking is in line with that of most Kentuckians.”

560 I could find no indication that any legislator wrote or submitted such a bill for consideration during that legislative session.
563 Emphasis added.
Although KFB locates itself in the Kentucky mainstream and stresses its ties to the University of Kentucky and agricultural stations across the state, comments made by members at the hearings also stressed the group’s position in networks of state and federal agricultural agencies and agribusiness firms. As previously mentioned, comments stressed the ‘insider’ knowledge that the group receives from the knowledge production of these other network participants to assert a superior understanding and relegate the opposition to the margins. Although in the group’s newspaper, KFB stresses its position in a global network of agricultural export products, the group has not stressed its global marketing aspirations at the hearings likely because its strategy has been to represent Kentucky CAFOs as operated by local farmers who are committed to protecting their localities. This representation was deployed to counteract the claims of opponents of CAFOs who stressed the contractual power of out-of-state integrators to determine the terms of production without consideration of impacts upon localities.

The group’s representation of the network in which it is embedded is partial. Monks (2000: 16-17) reports that the national and state Farm Bureau’s agenda is largely shaped by its financial networks, which were not referenced in any of the genres I researched.

The national, state and county Farm Bureaus also control some 654 insurance companies producing annual revenue of some $6.5 billion and cooperatives producing revenue of some $12 billion.

The Farm Bureaus also have investments in banks, mutual-fund and financial services firms, grain-trading companies and other businesses. Many of these businesses in turn own stock in oil and gas, pulp and paper, timber, railroad, automobile, plastics, chemical, steel, pesticide, communications, electronics and cigarette companies and even a nuclear power plant. The list of stocks held by Farm Bureau companies read like a who’s who of corporate heavyweights: Philip Morris, Weyerhauser, DuPont, Union Carbide, AT&T, Ford Motor, Raytheon, International Paper, CBS, Tyson Foods, Archer Daniel Midland (ADM) and many more.

Farm Bureau holdings in firms that have invested in industrial livestock farming might explain some of KFB’s enthusiasm for these farming practices.

KFB’s network also includes state and federal agencies with an interest in the regulations, the activist groups who support regulation, the regulations themselves, and the media coverage are also components of the network. Similarly, although members of the group have referenced biological organisms (as pollutants), the hogs as deanimalized commodities, and waterways, soil organisms, and air molecules as passive receptors of pollutants, they are not understood as network components.
Gender and religious strategies

Members of the KFB group on a less conscious level have consistently asserted gendered human-environment and human-animal relationships. Feminist theorists (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Haraway 1989, 1991; Harding 1984, 1993; Irigaray 1985; Merchant 1980; Rose 1993, Plumwood 1993; Shiva 1988; Warren 1997; Wolch et al. 2000) have deconstructed what they see as the masculinist assumptions564 that underlay the discourses of instrumental science and economics, the discourses deployed by KFB. Through historical analyses, they have chronicled the development of the binary systems that underlay these discourses. Although the starting points of their historical analyses differ,565 all point to the development of binary systems that posit hierarchical spatial splits between reason and irrationality, male and female, mind and body, objectivity and subjectivity, human and animal, culture and nature, and public and private. They argue that male-produced dominant discourses locate in the spaces of reason, mind, objectivity, human, culture, and public space; the female in the devalued spheres of irrationality, body, subjectivity, animal, nature, and the private. Thus, in these systems of representation, the male is represented as a rational, objective actor in the public domain; the female as a passive, irrational and emotional subject in the private realm.

By dint of her ascribed irrationality and emotionalism, the female has become represented as a potentially disruptive force that must be controlled. The practices associated with the disciplining of the feminine are deeply implicated in social norms and practices that KFB takes as ‘common sense’. The roles and spaces that the group assigns to women both reflect and reinscribe these systems of control.

The incorporation of an article per issue featuring subjects of interest to ‘women’ reflects the group’s policy of offering family memberships to encourage a very particular nuclear patriarchal family, its assumptions that that audience will read the newspaper in their homes, and that women’s interests are derived from their positions as support for family members. In the history that celebrates the group’s 50th anniversary, the roles of women are allotted only a half page of the 18-page publication. Further, women share that half-page with young people who are also assigned a low status in patriarchal social arrangements. The text describes the roles allocated to women.

Farm Bureau women conduct the King and Queen Contest, the Talent Contest (in cooperation with the young people), Style Revue, and leadership training conferences. FB women also promote special projects such as citizenship and participation in local affairs, in addition to numerous other activities.

Women are assigned the responsibilities of fostering ‘traditional’ male-female relationships, enforcing norms of attractiveness, and encouraging talents and fashions endorsed by the group. Their special projects are oriented toward nurturing a particular type of citizenship, male-female relations, and male-female characteristics. Importantly, women are the background in these activities that focus instead upon contest winners and the new leaders who emerge as a result of women’s caretaking in the private sphere.

564 Plumwood (1993) has a similar critique, however, she prefers to use the term master rather than masculinist.
565 For example, Irigaray and Plumwood begin their analyses with the Greeks and Merchant begins with the mid-fifteenth century.
Although the group maintains that it espouses equal opportunities for women, the following 1979 State Resolution carefully establishes limits.

The strength of every civilized society is the family.

We believe that women should be afforded equal opportunity, accept individual responsibility; and receive equal compensation for equal work. However, we do not believe an amendment to the constitution is necessary to accomplish this.

We oppose reverse discrimination.\(^{566}\)

The positioning of women within the family clearly establishes women’s roles—again, caretaking and nurturing—as the most important. This reinforces a geography of gender in which women are located in the “private” space of the home and men in the public, a spatial division that feminists (Butler 1990, Hays 1996, Van Buren 1989, Wearing 1984) have consistently challenged as creating “histories of exclusion, subordination, and control” (Moore 1997: 91). In other words, the nuclear patriarchal family functions as a form of social control.

Farming in the West is a male-dominated industry (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Sachs 1996). Farm women in the US have been represented and sometimes represent themselves (Peter et al. 2000) as responsible for farmhouse chores (cleaning, cooking, and raising children) rather than for the farm business itself. Sachs, however, reports that, in the US, farm women have traditionally raised animals.

Until the 1940s, U.S. farm women cared for chickens, marketed chickens and eggs, and maintained control over the income. Referred to as ‘pin money,’ farm women’s earnings from poultry enterprises brought substantial income to their farms (Sachs 1996: 106-107).

Likely because it was practiced by so many women, livestock farming was feminized (Peter et al. 2000). In the early 1900s, poultry scientists and extension services began an attempt to vest chicken production from women (Sachs 1996). Women, however, resisted and new production methods run by men did not displace women’s chicken production until the years following World War II (Sachs 1996).

In its alliance with Extension Service and agricultural professionals, KFB endorses this gendered division of labor. A 1979 resolution juxtaposes language that supports equal compensation for equal work to a statement about reverse discrimination, indicating that women’s abilities must not be allowed to threaten men’s incomes. Assumedly, the authors of this resolution feared that the passage of a state constitutional amendment that ensured women of equal pay would result in ‘reverse discrimination’. In other words, women must not be allowed to threaten male hegemony.

Similarly, in 1981, the group resolved in its Policies, Resolutions, and Recommendations (60), that “federal guidelines to eliminate sex discrimination in our educational institutions and programs should be permissive rather than mandatory.”\(^{567}\) It is noteworthy that this is also the group’s stance on environmental regulation: compliance should be voluntary. This strategy

\(^{566}\) Policies, Resolutions, and Recommendations, 1979, p. 69.

provides some ‘wiggle-room’, space from to argue that particular circumstances could override the intent to practice equality or comply with regulation, thus preserving male hegemony.

Also, as many feminist theorists (Hartsock 1987, Hays 1996, Van Buren 1989, Wearing 1984) working from a range of differing theoretical perspectives have noted, women have been assigned to the role of reproduction, both physical and social. KFB has maintained close surveillance on women’s physical abilities to reproduce. The group established reproductive boundaries in 1961 when it undertook a campaign to alter the state’s welfare system. The following quotation summarizes the changes that the group sought.

. . . no welfare program should be used to reward anyone for continually producing illegitimate children. This has become a major problem in many counties in our state.

We believe that the entire welfare program needs a thorough investigation by a group of responsible taxpayers. If necessary, as a result of such a study, we will support such changes in the law and in administrative rules that will correct some of the abuses of the present program. We believe that secrecy should be removed from the welfare records. Taxpayers should have a right to know who they are supporting through public funds (1961: 19).569

Only women with a man acting as the head of the household are candidates for reproduction in the group’s view; women who do not comply with the group’s norms of heteronormative patriarchal families will be punished economically.

The group moved further to limit women’s choices about reproduction in 1980 when, under the heading of “Human Life,” the group stated, “We believe in the sacredness of human life and support those engaged in working for the protection of all life.” The following year, under the same heading, the group opposed “abortion except when it is deemed medically advisable by a panel of doctors.”

In 1976, under the heading of “Public School Education,” the group suggested “caution and exercise of good judgement [sic] in offering sex education courses” and recommended “that parents be consulted in this matter.” Three years later, the group called for “the teaching (at all levels of education) of basic moral values, basic economics and responsibilities of living in a

570 Policies, Resolutions and Recommendations, 1980, p. 76.
The withholding of information and insistence on socialization to “basic moral values” which would be attained through Bible education and prayer in the schools in tandem with “basic economics and responsibilities of living in a democratic society” clearly establish capitalism as the moral economy of democratic politics. Thus, the group has conflated Christianity with capitalism.

The feminization of the ‘natural’ world as controllable is implicit both in KFB’s strategies of opposition to environmental regulation and in its representations of environmentalists. As previously mentioned, the group has consistently asserted that the ‘natural’ world can be controlled through technology. Similarly, the group’s representations of environmentalists as overreacting emotionally to industrial farming practices feminizes environmentalists by positioning them on the irrational side of the rationality/irrationality and culture/nature binaries. It is noteworthy that only women have held the group’s position of director of natural and environmental resources: because the ‘natural’ world is feminine (passive and controllable), the position charged with the responsibility to develop its regulation can also be female. Additionally, KFB’s hostility to environmental regulation and environmentalists indicates a hostility to the ‘natural’ world when it moves from background to foreground, much like the group’s hostility to women when they do not remain circumscribed within the patriarchal heterosexual private space of the family or attempt to exercise control over their reproductive capabilities.

The group’s overt hostility to vegetarianism is also noteworthy. Although it is possible to argue that vegetarianism presents an economic threat to livestock farmers, certainly that threat, in the U.S., is not especially acute because so much meat is sold to an increasingly global market. I argue that there is also a gendered reason for the group’s condemnation of vegetarians. Although Adams’ (1993) history of vegetarianism is flawed by a tendency to essentialize women and the ‘natural’ and to assume that vegetarian societies may be less hierarchical, she has carefully documented the linkages between vegetarianism and women and the feminization of male vegetarians. Adams (1993:36) writes that

> [t]o vegetate is to lead a passive existence; just as to be feminine is to lead a passive existence. Once vegetables are viewed as women’s food, then by association they become viewed as ‘feminine,’ passive.

Her research is helpful to understanding the gendering inherent in KFB’s conflation of vegetarianism, animal rights, and environmentalism. The group’s insistence on linking people who it categorizes as vegetarians, animal rights activists, and environmentalists effectively feminizes them by their associations to things in the environment that are feminized.

---

575 For example, a page one story in the November 2000 edition of the group’s newspaper reported that, according to USDA figures, Kentucky’s exports totaled $889 million in Fiscal Year 1999. Of that $889 million, $212 million was accrued from exports of live animals and meat (Kentucky ranked second nationally in this category). The paper reported that, throughout the 1990s, exports to Brazil increased 847%, Argentina 417%, and Chile, 172%. An August 1993 story in the group’s newspaper reported that 1993 export growth was 15-18% and that the majority of this increase was accounted for by U.S. pork exports.
The word vegetable acts as synonym for women’s passivity because women are supposedly like plants. Hegel makes this clear: ‘The difference between men and women is like that between animals and plants. Men correspond to animals, while women correspond to plants because their development is more placid.’ From this viewpoint, both women and plants are seen as less developed and less evolved than men and animals. Consequently, women may eat plants, since each is placid; but active men need animal meat (Adams 1993:37).576

As previously mentioned, the discursive shift from raising to growing deanimalizes hogs, rendering them more passive, more feminine and thus less a source of rational (that is, male) concern. This discursive move both naturalizes and stresses male dominance over that which has been assigned to a lower level of the ‘natural’ world. KFB’s strategies are an exemplar of what Warren (1990: 122-123) calls “an oppressive conceptual framework” which is characterized by five features: 1) “value-hierarchical thinking” which “attributes value to that which is higher ‘up’ than that which is lower or ‘down’”; 2) “value dualisms . . . in which the disjuncts are seen as exclusive”; 3) “power-over conceptions of power”; 4) “conceptions of privilege which serve to maintain and justify the dominance of those who are ‘up’ over those who are ‘down’ “; and 5) “a logic of domination, i.e., a structure of argumentation which provides the moral justification of subordination.” Both KFB (and, as will be illustrated in the following chapter, the Cabinet) assert (white middle and upper class) male dominance over women, the biophysical domain, and animals. This position is asserted through technological prowess (Plumwood 1993). Yet, that technological control is threatened by the hauntings of all that KFB desires to repress.

**Hauntings**

A number of ghosts hover about KFB’s discourse. The ‘natural’ world itself is a specter in KFB’s cosmology of a passive ‘natural’ world that can be controlled and/or improved. Similarly, the hogs are specters, represented only as “units” or, in marketing discourse, as pork. Adams (1993) argues that the shift from hog to pork renders the hog an “absent referent.”

Through butchering, animals become absent referents. Animals in name and body are made absent as animals for meat to exist. Animals’ lives precede and enable the existence of meat. If animals are alive they cannot be meat. Thus a dead body replaces the live animals. Without animals there would be no meat eating, yet they are absent from the act of eating meat because they have been transformed into food (Adams 1993: 41).

Although KFB’s strategy throughout the debate has largely consisted of a denial of significant change in agricultural practices through its insistence that industrial farming is the next ‘natural’ step in the ‘progress’ of agriculture, the group has made dramatic changes to both interdiscursive and intradiscursive dependencies. Despite the group’s use of familiar discursive elements, the group’s meaning systems have undergone a major shift. Through its endorsement of contract farming, genetically-designed hogs, biotechnology experts, and stress on export markets, KFB has altered interdiscursive dependencies which, in turn, has changed intradiscursive dependences by creating a new modality of enunciation (that of large-scale

576 Adams does not cite Irigaray who, in 1985, published a critique of Hegel’s association of women and plants.
contract livestock farming) which demands a new mode of rational behavior, and creates a new boundary that excludes the smaller-scale sustainable practices advocated by KFTC and CFA from the domain of agricultural rationality. This exclusion has effectively cast farmers who advocate CFA’s vision of agriculture further outside of the dominant discourse of agriculture—they are no longer subjects who may speak. KFB’s discourse entails changes in scientific, agricultural and legal discursive formations. Both the discursive formations of science and agriculture deployed by KFB rely upon biotechnological ‘advances’ that allow confinement of hogs (and chickens) and the power of these formations is intensified by their compatibility with neoliberal economic discursive formations of competition, economies of scale, and profits. At the same time, however, the Cabinet’s scientific discourse has been altered to include discursive elements related to environmental and public health effects of industrial farming and that alteration has resulted in the regulations which KFB has represented as constraints.

The changes in legal discursive formations are also double-edged. On the one hand, changes that facilitate contractual agreements between farmer and corporate integrator also support the altered scientific and agricultural discourses, as well as that of neoliberal economics. On the other hand, the inclusion of environmental and public health discourses into the Cabinet’s legal discursive formation challenges KFB’s discursive formations of science and agriculture.

As previously mentioned, KFB locates the agency that drives the shift to industrial farming in the ‘market’ and technological ‘advances’. In the group’s calculus, this spectral ‘market’, which is completely disassociated from social relations, operates according to the laws of supply and demand, and the equally ghostly technology defines what is ‘progress’. Similarly, although the group insists upon the objectivity of agricultural experts, their subjectivities, manifested by the power/knowledge networks in which they are embedded, haunt the debate.

Having explored the activists’ and the KFB group’s positions and strategies within the debate, in the following chapter, I interrogate the Cabinet’s role and its representation of the regulations.

577 Clearly, this process of exclusion is not a new phenomenon, however, this discursive move heightens CFA’s exclusion.
We do not know who are the agents who make up our world. We must begin with this uncertainty if we are able to understand how, little by little, the agents defined one another, summoning other agents and attributing to them intentions and strategies.\textsuperscript{579}

Cool.

Moist.

Water flows beneath me. It seeps through my neighbors’ pores, trickles down my hard surface and pools in my cracks.

I am calcium carbonate.

I am strong.

I have been here forever.

Tremors. Rumbles.

Falling. I have shifted.

Dirt is falling. Rocks strike my surface. They are piling up in front of me, over me.

I am surrounded by dirt and rocks that are not of my kind.

Where is the water? I hear but cannot feel it now.

The water is moving.

I am enclosed now.

\textsuperscript{579} Latour (1983: 35).
CHAPTER SIX

Truth effects, discipline and governmentality

... authority produces space through, for example, cutting it up, differentiating between parcels of space, the use and abuse of borders and markers, the production of scales (from the body, through the region and the nation, to the globe), the control of movement within and across different kinds of boundaries and so on. ... Nevertheless, these spatial practices of oppression do not mean that resistance is forever confined to the authorized spaces of domination. Indeed, one of authority's most insidious effects may well be to confine definitions of resistance to only those that appear to oppose it directly, in the open, where it can be made and seen to fail.\textsuperscript{580}

Participants’ risk discourses have been formed through the development of knowledges that have been produced as tactics and strategies of power to attain specific objectives. Just as notions of risk expressed during the debate are embedded within particular socio-spatial histories, so are notions of governmentality. In previous chapters, I have indicated the forms of governmentality recognized as legitimate by KFTC, CFA, and KFB. Briefly, KFTC and CFA acknowledge that environmental conditions play an important role in governing human actions, assert that state governmentality of industrial farming practices is necessary to protect the environment and public health, and, while recognizing that economic conditions govern farmers’ behaviors to varying extents, argue that those economic conditions are a form of hegemonic social relations that can be changed. This position is argued through a strategic construction of ‘traditional’ versus industrial farming practices.

Conversely, KFB argues that, to a large extent, environmental conditions can be protected by technologies of control that render the type of state intervention represented by the regulations unnecessary, and although the group agrees that economic conditions govern farmers’ behaviors, it sees ‘market forces’ as inexorable laws that operate outside of social contexts and thus are not subject to change. In this construction, industrial farming is a rational accommodation to the ‘market’. KFB’s notions of acceptable forms of rationality can be traced to its ideas of proper forms of governmentality and of the knowledges that should be brought to bear in designing a regulatory scheme.

Because KFTC and CFA assert the importance of environmental conditions and see the ‘market’ as a social relation, they maintain the primacy of knowledges produced by physical, medical, and social scientists researching the environmental and social impacts of industrial farming practices. The rationalities associated with this position are environmental, which entails a long-term \textit{vis-à-vis} a shorter-term perspective, and social, which are expressed in the counterhegemonic discourses noted in previous chapters. On the other hand, KFB argues for the primacy of knowledges produced by agricultural ‘experts’ that includes technological and economic rationalities. As previously indicated, KFB’s position relies upon the assertion of a number of boundaries, including those between ‘experts’ and ‘lay’ knowledges, public and

\textsuperscript{580} Pile (1997: 3).
private domains, economic and social systems, and, although not explicit, gendered notions of socio-spatial relations.

Similarly, although the Cabinet asserts its right to govern, it is also subject to differing forms of governmentality with associated rationalities. The state, in Foucault’s scheme of things, distributes “the disciplines of a competitive world market” (Gordon 1991: 43) throughout the social body. In this rendering, however, the state is not a monolithic entity; instead it consists of many, sometimes competing, regimes of truth that must be identified. Foucault saw modern governmentality as the construction of techniques of power articulated through linkages between power and knowledge that are “designed to monitor, shape, and control the behavior of individuals situated within a range of social and economic institutions” (Gordon 1991: 3-4).

Darier (1999: 22) argues that Foucault’s notion of governmentality is useful to environmental critique because it explicitly deals with issues of (state) ‘security’, techniques of control of the population, and new forms of knowledge (savoirs). Contrary to more traditional analyses of ‘public policy’, which focus narrowly on ‘objectives,’ ‘results’ within an instrumental framework of linear causalities and quantifiable data, governmentality focuses on the deeper historical contest and the broader power ‘effects of governmental policy.

The regulations are designed to shape and control industrial hog farmers through surveillance of their behaviors and environmental conditions. Throughout the debate, the Cabinet reiterated its concern to maintain a balance between what it represented as competing environmental and economic goals, stressing its role as mediator, representing itself as objective and removed from the partisan interests of participants in the debate. To critics from all sides, the Cabinet asserted the need to “balance the competing interests of all of its citizens in the development of statutes and regulations.”

When pressed for more stringent regulation, the Cabinet frequently asserted its desire to avoid creating economic constraints on industrial hog farmers. For example, in response to activists’ insistence that the regulations require geotechnical investigation, the Cabinet replied, “Costly and extensive geotechnical investigations to determine susceptibility to subsidence of the lagoon site would not substantially improve environmental protection compared with the costs of investigation.” And. to activists’ requests for more stringent monitoring of land application of swine waste, the Cabinet said it had “required the least amount of land application monitoring possible to preserve economic vitality, without sacrificing the environment.” It also tried to “strike a balance between environmental protection and program costs. The Cabinet’s insistence on developing a regulatory regime that avoids interference in economic processes may be understood as “the furious institutional seaching for compatible systems of accumulation and regulation” (MacLeod 1995: 53).

As previously indicated, most social science research takes the existence of environmental risks, the regular incorporation of new risks into public discourse, government regulation, and technological intervention as givens. I argue, however, that this unquestioning

581 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 10.
582 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 82.
583 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 65.
584 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 39.
acceptance masks the historical connection of risk to processes of capitalism and state concerns with security, both political and social (Gordon 1991). Ewald (1991: 198) analyzes risk as a capital and insurance as a “technology of risk.” In this reading, the regulations, which activists see as a form of insurance to protect the environment and public health, become a technology of risk that is mediated through networks of embedded understandings that are situationally derived.

Ewald (1991: 199) defines insurance as “the practice of a certain type of rationality: one formalized by the calculus of probabilities.” Experts are necessary to produce the statistical probabilities from which risk and cost-benefit analyses are derived. The ‘truths’ produced by these experts are used to design the regulations that govern. By ‘truth’ I am not referring to ‘true’ statements but to “the establishment of domains in which the practice of true and false can be made at once ordered and pertinent” (Foucault 1991: 79). Gordon (1991) reports that the notion of risk, derived from insurance techniques, was gradually applied to social matters thus extending the scope of economics to include even issues of social justice. As a result of the insurance technique’s use of expertise as a form of security, the category of economics has come to include “all purposive conduct entailing strategic choice between alternative paths, means, and instruments” (Gordon 1991: 43). Once this expertise in service of security was adopted by government, government became “bound to the authority of expertise” (Rose 1993: 291) and the knowledges that experts produce—e.g., risk assessments and cost-benefit analyses—are used to determine the rationality of governmental actions.

Knowledge here is an apparatus for the production, circulation, accumulation, authorization and realization of truth. And truth is a technical matter—it is the ‘know how’ that promises to make government possible (Rose 1993: 291).

In this chapter, through a legislative history of the Cabinet’s attempts to regulate hog farming and discussion of areas of contestation between state agencies that surfaced during the rulemaking process, I indicate the different objectives of state authorities with an interest in the regulatory process. I then discuss how the Cabinet’s strategies—its public participation procedures and regulatory scheme—produced subjects. Through an analysis of the Cabinet’s discourse in the debate, I examine its disciplinary logic to locate the ways in which it constructs the environment as “amenable to interventions by administrators, politicians, authorities and experts” (Rose 1993: 289). Then, to examine the ways in which power relations and existing socio-spatial formations affected the debate, I consider both the implications of the knowledges that the Cabinet validated by incorporation into the regulations and the ways that existing institutional arrangements, particularly jurisdictional boundaries, influenced the changes that the Cabinet made in the regulations during the public comment period. After a discussion of the Cabinet’s assumptions, I conclude with an analysis of the ways in which the Cabinet’s disciplinary logic inscribes new rural spaces and rural subjects while simultaneously reinscribing pre-existing hegemonic socio-spatial relations.

**Regulatory history**

The Cabinet’s promulgation of the first emergency regulation set off a battle between governmental bodies that is still ongoing and will likely be determined by the courts. Under Kentucky law (KRS 13A.333), if a proposed regulation is not passed by the General Assembly,
that regulation cannot be repromulgated without substantive changes for two years. The Cabinet promulgated the first emergency regulation (401 KAR 5:001E) on 18 September 1997. Each emergency regulation has two associated regulations—a permanent regulation that bears the same number, minus the ‘E’, and another that includes the definitions of terms used in the emergency and permanent regulations. The emergency regulation was scheduled to expire at the close of the 1998 legislative session because either the associated permanent regulation would be passed or the General Assembly would not endorse the regulation, which would necessitate a new declaration of emergency and promulgation of a new emergency (and permanent) regulation to stay in effect until the end of the next legislative session. Because the 1998 regulation was effectively killed by the stalling tactics of an agricultural subcommittee, the associated emergency regulation expired. During the 1998 session, CFA and KFTC members fought off an industry bill that would have weakened provisions in the regulations.

To ensure continued protection, the governor declared another emergency and the Cabinet promulgated a second emergency regulation (401 KAR 5:002E). The hearings that were part of the public participation process discussed in previous chapters were held to gather comments on the first two sets of emergency and permanent regulations. The Cabinet made a number of changes, which will be discussed later in this chapter, to these regulations during the public participation process. The second regulation was also killed by a legislative subcommittee.

At that point, Governor Patton declared another emergency and the Cabinet issued 401 KAR 5:009E that would be effective until the end of the next legislative session in 2000. Again, KFTC and CFA fought off legislative maneuvers to weaken the regulation. After a legislative subcommittee indicated in August 2000, that it found the proposed regulations deficient, the governor issued 401 KAR 5:011E to repeal 401 KAR 5:009E and allow the Cabinet to develop a new emergency (401 KAR 5:011E) and permanent regulation that included the beef, dairy, and poultry industries in the regulatory scheme. Again, the new emergency regulation was effective only until the end of the legislative session. The Cabinet opened a new public comment period and held public hearings in Frankfort on 28 March 2000 and in Madisonville on 30 March 2000.

After this emergency regulation also died in legislative subcommittee, the governor issued yet another emergency and the Cabinet promulgated 401 KAR 5:074E to be effective until 17 October 2001. The Cabinet opened another public comment period and held a public hearing in Madisonville on 22 May 2001. The following month, KFB, Kentucky Cattlemen’s Association, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Kentucky Poultry Federation, Kentucky Milk Producers Association and two farms filed a lawsuit in Franklin Circuit Court charging that the Cabinet had overstepped its legal authority. Table 6.1 provides a summary of the regulatory history.

585 balancing the scales, 2 April 1998.
586 balancing the scales, 5 April 2000.
Table 6.1. CAFO regulatory history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULATION</th>
<th>DATE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>FATE OF REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401 KAR 5:001E</td>
<td>18 September 1997</td>
<td>Killed in 1998 by a legislative subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 KAR 5:002E</td>
<td>Close of 1998 legislative session</td>
<td>In August 2000, a legislative subcommittee found the regulations deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 KAR 5:011E</td>
<td>14 February 2000</td>
<td>Issued to repeat 401 KAR 5:009E and allow the Cabinet to develop another set of emergency and permanent regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 KAR 5:072E</td>
<td>Close of 2000 legislative session</td>
<td>Killed in 2000 by legislative subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 KAR 5:074E</td>
<td>Close of 2000 legislative session</td>
<td>Still in effect, but challenged in court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In May 2001, a circuit court judge upheld KFB’s suit, saying that the regulations were null and void because the Cabinet had not made sufficient changes in the regulation before repromulgation. The judge, however, disagreed with the plaintiffs’ claims that the proposed regulations were more stringent than federal regulations and that the Cabinet had exceeded its authority. In response to the judge’s ruling, the Cabinet filed a motion to amend, alter or vacate the judge’s opinion and Governor Patton filed suit against the legislature’s ability to use subcommittees to thwart executive branch regulations. Patton argued that he was suing to protect executive prerogative because, as it stands, the veto power of the regulations subcommittee and the standing committee of jurisdiction gives a small number of legislators veto power over proposed administrative regulations. Pending court decisions, 401 KAR 5:074E is still in effect and the Cabinet is issuing permits for CAFOs.

The Cabinet has been placed squarely in the middle of a territorial battle for regulatory space between the executive and legislative branches of state government. This is not, however, the only conflict that the Cabinet has had to negotiate during the rulemaking process. The Cabinet also found itself embroiled in disputes with other state agencies about the content of the regulation. These agencies, each operating within “their own multiple spaces of partly autonomous authority” constitute “a multiple regime of governmentality” (Gordon 1991: 36) with often overlapping jurisdictional boundaries. These overlaps create spaces of negotiation and contestation.

587 The USEPA is currently writing CAFO regulations. The federal regulations also include a joint liability provision.
590 “Patton sues to limit legislative power,” The Courier Journal, 5 June 1001.
Competing regimes of truth produced by government agencies

The most consistent criticism of the regulations was levied by state agencies associated with agriculture. Stephen A. Coleman, a member of both the Kentucky Water Quality Authority and the Kentucky Division of Conservation, unleashed a barrage of complaints about the regulations during the Hopkinsville and Paducah hearings. At both meetings, Coleman argued that the Cabinet should use standards produced by the University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service for the development of nutrient management plans591 and use lesser standards from the Agriculture Water Quality Act to determine noncompliance.592 At the Hopkinsville hearing, Coleman stressed the need for the Cabinet to define “geotechnical demonstration,”593 include both aerobic and anaerobic lagoons in the regulations,594 reduce the 10 year lease requirement for land on which swine waste will be applied from 10 years to five,595 delete the requirement to inject residual solids into soil,596 and increase the number of areas from which applicants could seek variances.597 Coleman also complained that the regulations restricted family farm operations and could restrict contracts between landowners and tenants,598 that fees were excessive,599 and argued that the Cabinet should reduce the time frame for permit evaluation from 180 to 60 days.600 At the Paducah hearing, Coleman asserted that the Cabinet should rely on the Agricultural Water Quality Authority for assistance in developing the regulations,601 delete the requirement to inspect lagoons periodically,602 increase the variance percentage for numbers of hogs from 10 percent to 15-25 percent,603 weaken the criteria used to determine if hog facilities are related,604 and reduce lagoon monitoring requirements.605

The Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture also asserted that the Cabinet should use the Agricultural Water Quality Act instead of the new regulations606 that he argued would place family farms at a competitive disadvantage.607 He also maintained that the Cabinet should rely on the Department of Agriculture to develop the regulations,608 make the formula used to determine swine units compatible with that used by federal government agencies,609 and eliminate phosphorous testing in soil analysis.610 Faculty members from the College of Agriculture at the University of Kentucky also argued to eliminate phosphorous testing.611 They

592 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 114 and Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 131.
593 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, pp. 32, 33, and 47.
594 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 76.
595 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 96.
596 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 99.
597 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 112.
598 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 50.
599 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 60.
600 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 118.
601 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p.
602 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 102.
603 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 64.
604 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p.70.
605 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, pp. 104-105.
606 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 17.
607 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 22.
608 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 48.
609 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 55.
610 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 122.
611 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 123.
also asserted that the Cabinet delete the requirement that swine waste be land applied on the same parcel of land for only three out of every four years, and reduce the types of nitrogen for which testing was required.

Other members of government agencies argued that the regulations should be strengthened. Todd Leatherman of the state Attorney General’s office insisted that the Cabinet retain the joint liability provision, extend the public comment period from 10 days (in the emergency regulation) to a longer period in the permanent regulation and develop a process through which members of the public could appeal Cabinet decisions on permits, encourage the use of alternative technologies over anaerobic lagoons, increase setbacks, especially if anaerobic lagoons (which emit more odors than aerobic lagoons) are retained as treatment methods in the regulations, increase setbacks from state parks and recreation areas, wildlife management, and other sensitive areas, and measure phosphorous as well as nitrogen. Other members of state agencies made similar requests: a representative of the state Conservation Committee and a magistrate from Hopkins County also argued for increased setbacks, and the magistrate urged elimination of the use of anaerobic lagoons. Additionally, both government representatives argued that the regulations should be strengthened and the joint liability provision be retained.

The Conservation Commission representative also asserted that the Cabinet develop an odor standard, account for cumulative effects, use the lagoon rather than the property boundary as the point at which water quality standards must be met, require that the nutrient management plan be developed by an agronomic professional, reinsert standards for phosphorous testing, test for potassium, pesticides, and bacteria, and establish a variance procedure. He further maintained that the Cabinet should develop a requirement for performance bonding, liability insurance, closure funding and closure standards, develop a form of analysis to assess cumulative impacts within a watershed, require public notice for
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621 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, pp. 11 and 25; Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 7.
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624 Bowling Green Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 41.
625 The full name of the board is the Soil and Water Commission. It is responsible for oversight of Kentucky’s 121 soil and water conservation districts.
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permit renewals, prohibit the construction of barns and lagoons in 100-year floodplains, and require the use of best available technologies for waste disposal. The magistrate argued further that the Cabinet evaluate the past performances of applicants and retain the 10-year requirement for leases on land for swine application. As previously noted, a representative of the health department argued that the Cabinet should restrict the application of swine waste on land used to produce crops for human consumption.

**Governmentality and disciplinary logics**

*Producing subjects.* The Cabinet’s ability to modify farmers’ behaviors through regulation is obvious. Environmental regulation is “a process of social ordering as farmers are recast as responsible environmental managers with newly instrumentalised self-governing properties” (Ward et al. 1998: 1165). There are significant differences between KFB’s assertions of farmers as ‘stewards’ of the environment and the new role of environmental manager. As previously indicated, industrial livestock farming does not require the farmer to maintain soil quality because the land is used as a repository for waste rather than for the growing of crops. Secondly, KFB’s notion of stewardship is voluntary and utilitarian: the farmer cares for soil and water to assure a quality sufficient to produce agricultural goods. Environmental quality is determined by the farmer’s surveillance. The farmer who does not maintain quality is penalized by poor or nonexistent yields that reduce income. Although the regulations create an environmental manager who still conducts environmental surveillance, the manager must maintain records of his/her surveillance and periodically report to Cabinet employees who can, if environmental quality is not maintained to the Cabinet’s criteria, assess a monetary fine. Finally, as previously indicated, Cabinet records call KFB’s assertion of stewardship into question and the increased surveillance required by the regulations may further threaten these claims. Thus, the environmental manager is a more externally-disciplined subject position than KFB’s steward-farmer.

Throughout the hearings, activists were skeptical of the Cabinet’s assumption that it can create environmental managers of industrial livestock producers. Their suspicions, as previously indicated, were based in the beliefs that industrial producers are governed almost solely by economic rationalities and would ignore provisions that impeded profits. Similarly, many activists questioned that, given the Cabinet’s institutional history of failing to enforce existing regulations, employees would adequately perform the tasks stipulated in the regulations. Others expressed concern that the Legislature would not allocate sufficient funds for Cabinet employees to assure compliance.

Also as previously indicated, the Cabinet’s ability to establish regimes of truth that determined which knowledges to include and exclude in the debate may have constrained participants who may have edited their comments to exclude topics that were outside of the discursive boundaries that the Cabinet had drawn. Less obvious perhaps is the way that public participation procedures created particular subject positions. By promulgating the regulations

---
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and establishing public participation procedures, the Cabinet enrolled all participants, regardless of opinion about the regulations, as democratic subjects in the rulemaking process.

The regulations established the point from which subject positions were derived—subjects could choose positions ranging from opposition to strengthening the regulations. Once the draft regulations were written, other options and subject positions were foreclosed, narrowing the parameters of debate while simultaneously masking power differentials and complex relations between subjects. Rose (1993: 287) reports that within modern forms of governmentality

there is no simple distinction between those who have power and those who are subject to it: a diversity of types of authority have been invented, justified in different ways, and with different relations to their subjects. And, of course, so many of those who are subjects of authority in one field play a part in its exercise in another.

Participants in the debate occupy different subject positions in relation to a number of authorities, and to each other. All participants are subject to the authority of economic relations that are justified in terms of efficiency and rationalities of profit and loss but subject positions vary within these contexts. Although KFB members assert their subject positions as entrepreneurs producing within a ‘free market’ system, they are also disciplined by that system and simultaneously occupy subject positions as consumers of agricultural and other products. Similarly, activists occupy subject positions as consumers. It is, however, possible, as is the case with CFA and KFTC, to recognize the need to conform to economic rationalities simply to survive while maintaining an understanding of the ‘market’ as a network of social relations and incorporating environmental rationalities into economic rationalities. This ‘dual disciplining’ was expressed by many CFA and KFTC members who also belong to KFB. To the extent that the Cabinet is dependent upon tax revenues and the Legislature’s allocation of those revenues, it too is disciplined by economic relations.

Similarly, subject positions vary vis-à-vis the assumptions of the technologies of risk that will assist in conducting the surveillance and control written into the regulation. Although many activists argued for more stringent technologies of control than stipulated in the regulations, they did so out of recognition that this was the only approach sanctioned by the Cabinet. The majority of activist comments indicated a fundamental disagreement with the Cabinet’s technologies of risk: this group preferred to outlaw industrial farming in favor of more sustainable agricultural practices that require less technology to control. Again, subject positions were adjusted to the disciplining of the proposed regulations. Many of those opposed to regulation, and KFB, were willing to acquiesce to risk technology to the extent that they supported the provisions of the Agricultural Water Quality Act that, not unimportantly, made compliance to environmental goals voluntary and did not establish penalties for noncompliance. KFB members were also willing to accept weaker terms of regulation (e.g., lesser setbacks, fewer reporting provisions). Arguably, KFB took this position because it recognized it could not avoid the technologies of risk adopted by the Cabinet.

Once enrolled as subjects in the debate, participants were inserted into a network that included such artifacts as reams of paper (hearing notices, regulations, addenda, correspondence, 639 I do not mean to imply that subject positions are bounded entities. Rather, subject positions are fluid, shifting from context to context and within contexts (Massey 1999).
hearing transcripts, sign in sheets at hearings, handouts), staples, computers and printers, copy machines, telephones, fax machines, electrical circuits, the U.S. Post Office, buildings, air conditioning systems, microphones, tables and chairs, eyeglasses and contact lenses that enabled some participants to read the regulations, hearing aids that allowed others to hear the discussion, vehicles, engines, gasoline, highways, and media outlets represented by journalists. 640 Within this network, participation was temporally and spatially bound.

The Cabinet’s comment periods included deadlines: to be counted, written comments had to be submitted by a specified date. Similarly, to comment at hearings, participants had to adjust schedules to arrive at the right place at the right time. Because the length of the hearing was determined by the numbers of people who made oral comments’, time commitments varied from hearing to hearing.

The status of hearing participants was established spatially. After entering the hearing building, participants who wanted to receive a transcript of hearing comments and the regulations, proceeded to a desk manned by Cabinet personnel to sign in. After signing in, early arrivals milled about the lobby or stood outside the building smoking and talking with friends. Once inside the auditorium, participants took chairs facing a long table that was occupied by representatives of the Cabinet who spoke only to open and conclude the hearings. A stenographer sat at a small table off to one side. Only those who had notified the Cabinet of their intentions to comment orally at the hearings were allowed leave their seats to walk down the aisle between the chairs to speak into the microphone for their allocated five minutes. To assure that the proceedings remained non-adversarial, speakers could not be questioned.

Fewer people attended the Frankfort hearing than attended the other four hearings. The small audience may be attributed in part to the fact that some hours prior to the start of the hearing, Cabinet representatives had announced that the air conditioning system at the meeting site (Western Hills High School) was malfunctioning. It had been a particularly warm and humid June day and the temperature in the auditorium that evening felt like 90 degrees or more. I heard some participants complain to each other that the Cabinet had not moved the hearing site because it wanted to avoid attracting the large numbers of attendees it had seen at the Hopkinsville, Bowling Green, and Paducah hearings. Although this suspicion is a significant indicator of relationships between participants and the Cabinet, it is important to note that because the public notice of the hearing had specified date, time, and location, a venue change would have jeopardized the legality of the hearing.

Also, it is also possible that many people who had expressed their opinions at earlier hearings saw no need to attend another or that some people in western Kentucky did not want to make the long drive to and from Frankfort or incur the cost of lodging overnight when the next meeting was scheduled in western Kentucky. Additionally, CAFOs are more of an issue in western Kentucky than in central Kentucky where Frankfort is located.

Although many of us were uncomfortable in the overly warm room and feelings on both sides of the debate ran strong, participants acquiesced to the Cabinet’s protocol and the hearing proceeded calmly, punctuated occasionally by applause for a speaker’s comments.

Decontextualization. Hearing attendance, however, brought to light another form of governmentality. My notes of comments made by speakers at the Frankfort and Cadiz hearings

640 This necessarily partial listing of network components is limited to those that would likely be recognized by the majority of the hearing participants. In the following chapter, I will explore network components that were not recognized during the rulemaking and hearing process.
contain the full text of speakers’ comments. In the hearing transcripts, however, the speakers’ comments have been placed into categories established by the Cabinet. In some cases, comments had been divided into two or three categories and the full text of the comment was lost. This loss, in many instances, amounted to a loss of emotional context. For example, in my notes from the Frankfort hearing, a member of the Anderson County Farm Bureau, said, “We as farmers and other Kentuckians are literally scared to death of the EPA. . . They’re scared to death.” Although portions of the rest of his comment appeared in the transcript, his reference to fear was not included. As a result, the portions of the comment that were reproduced appear to be unemotional criticism of the regulation. Similar deletions occurred at the Cadiz hearing. For example, although other portions of this speaker’s comments were included in the transcript, the following statement was deleted: “the Farm Bureau’s claim as a voice of farmers is dubious. . . During the 59 years I’ve been on our farm, I’ve hardly heard from the Farm Bureau.” The deleted statement is important because it provides context by establishing the speaker as a farmer and long-term resident of Kentucky who was arguing for stronger regulations and because it challenges KFB’s claim to grassroots democracy.

The problem is not that the Cabinet established categories—I did the same thing when I coded comments and, although I developed more categories, many of our categories are similar. The differences in the number and type of categories that we used are directly related to differences in objectives. Because the Cabinet’s aim was to solicit comments to its regulation, Cabinet employees categorized comments by relevant sections in the regulation; those fragments of comments that did not address the debate in the terms of the regulation were ignored. On the other hand, my objectives are to interrogate the linkages between assertions of risk and notions of farming, farmers, and rurality, to explore the implications of these notions for human-environment and human-animal relations, and to investigate the processes through which some groups are marginalized in order to identify strategies to enable those groups to participate more fully in the formulation of decisions that affect them. Thus, I need a more extensive and complex coding system for identifications (e.g., gender, group affiliation, farmer) and discourses.

Additionally, the Cabinet (and all participants in the debate) are trying to fix the categories and meanings that I am attempting to destabilize. Thus, where the Cabinet is not concerned about imposing its categories and meanings on participants, I am examining the processes of knowledge production, the discourses that disseminate the knowledges, and the practices that result from the application of these knowledges to challenge discursive boundaries and destabilize the categories and meanings deployed in the debate. Like many other participants, I am interested in the knowledges that the Cabinet used in the development of the regulations.

Whose knowledges? KFB, KFTC, and CFA members sought to determine the archive that the Cabinet used to develop the regulations. Some participants objected to the Cabinet’s tendency to overlook local knowledge about the impacts of industrial hog farming. A letter signed by 72 citizens charged:

In the response to comments at the November 25 public hearing in Hopkinsville, the Cabinet stated that it based its decision (on setback distances) on research gained from various sources. The commenters ask what was the basis of

641 The same situation occurred in many of the letters that I copied from the Cabinet’s file of correspondence.
642 The Cabinet developed 227 categories; I had 324. My codes can be found in the Appendix.
research? Did they visit or talk to citizens living in large-scale hog operation areas? While on their visit, did they attend school functions? Did they find that children and teachers were happy and content in their surroundings? Did the researchers visit any rural businesses (motel, restaurant, gas station) or neighbors of the hog operation? Did they picnic in the local park and swim or fish in the lakes or rivers? Did they drink water from a well located 300 feet from a hog barn or lagoon and 75 to 150 feet from a hog waste application area?643

The Cabinet replied that it had relied upon a number of sources, including regulations for swine and animal feeding operations from “approximately 15 other states, as they related to setbacks. Also, other state regulatory programs were reviewed for similar setback and siting considerations.”644 By this response, the Cabinet played what Haraway (1991: 189) calls “the god-trick,” privileging a universalized technologically dependent knowledges of an abstract (and reified) ‘environment’ produced by government technocrats over those of non-experts, in this case, the people who are intimately involved with a particular physical landscape by dint of living in areas near industrial hog farms.645 One participant who advocated stronger regulation, noted that the Cabinet’s response was typical of other regulatory agencies. In his research of other states’ regulations, he said he had not found “any state regulatory agency that took seriously the complaints of citizens that would be impacted in a negative way.”646

When a member of the Pork Producers Association complained that the Kentucky Agricultural Water Quality Authority had been ignored in the development of the regulations,647 the Cabinet responded that it had worked with the Authority and that the Authority “may be active in the development of Best Management Practices relating to this permitting program, and the Cabinet will work closely with the Authority to develop them.”648 To a complaint that KFB had too much influence during the development of the regulations, the Cabinet replied,

During the development of the emergency regulation and the permanent regulation, the Cabinet has received input from numerous special interest groups, including the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation. There has also been input from other state and federal agencies, universities, and individual concerned citizens. Each entity is afforded equal opportunity for public input in the development of regulations. To the extent that the Farm Bureau provided input of technical or legal merit, it had influence in the regulatory development process. The Cabinet considered each comment, regardless of its source, and accepted or rejected it based on its merits.649

644 Ibid.
645 Many social scientists researching divergent notions of risk (e.g., Brown 1991, Edelstein 1988, Kroll-Smith and Couch 1991, Murphy 1994, Schrader-Frechette 1991) have noted the technocratic tendency to privilege ‘expert’ over ‘lay’ knowledges.
646 Ibid.
647 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 16.
648 Ibid, pp. 16-17.
649 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, pp. 15-16.
Two participants, who advocated more stringent regulation, complained about the content of Cabinet responses to questions. In reply to a participant who provided examples of what would constitute a sufficient response, the Cabinet wrote:

The Cabinet recognizes that the commenter did not agree with the Cabinet’s response to a comment he contributed during the Notice of Intent public comment period. However, the Cabinet has seriously considered all submitted comments and determined that the proposed regulations, as amended, are sufficient to protect the environment. While developing these proposed standards the Cabinet consulted many experts in the field of swine waste management.650

This response impugns the comment by implying the speaker’s disagreement with the Cabinet’s response to his question, rather than a desire for specific information about what the Cabinet considered relevant and acceptable data, is the sole motivation for the speaker’s criticism. To another critic who pointed to the state law that required substantive responses to comments, the Cabinet simply stated that it was conforming to the law.

From the Bowling Green and Paducah hearings through the Cadiz hearing, the Cabinet referenced unspecified sources of information: “public health officials,”651 “numerous organizations and individuals,”652 “authorities within the Commonwealth of Kentucky and other pork-producing states, including the Kentucky Farm Bureau, the Kentucky Department of Agriculture, the Kentucky Pork Producers Association, and the University of Kentucky College of Agriculture”653 and “numerous public and private authorities.”654 The Cabinet also stated that it

... used various air dispersion models, risk information, and research tools to evaluate the potential odor, air toxics, pathogen and airborne health impacts from these operations. The setback distances in the proposed regulations represent the result of that research.655

At the same time, some ‘expert’ information was disregarded. Many activists referred to academic research (e.g., Donham 1998 and Schiffman et al. 1998) that indicates that the Cabinet’s setback distances may not be adequate. Similarly, a report on Kentucky’s karst system (Crawford 1998) that was submitted to the Cabinet was ignored. The report criticized the Cabinet’s reliance upon monitoring wells in karst landscapes and maintained that the Cabinet had underestimated potential for subsidence. Throughout the hearings the Cabinet failed to respond to this and other academic research submitted by activists.

While researching, I encountered a similar problem. In response to my request to examine the Cabinet’s files of data that it had used to develop the regulations, the Cabinet told me I had to compile a Freedom of Information Act request to have access to the data. This is not standard governmental agency procedure. For example, the Massachusetts Department of

650 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 29-30.
651 Frankfort public hearing transcript, pp. 14, 24.
652 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 28.
653 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 24.
654 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 29.
655 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 40.
Environmental Protection sets aside one day a week, called “File Day,” during which the agency’s files are open to the public, and Montana’s state environmental agency and the federal EPA make files available by appointment. Kentucky’s policy of requiring people to file a FOIA request to obtain information of a kind that is a matter of public record and easily accessible from other states and federal agencies is problematic.

This practice tends to constrain information gathering and contributes to the creation of an unnecessarily adversarial relationship between persons seeking information and the Cabinet. Because the preparation of a FOIA request takes time and requires both background and procedural knowledge, the request procedure can act as a barrier to those seeking information. A detailed understanding of the background of the issue being investigated and the organizational structure of the agency is necessary to identify the types of files and documents to be requested. This is not common knowledge outside of government employment and takes time to obtain, so it tends to hamper a newcomer’s efforts to gather information. Further, because files have to be viewed in the agency office, people who cannot take time from jobs, farms or families cannot access the information they seek.

The FOIA request procedure presents two additional difficulties. First, the process is an effective way for an agency to withhold information. No matter how relevant a document may be, if that document is not specifically requested, the agency is under no obligation to advise the researcher of its existence. Second, even a well-designed request (mine had been reviewed by a university attorney prior to submission) is no guarantee that the material requested will be provided. The Cabinet’s files contained few pieces of correspondence from other agencies, and the risk analysis and computer modeling that the Cabinet referenced in the hearing transcript were not forthcoming although I had specifically requested both, as well as cost-benefit analyses.

My second FOIA request asking specifically for the documents cited by Cabinet employees on page 13 of the Bowling Green-Paducah hearing transcript was also denied. Jeffrey W. Pratt, director of the Cabinet’s Division of Water, replied,

There were only two (2) documents that I could find pertaining to your request. Both of the documents were preliminary drafts. Please be advised that the records included in your request are exempt from inspection as ‘preliminary drafts, notes, correspondence with private individuals, other than correspondence which is intended to give notice of final action of the agency,’ pursuant to KRS 61.878(1)(i).

It is noteworthy that, each draft of the regulations that the Cabinet brought to the General Assembly was represented as permanent, rather than preliminary, regulations that would go into effect when endorsed by the legislature. Assumedly, the Division of Water would have produced a final product upon which it built the permanent regulations. Yet, throughout the hearings, only these ‘preliminary’ documents, protected by exclusions in the state’s FOIA law, were referenced. At best, this seems a strategy to keep information away from the public; at worst it may indicate that nothing beyond drafts was ever produced, an omission that would call the Cabinet’s assertions of basing the regulations on careful research produced by experts into question. The issue of what knowledges are validated is crucial because

656 Correspondence from J.W. Pratt dated 15 January 2002.
it is not simply that changes in the social conditions of knowledge—in technologies, practices, and the very material factors of knowledge production. . .—change how knowledge procedures are conducted; it is rather that these changes in turn transform what knowledge is and how we may interact with it and use it (Wolfe 1998: 152).

Despite the Cabinet’s strategies—refusal to specify knowledges used to develop the regulations, failure to explain its reasons for including and excluding knowledges, and the use of FOIA as a disciplinary tool—to assert its authority and expertise and obscure its information-gathering processes—its ability to act was constrained by numerous jurisdictional borders on both the state and national levels. For example, in response to concerns about the effects of industrial livestock farming on small farmers, the Cabinet replied: “The problem of market access for small farmers lies beyond the scope of the regulations.”657 Similarly, when activists questioned why the regulations did not address the disposal of dead animals, the Cabinet said: “The statutory authority for dead animal disposal lies with the state veterinarian’s Office, in the Department of Agriculture. This administrative regulation cannot supersede the relevant statute.”658 To a question about biosecurity, the Cabinet replied: “. . . such a topic is better addressed by the U.S. or Kentucky Departments of Agriculture.”659 Similarly, when a participant called for the removal of existing state agricultural exemptions so that the Cabinet could develop a more comprehensive waste disposal plan, the Cabinet said that it did not have the authority to address the issue of exemptions.660 To concerns about the health and safety of workers in hog CAFOs, the Cabinet replied that the Kentucky Labor Cabinet regulates occupational safety and health.661 In reply to calls to increase penalty fees and establish litigation procedures, the Cabinet said its

standard practices on violations that don’t present an immediate threat to human health and the environment is to provide assistance to the violator; issue a warning order; issue a notice of violation, and negotiate agreed orders before sending the case to litigation. The General Assembly, not the Cabinet, establishes the penalties for violations of regulations.662

To KFB’s assertions that the joint liability provision would impede swine farmers’ ability to contract with an integrator, the Cabinet stated:

The Cabinet does not believe it has the statutory authority to interfere with contractual relationships between integrators and contract growers. The provision only ensures that an individual does not attempt to evade the applicability requirements. The relationship will, in most cases, be an independent contractor relationship; a relationship well understood in Kentucky law.663
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662 Ibid, p. 47.
663 Ibid, p. 70.
Recommendations about the reporting of disease outbreaks among confined hogs and requirement of treatment plants for hog waste were also outside of the Cabinet’s jurisdiction, as were recommendations that required changes to the federal bankruptcy code and General Assembly action to require a bond for closing costs, tax swine producers for remediation costs and establish water withdrawal permits for agricultural producers. Even within the Cabinet, jurisdictions are carefully defined. Repeatedly during the hearings, the Cabinet explained that the regulations are being developed by the Cabinet’s Division of Water and the odor issues that were of such concern to many participants fell within the Air Quality Division so could not be addressed in the regulations.

Thus, jurisdictional boundaries established in the past, impose a mode of regulation that is also rigidly compartmentalized. As indicated by comments at the hearings, however, environmental issues in particular require a multi-jurisdictional approach that recognizes the complex inter-relationships of components of the biophysical world. By fragmenting the ‘environment’ to fit into arbitrary jurisdictional domains, a holistic ecosystem approach that is better suited to comprehend ongoing processes (e.g., air and water flow, soil composition changes, and subterranean activities such as karst construction/deconstruction and earthquakes) as a system or network of interconnections is precluded.

The monitoring requirements operate across a variety of scales: soil composition testing is conducted on a micro scale; water monitoring wells also test at the local level but can detect changes across scales because of groundwater movement; and the regulations do not specify air testing methodologies. Although activists have argued that the Cabinet must consider local or micro conditions, such as the variability of rainfall, winds and karst formations in local areas, the Cabinet has imposed a mechanistic and reductionist approach that does not account for differences that result in test results taken from relevant scales across space-time. This is important because

[w]e cannot understand and predict long-term broad-scale landscape evolution on the basis of local process mechanics (or vice versa). There are situations where representations (models, measurements, observations, conceptual frameworks, etc.) simply cannot be extended across the entire range of relevant scales (Phillips 1999: 757).

Arguably, the Cabinet is not concerned with the effects of micro changes on landscapes over geologic time. But the fact that the Cabinet’s fragmented mechanistic model fails to recognize that “different methodologies are often appropriate or necessary at different scales . . .

664 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 128.
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670 Although I describe jurisdictional boundaries as limits to Cabinet authority, I have no reason to believe that Cabinet employees were uncomfortable with these boundaries. Rather, Cabinet employees who were criticized from all sides during the debate, may have welcomed limits to their accountability.
671 Arguably all social issues involve multiple jurisdictions. For example, the press toward workfare programs that have forced welfare recipients into the labor market involve wages, health insurance, housing, daycare provision, and potentially specific workplace safety and health issues that are the domains of a multitude of governmental agencies.
and links between different representations are necessary to understand physical geography” (Phillips 1999: 758) is problematic in that some environmental processes (karst formation, rainfall, airflow) have been disregarded and that the interactions between components of the environment which mandate “links between different representations” on different scales will not be made.

The Cabinet has dismissed the micro activities that the activists have tried to bring to the fore on the grounds that they are unscientific and emotional. Yet, “[e]xperience, intuition, tacit knowledge, and other deeply individual ways of knowing are of immense importance” (Phillips 1999: 759). Residents’ understandings of wind and groundwater flows, signs of karst landscapes, karst windows, vagaries of soils, and microclimates challenge the Cabinet’s sterile, passive model of the environment.

Further, the fragmentation of the environment that is caused by existing jurisdictional divisions and modes of regulation that have exerted such influence on the development of the Cabinet’s regulatory regime is reinscribed in the hog CAFO regulations. This reinscription will “channel the course of agricultural development insofar as it modifies present agricultural practice and induces technical change on the farm” (Ward et al. 1998: 1167). Because KFB and agricultural professionals do not account for the juridical landscape, they assume that technology has a life of its own and represents progress. Analysis of the juridical landscape, however, indicates how the institutionalization of cognitive maps and the power relations embedded within those maps create the conditions in which the environment is constructed and manipulated.

I have referred earlier to the Cabinet’s failure to recognize the transaction costs (time and financial costs of meeting attendance, researching academic literature and other state’s regulations, reading and commenting upon revision after revision) of participating in the debate. I think of this as classism and, in some cases, sexism by omission— the failure to factor such things as a wage earner’s ability to take time from work, a poor or low-income person’s access to a car, a woman’s ability to pay a babysitter to care for children or caretaker to care for an elderly family member—that erases economic differences. Similarly, the Cabinet’s classification of the letters submitted in a letter-writing campaign as “form letters” and use of quotation marks around the word “petition” when listing the signers or referring to the opinions expressed by those who signed the petition submitted at the Cadiz hearing, trivializes both letter writers and petition signers. The quotations indicate that the opinions of those who did not take the time to write individual letters or attend the hearings was regarded as less important than the opinions of those who had. Again, transaction costs were erased.

Jurisdictional boundaries also encourage a form of classism by omission. To participants who questioned the level of protection the regulations afforded to neighbors of hog CAFOs, the

---

672 A Roman Catholic Pope once said if a child were brought into the Church by the age of seven, he/she would never escape the influence of Roman Catholicism. This may be an accurate assessment. The Roman Catholic Church differentiates between sins of commission (e.g., murder, burglary) and sins of omission (e.g., failing to tell the ‘whole truth’). Classism by commission in my translation would require action, such as writing the regulations to site hog CAFOs in the poorest sections of Kentucky counties. I do not mean to set up a binary between omission and commission or action and inaction (which would likely be untenable), I am merely describing how this form of classism is performed in this case.

673 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. viii.
Cabinet often explained that neighbors who experienced problems had recourse to lawsuits. The following statements by the Cabinet are representative:

The regulations, if followed, should prevent nuisances. If they do not, private rights of action exist to compensate damaged parties.

The state has the power to bring injunctions to control health hazards. Individuals may also sue for any damage caused by these operations.

Again, the failure to recognize that some people do not have the financial resources to hire an attorney, take time from work or caretaking responsibilities to meet with his/her attorney and appear for court dates erases class and gender differences. Equally importantly, the Cabinet’s glib references to legal solutions fail to account for the fact that those who do sue are taking on powerful agribusiness firms with recourse to hundreds of attorneys who are handsomely paid to defend corporate interests. Additionally, as reported by a former attorney general of North Carolina who represented neighbors trying to sue hog producers (Morgan 1998), plaintiffs may also incur the wrath of local elites and businesses, such as real estate agents. The Cabinet’s statements also fail to recognize the emotional toll of participating in prolonged court actions (DiPerna 1985, Gibbs 1982).

Established modes of regulation. The Cabinet is also limited by existing modes of regulation. For example, to activists who argued that the point of compliance for groundwater standards should be the relevant structure on the hog CAFO, the Cabinet responded: “The point of compliance for other groundwater remediation programs administered by the Cabinet is the property boundary.” Similarly, when activists argued for more limitations on the ability of hog CAFOs to locate in floodplains, the Cabinet replied that the regulations were consistent with existing state law regulating construction in floodplains. And, to those who questioned how wetlands would be determined, the Cabinet stated, “In the current Memorandum of Agreement between the NRCS (National Resource Conservation Service) and the US E.P.A., the NRCS has the lead among federal agencies for conducting jurisdictional determinations of wetlands when such determinations are requested for agricultural lands.” The Cabinet was also bound by an existing assumption in Kentucky law that “smaller structures (such as barns and lagoons) pose lesser risks.”

To those who insisted that the regulations should require criteria for phosphorous levels in soil, the Cabinet replied, “The acceptable limit for phosphorous is not defined for Kentucky soils and further research is needed before phosphorous limits become regulatory limits.” The Cabinet attributed the lack of a phosphorous standard to “the position of the University of Kentucky’s College of Agriculture that nitrogen is the primary parameter contained in swine

674 For examples, see the Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 23, p. 128, p. 129; Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 53; and Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 12.
675 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 53.
676 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 12.
677 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 113.
678 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 47.
679 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 48.
681 Ibid, p. 74.
waste that will limit land application rates. Confronted with numerous requests that Cabinet inspectors conduct at least one visit a month to each hog CAFO, the Cabinet said:

[this] is not consistent with the requirements of mandated inspections in any other program within the Cabinet’s jurisdiction. Further, monthly inspections are not warranted for these facilities.

The constraints placed by existing modes of regulation are problematic for a number of reasons. First, the assumptions that existing modes are sufficiently protective of the environment and human health may be questionable given the number of state and federal Superfund sites in Kentucky. An August 2001 report prepared by the state Auditor of Public Accounts (Hatchett, Jr., 2001) clearly states that Cabinet enforcement of agricultural, sewage, and acid mine drainage has been insufficient to prevent environmental degradation and has created a danger to residents who drink Kentucky’s water.

Secondly, given the 20 years that KFTC members have attempted to ensure that divisions of the Cabinet enforce existing environmental laws, the Cabinet’s assumption of adequate enforcement is dubious. I do not mean to imply that Cabinet employees are recalcitrant. Budgetary and concomitant staff constraints can effectively impede the ability of employees to assure compliance with the law (Barnett 1994, Hird 1994, Yeager 1991). Additionally, the Cabinet’s assumption does not account for the ways in which employees have internalized the institutional milieu of less-than-rigorous enforcement. Employees who have never been pushed toward stringent enforcement are unlikely to adopt new norms if and when another regulation is adopted.

The Cabinet’s assumptions also fail to confront the linkages between power and knowledge production. For example, under the Memorandum of Agreement referenced previously, the NRCS, a federal agricultural agency, is responsible for the determination of wetlands. Similarly, the lack of a phosphorous standard is the result of the failure of state land grant experts to conduct the research necessary to develop a standard for Kentucky. The knowledges to establish wetlands criteria and decide that a phosphorous standard was not essential, were produced by institutions embedded in a milieu oriented toward the neoliberal economic assumptions of agricultural economists that industrial farming methods are a positive step in the ‘progress’ toward efficiency and rationality. This embeddedness tends to preclude the development of criteria and standards that might impede attainment of these goals.

The Cabinet, however, did not acquiesce totally to the existing regulatory landscape. It chose to develop a new formula to determine animal units because “the NRCS definition normalizes the swine waste by weight, which the Cabinet believes is less accurate.” During the course of the five public comment periods and hearings referenced here, the Cabinet also revised the regulations as a result of comments.

Revisions

Analysis of the changes that the Cabinet made to the regulations allows an assessment of the relative authority of participants in the debate. In this section, I will indicate the revisions, the

682 Ibid, p. 79 and Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 86.
683 Ibid, p. 90.
684 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 22.
positions that the revisions favored, the knowledges that the revisions valorized, and the Cabinet’s responses to participants’ complaints about the changes.

Table 6.2. Summary of changes in regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>GROUP BENEFITTED</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE PRIVILEGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of existing operations</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of livestock numbers</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculating swine units</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint liability</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td>Some academic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of comment period</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td>Local knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit fees</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karst siting</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td>Geologists, local knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine waste application</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Soil pH</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Areas of application</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Nutrient Management Plans</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Limitations</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback distances</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td>Some academic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon technology</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon liner requirements</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon performance monitoring</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring frequency</td>
<td>KFTC, CFA</td>
<td>Local knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease requirement</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record retention</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agricultural experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit review timeframe</td>
<td>KFB, agribusiness</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of these public comment periods, the Cabinet’s revisions primarily favored KFB’s position and asserted the primacy of knowledges produced by land grant professionals and other agricultural ‘experts.

Applicability and expansions. The Cabinet revised the regulations to exempt swine operations currently permitted under the Kentucky law regulating point discharges to waterways from the new regulations. This change benefited existing industrial hog producers and endorsed KFB’s arguments about regulation impeding hog producers. The Cabinet’s decision to grandfather existing operations likely avoided numerous lawsuits from hog producers who would have been brought under a more stringent regulatory regime, however, the Cabinet decided that, if current operations expand, the expansion only rather than the entire operation would be subject to the new regulations. This change also benefited KFB’s position as well as agribusiness
integrators seeking contractual agreements with hog producers willing to adopt industrial
technologies.

KFTC, CFA, and the majority of participants hotly contested this decision, arguing that, in instances of expansion, the entire operation rather than only the expansion should fall under the regulation. In response to their arguments, the Cabinet replied,

The Cabinet has chosen not to retroactively impose the conditions of this administrative regulation on operations permitted under 404 KAR 5:005. To do so would result in undue economic hardship to existing operators. Expanded portions of existing swine feeding operations must comply with this administrative regulation. If an operation permitted under 401 KAR 5:005 results in adverse impacts to public health and the environment, appropriate permit modifications will be imposed.685

This decision, which is contradictory to the Cabinet’s stated intentions to maintain a simplified regulatory regime—existing operations that expand will require two sets of files, one for the operation governed by the state point discharge program, another for the expanded area governed by the new regulations—can be read as reflecting the Cabinet’s goal of non-interference with capital accumulation. Thus it tacitly affirms agricultural experts’ assertions that industrial farming does not pose sufficient environmental or public health risks to justify more stringent regulation.

**Variation of livestock numbers.** In the first drafts of the regulation, the Cabinet designated 1,000 swine units as the threshold at which an operation would fall under the new regulation. To account for normal variation among swine herds, the Cabinet allowed hog producers a 10 percent increase before requiring a permit modification. If a producer had a larger percentage increase in numbers of swine units, he/she would have to apply to the Cabinet for a permit modification. As previously mentioned, KFB and others who opposed regulation fought to increase the threshold and provide for more percentage variability before the requirement to apply for permit modification. Conversely, the activist group argued for lower thresholds and less latitude for variability.

After the Hopkinsville hearing, the Cabinet changed the variability provision to “allow for a 20 percent operational variability for farrowing operations and a 10 percent operational variability for all other operations.”686 After the Bowling Green-Paducah hearing, the Cabinet eliminated the variability provision saying that it had “led to confusion and misinterpretation among both farmers and the public.”687 At that point, the Cabinet also revised the threshold number of swine units allowed before the new regulation was imposed from 1,000 to 1,250. The combined result of these revisions was an increase overall in the numbers of swine units allowed—under the 10 percent variation and 1,000 swine unit threshold, a producer could house 1,100 swine units without falling under the new regulation and a farrowing house could have 1,200 swine units. These changes were supportive of KFB’s position and tacitly endorsed the industrialization of livestock production, affirming agricultural experts’ focus upon efficiencies of scale and representations of industrialization as progress.

685 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 24.
686 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 57.
687 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 29.
Joint liability. As previously mentioned, the Cabinet’s requirement of joint liability was one of the most contentious provisions. During the course of the public comment periods, the Cabinet clarified the language, making clearer the extent of the conditions under which joint liability would be imposed. In response to the KFB group’s insistence that the provision was unconstitutional, the Cabinet replied,

The administrative regulation is constitutional and fair in ensuring that another entity that ‘owns the swine, directs the manner in which the swine will be housed, or controls the inputs or the other material aspects of the operation,’ and thus has substantial input into the way a farm operates, is also responsible for that operation. The provision does not change a private contract and does not deal with responsibility between contracting parties. It requires both parties to the contract to be responsible to the state and the public.

The retention of the joint liability provision and clarification of language supported the activist group’s insistence that the regulations account for power imbalances between corporate integrator and local producer.

Relatedness. The issue of relatedness was crucial because the numbers of swine units at related facilities would be aggregated to determine if the facilities had sufficient numbers of hogs to be subject to the regulation. Thus the definition of relatedness would play a large part in determining how many operations would be subject to the new regulation. As previously indicated, the KFB group was vehemently opposed to the Cabinet’s original definition that stated facilities were related if: they were owned by the same person or were subsidiaries of the same corporation; the same person had the authority to direct the operations; more than 50 percent of each facility was owned by the same person or corporation; or facilities were under the same ownership or control of members of the same family, had common partners, investors, officers or directors, the same landowner, tenant or operator, or had common owners who owned 10 to 50 percent of each facility. After the Frankfort hearing, the Cabinet’s definition of relatedness included only facilities that shared common waste lagoons or common land application areas. Some activists had argued against the change, maintaining that the Cabinet should aggregate “all operations under contract with a particular aggregator and corporation” to ensure that operators did not avoid regulation by dividing ownership interests among several people, and to extend concerns about ownership to contractor. In response to criticisms of the change, the Cabinet replied that it was not necessary to account for common ownership because:

It is the intent of the regulations that newly permitted swine feeding operations will not discharge to waters of the Commonwealth and, therefore, will not impair

---

688 Emphasis is the Cabinet’s.
689 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 32.
690 Hopkinsville permanent regulation, pp. 10 and 11.
691 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 70.
692 Frankfort public hearing transcript, pp. 41 and 42.
693 Ibid, p. 42.
existing water quality. Based on this premise, no cumulative loadings are
assumed to occur in waters that would require permit limitations other than the
practices prescribed in the regulations.694

Additionally, the Cabinet said, the original language regarding ownership was redundant
because:

. . . while related facilities with more than 50% [sic] of each facility owned by the
same person are, by law, under common ownership and control, related facilities
that have common owners owning ten (10) to fifty percent (50%) of each facility
are presumed to be under common ownership and control unless that
presumption can be rebutted.695

The omission of ownership and control criteria from the definition benefited both hog
farmers seeking contacts with corporate integrators and integrators who wanted to avoid liability
under the regulations. The omission allows the ownership, family or stockholders or the same
integrators to control as many operations as they wish as long as each operation has fewer than
the 1,250 swine units stipulated in the regulation. Conceivably, the same operators could control
or own five operations, each with 1,000 swine units, and not fall within the relatedness criteria for
regulation if the operations did not share lagoon or land application areas. This loophole in the
regulation legitimates KFB’s assertions of the need to expand to take advantage of economies of
scale.

Length of comment period. As previously indicated, the Cabinet changed the time for
submission of comments to the permitting of operations from 10 to 30 days. Although this
change benefited residents of the locales in which a hog CAFO planned to expand or locate, and
asserted the importance of local knowledges, it is noteworthy that the other public participation
recommendations made by members of the activist group were not incorporated into the
regulations.

Permit fees. The first emergency regulation had imposed permit fees: $1,500 for a swine
management permit, $1,000 for a permit renewal, and $500 for a permit modification.696 The
KFB group adamantly opposed the fees, arguing that compliance costs were too high and the
fees added insult to injury. Much to the activist group’s concern, the Cabinet did not include fees
into the permanent regulations. In response to activists’ criticism, the Cabinet noted that permit
fees were not part of the point discharge system and did not constitute a major portion of the
Cabinet’s budget:

Nor does the Cabinet recoup the costs of administration and enforcement of all
environmental programs through permit fees. The majority of these programs are
funded through the State Executive Budget (via state tax revenues) and federal
funds, where applicable. Permit fees provide less than 8% [sic] of the Division of
Water’s annual budget.

694 Ibid, p. 42 and Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 35.
695 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 52.
696 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 13.
It should be noted that, although no permit fee is required in the regulation, the applicant is required to invest significantly in pollution prevention measures prior to permit issuance. The investment required is correlated with the size of the operation.\(^{697}\)

Thus this change also affirmed the KFB group’s argument that fees impeded processes of capital accumulation.

**Karst siting.** As previously mentioned, members of the activist group and the president of the American Cave Conservation Association objected vehemently that the regulations were not sufficiently protective of karst landscapes and argued for larger setbacks for barns, lagoons, and land application areas in karst regions. The Cabinet maintained that setbacks were adequate because

\[\ldots\] the regulation is meant to address overland flow concerns of pollutants to a feature in direct communication with groundwater. Water infiltration through the soil and epikarst zone in an intersinkhole zone does not necessarily enter groundwater or interact with groundwater in a manner that is more or less direct than in areas with sinkholes. \(^{698}\)

The Cabinet did add ‘karst window’\(^{699}\) to its definition of karst features, \(^{700}\) a prohibition on the construction of barns and lagoons in “a sinkhole or other enclosed depression where subsidence is evident,”\(^{701}\) and a definition of karst.\(^{702}\) In reply, however, to members of the activist group who felt the additions were insufficient, the Cabinet said, “It is not the Cabinet’s intention to exclude swine feeding operations from all karst areas, but to limit specific activities in the vicinity of environmentally sensitive karst areas.”\(^{703}\) These changes legitimated the knowledges of the previously referenced geologist’s report and the executive director of the American Cave Conservation Association but were not nearly as extensive as the changes they, and activists, had requested.

**Swine waste application.** Although the first emergency regulation mandated that hog producers maintain a pH ranging from 6.0 to 8.0 on fields used for land application of swine waste, this requirement was deleted in the first permanent regulations. To criticism from activists who insisted that the pH requirement be retained, the Cabinet replied that the requirement was not necessary because the proper pH would be maintained “through normal agronomic practices.”\(^{704}\) As previously mentioned, the assumption that a hog producer who uses fields for waste application would make the same effort to maintain pH as a farmer using the fields to

\[^{697}\] Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 21.
\[^{698}\] Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 92.
\[^{699}\] A window is a site where surface matter may enter the underground karst system.
\[^{700}\] Frankfort definitions, F:20.
\[^{701}\] Frankfort siting restrictions, p. 10.
\[^{702}\] The Cabinet defines karst as a “type of geologic terrain underlain by carbonate rocks where significant solution of rock has occurred due to flowing water.” Cadiz definitions, p. 20.
\[^{703}\] Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 1.
\[^{704}\] Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 100-101.
grow crops is questionable. This change benefits the KFB position and validates the knowledges produced by agricultural experts.

Similarly, the Cabinet’s decision to eliminate the provision that limited land application of swine waste to a field to three out of every four years was opposed by activists. The Cabinet argued that the requirements of the nutrient management plan would necessitate that hog producers owned or leased sufficient land that would result in practices similar to the three-out-of-four-years restriction.705 If the Cabinet’s assessment is correct, this revision did not result in a change that would benefit any specific group. The Cabinet’s decision to delete the requirement that land application plans be developed by the NCRS or an agronomic professional was also hotly contested by the activist group. The Cabinet argued that those producers “who are already familiar with nutrient management planning and are capable of completing their own plans should not be penalized by having to solicit professional service unnecessarily.”706 Arguably, concern about complying with the regulation would provide impetus for hog producers with any doubts about the quality of their nutrient management plans to consult professionals. So, although activists opposed the change, it may not have provided a real benefit to industrial hog producers. Although the KFB group protested the Cabinet’s addition of a restriction that precludes the application of swine waste on land used to grow crops for human consumption, the Cabinet replied that it had acted on the advice of “the Cabinet for Health Services, Department for Public Health.”707 This change, which validated knowledges of public health officials, benefited food consumers, a group that includes the members of the KFB group who opposed the change.

Setback distances. As indicated previously, the size of setbacks was highly contentious. The KFB group argued to decrease the setbacks; the activist group asserted the need for substantial increases. Table 6.3 indicates the range of setbacks proposed by participants in the debate.708

705 Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 63.
706 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 99.
707 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 77.
708 The recommended setbacks can be found in the following hearing transcripts: Kentucky Resources Council, Hopkinsville transcript, p. 72, Frankfort transcript, p. 54, and Cadiz transcript, p. 42; Hickman County Local Governance Project, Cadiz transcript, p. 44; Democracy Resource Center, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 85, Frankfort transcript, p. 51; Susan Crosswait, Frankfort transcript, p. 52; Sue Whayne, Frankfort transcript, p. 52; Sierra Club, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 88; letter and petition, Cadiz transcript, p. 43; Donald Bishop, Cadiz transcript, p. 43; Dan and Barbara Weatherspoon, Frankfort transcript, p. 54; Jesse Steenbergen, Frankfort transcript, pp. 51-52; David Carter, Frankfort transcript, p. 52 and Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 89; Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Frankfort transcript, p. 57; Larry Thomas, Frankfort transcript, p. 57; Andy Elliott, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 90; Kelly Kirchner, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 90; Paul Hayden, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 90; CFA, Hopkinsville transcript, p. 70; KFB Hopkinsville transcript, pp. 72-73; and Patty Wilson and citizens, Bowling Green-Paducah transcript, p. 93.
Table 6.3. The range of setback distances proposed by hearing participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>Setback feature– barns, lagoons, residences Proposed setback</th>
<th>Land Application Method Proposed setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Resources Council, Hickman County Local Governance Project, Democracy Resource Center, Susan Crosswait, Sue Whayne, Sierra Club</td>
<td>Adjoining landowners, All land uses, 10,000 ft.</td>
<td>All methods 10,000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter and petition</td>
<td>Property lines, 3,000 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Bishop</td>
<td>All features, 3,000–5,000 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherspoons</td>
<td>Property lines, one half mile</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Steenbergen</td>
<td>Private homes, 5000 ft. Homes, streams, wells, public facilities, 2500 ft.</td>
<td>Injection, 5,000 ft. Spraying, 2500 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Carter</td>
<td>Property line minimum, 1500 ft. Residences, 3000 ft. Churches, schools, 5000 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Pork Producers Association</td>
<td>Existing residence, 1500 ft. Property line, no residence, 150 ft.</td>
<td>All methods, no residence, no setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Thomas</td>
<td>Property line, less than 500 ft.</td>
<td>Spreading, less than 500 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Elliott</td>
<td>Dwelling, more than 1000 swine units, 3000 ft. All property lines, 1500 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Kirchner</td>
<td>Unspecified, 1500 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hayden</td>
<td>Property lines, 1500 ft. Dwelling, 3000 ft. Schools, churches, 10,000 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Nearest property line, roadway, 5000 ft.</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KFB</th>
<th>Patty Wilson and 71 concerned citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, church, school, business, public structures, 1320 ft.</td>
<td>Incorporated city limit, 2640 ft.</td>
<td>Dwelling, city limits, 3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake, river, blue-line stream, 50 ft.</td>
<td>Karst feature, 30 ft.</td>
<td>Lake, river, stream, 2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water well, not owned by applicant, 300 ft.</td>
<td>Property line, 100 ft.</td>
<td>Property line, 2640 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream water, not use protected, 2640 ft.</td>
<td>Downstream public water, surface water intake, one mile</td>
<td>Land application, 3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land application, 2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land application, 2640 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land application, 3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land application, 3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land application, 5 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, members of the activist group deployed space to distance residents from CAFO buildings and operations. The larger setbacks also served to limit expansion possibilities of existing CAFOs and smaller operations as well as preclude siting of large CAFOs in many areas. This, as previously mentioned, was the reason that members of the KFB group insisted that the proposed regulatory setbacks be reduced. The difference in setbacks argued by participants also indicates differing beliefs in technologies to control environmental impacts and the Cabinet’s ability to conduct surveillance sufficient to identify problems before they affect residents. The difference also indicates divergent understandings of the physical world as passive and controllable or active and less amenable to control. As previously indicated, members of the activist group represented the physical world as active and less likely controllable than did members of the KFB group.
Setbacks in other states’ CAFO regulations also differ dramatically from those proposed by the Cabinet. For example: North Carolina imposes a 500-foot setback from property lines; South Carolina, a 1750-ft. setback between lagoons and real property owned by another person; Missouri, a 3000-foot setback between CAFOs and public buildings and residences; Oklahoma, up to three-quarters of a mile between CAFOs and other residences, a mile from 10 or more residences, and three miles from city limits; Kansas, a mile from dwellings; and Hyde County, South Dakota, 4 miles between hog operations with more than 1,250 hogs and residences. Cabinet employees said that they had consulted with officials in North Carolina and Oklahoma while drafting the regulations. Table 6.4 indicates the changes to setbacks that Cabinet employees made during the five hearings discussed here. Even after the changes, Kentucky’s regulation provides substantially smaller setbacks than many other states.

Table 6.4. Changes in setback distances during the course of the five hearings. The figures that are struck through are the original setbacks from the Hopkinsville hearing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING SETBACK FEATURE</th>
<th>BARN &amp; LAGOON</th>
<th>INJECTION OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling not owned by applicant, church, school and school yard, business and other structure to which the general public has access, park</td>
<td>1500 ft.</td>
<td>500 ft. 750 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated city limit</td>
<td>3000 ft.</td>
<td>1000 ft. 1500 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake, river, blue-line stream, karst feature</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
<td>75 ft. 150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water well not owned by applicant</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft. 150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property line</td>
<td>150 ft. 750 ft.</td>
<td>50 ft. 100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream water listed as other than use-protected, outstanding resource water</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>750 ft. 1500 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream water supply surface water intake</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>1 mile 1 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to members of both the activist and KFB group who protested the changes as insufficient or too extreme, the Cabinet replied that the setbacks were sufficiently protective. Although the setbacks are a part of the regulatory pattern, the Cabinet said... setbacks should not be viewed as the sole means by which an operation seeks to assume prevention of water pollution, odors, and other environmental concerns. However, until technologies advance to the point where setback

---

709 The state’s problems with CAFO-related environmental problems is well-documented in Thu and Durrenberger (1998).
710 Figures supplied by W. Hank Graddy, Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 88.
711 Regulatory Impact Analysis for 401 KAR 5:009E, p. 11-12.
712 The final setback figures are those in the regulations after the Cadiz hearing.
requirements can be rendered unnecessary, the Cabinet has chosen to use setbacks to address many of the environmental concerns posed with swine feeding operations.\textsuperscript{713}

The Cabinet’s response ignores the criticism that because the Cabinet relied predominantly upon setback distances to protect neighbors of hog CAFOs, the setbacks must be increased. The response also assumes the further development of technologies of control that will render setbacks unnecessary in the future and thus allow for further expansion of existing CAFOs.

\textit{Lagoon-related issues.} From the first emergency regulations to the first proposed permanent regulations, the Cabinet changed the type of lagoons allowed. The Cabinet had not included aerobic lagoons in the first emergency regulations but the first permanent regulations allowed aerobic and anaerobic lagoons.\textsuperscript{714} As previously indicated, members of the activist group had argued that anaerobic lagoons which tend to be more odiferous than aerobic should not be allowed.\textsuperscript{715} The Cabinet asserted\textsuperscript{716} that “[o]dors can be managed with properly constructed and operated aerobic and anaerobic lagoons.” Because anaerobic lagoons are less expensive to construct than aerobic, the change benefited the KFB group’s position and legitimated the agricultural experts’ argument that technological interventions could solve current odor problems.

Similarly, the Cabinet’s decision to reduce the required depth of the lagoon compacted soil liner from 18 inches with a permeability of $1 \times 10^{-7}$ in the first emergency regulations to 12 inches in the first proposed permanent regulations without specifying permeability testing methods benefited KFB’s stance. University of Kentucky professionals had argued that 18 inches was excessive.\textsuperscript{717} The addition of lysimeters for lagoon monitoring is ambiguous because lysimeters will be allowed only in cases where monitoring wells cannot be used in the vadose zone. Lysimeters will provide \textit{no} information about groundwater levels and flows that exist prior to the installation of the devices. Because lysimeters measure potential and actual rates of evapotranspiration within a plot of land, they can provide only information about the amounts of moisture moving through the plot (Christopherson 2000). Without sufficient baseline information about groundwater levels and flows, there is no accurate way to assess changes within the groundwater.

Changes in the frequency of lagoon monitoring from biannual to quarterly conformed to the activists’ calls for more stringent monitoring. To activists who maintained the change was not sufficiently protective, the Cabinet replied, “The proposed quarterly monitoring frequency is sufficient to identify temporal variations in water quality of most groundwater systems, and is consistent with other departmental monitoring requirements.”\textsuperscript{718} To KFB and others who complained that the change was excessive, the Cabinet asserted that\textsuperscript{719}

\textsuperscript{713} Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{714} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{715} Ibid, pp. 77-78.
\textsuperscript{716} Ibid, p. 79.
\textsuperscript{717} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{718} Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{719} Ibid., p. 60.
The costs of all construction and operation are considered to be reasonably small as a portion of the total cost of the operation. The monitoring requirements are intended to benefit the producer by providing information about the effectiveness of the lagoon liner. This pollution prevention device is cost-effective to heading off the long-term costs of remediation or water supply replacement.

Lease requirement, record retention, and permit review. Activists fought the Cabinet’s decision to reduce the stipulated time period for leases of land that would be used for application of swine waste from 10 to five years. The Cabinet attributed the change to “numerous comments about the difficulty producers would have in obtaining 10-year lease agreements.” This change also benefited KFB by facilitating hog producers’ search for land. Similarly, the decision to require CAFO operators to retain records for five, rather than 10 years, was protested by activists. Maintaining that operations’ records would provide baseline information from which to determine environmental changes over time, Tom Fitzgerald argued that the Cabinet should require operators to retain records for the life of the operation and throughout closure and corrective action. The Cabinet responded that it had decided that records should be kept for five years only, the life of a permit, because that was consistent with other permit programs.

The Cabinet’s decision to reduce the time period allocated for the entire review of each permit from 180 days to 90 days was also protested by activists who feared that a shorter time frame would result in less careful reviews. To their concerns, the Cabinet replied that 90 days would “allow enough time for the Cabinet to provide a thorough review.”

The Cabinet’s strategies

So, of the changes made to the regulations during the course of the public comment periods and Hopkinsville, Bowling Green-Paducah, Frankfort, and Cadiz public hearings, 12 upheld KFB’s arguments for the primacy of capital accumulation through industrialization and growth, six supported KFTC and CFA arguments, and three were neutral or ambiguous. The “scales” the Cabinet used to ‘balance’ the interests of citizens were weighted toward agricultural industrialization and concentration. Despite its apparent privileging of KFB and agricultural experts, throughout the hearings, the Cabinet represented itself as an impartial mediator through the tactic of discursively distanciing itself from the politics of the debate.

To members of the activist group who sought to establish borders to keep corporate integrators from locating in Kentucky, the Cabinet consistently replied:

The emergency and proposed regulations address operations confining 1,000 or more swine units. Whether the operation is considered a family farm or industrial farm is not an issue in the regulation.

720 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 90.
721 Ibid, p. 128.
722 Ibid, p. 129.
723 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 134.
724 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 4. Similar statements can be found on p.3 of the Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, pp. 7 and 8 of Frankfort, and pp. 5 and 6 of Cadiz.
This strategy, which represented the complex issues that the activist group sought to address as a simple disagreement between family/industrial farms, effectively homogenized activist positions that we have seen contained substantial differences related to issues of importance and recommendations to address these issues. By erasing these complexities, the Cabinet relegated the social issues that activists sought to address to the margins and implicitly cast their concerns as simply a political disagreement about farming practices.

The Cabinet also implied that members of the activist group were seeking to eliminate all risks, a position that the Cabinet implied was unrealistic:

The Cabinet obviously cannot prevent all catastrophic environmental events from occurring. The Cabinet has attempted to minimize the environmental threats and odors through the requirements in the emergency and proposed regulations.\textsuperscript{725}

This statement, which represents citizens’ concerns as unrealistic desires to avoid all risk over against the Cabinet’s attempts to take whatever steps are reasonable to reduce risk to an acceptable level, implicitly represents activists as hysteries seeking a level protection that no agency could possibly provide. Through this strategy the Cabinet reserves the right to fix the meaning of acceptable risk and to distribute it among members of the social body. This strategy also allows the Cabinet to sidestep the thorny issue of whether its definition of risk and measures to reduce that risk are insufficient.

This representation of activists implicitly maintains a gendered bias. The comment reflects the mind/body and rationality/emotion split characteristic of Western thought that has been deployed to justify male dominance (Haraway 1991; Harding 1991, 1993; Irigaray 1985; Plumwood 1993). As mentioned earlier, the binary of male as rational and unemotional and female as irrational and emotional is important to the maintenance of patriarchal relations. The Cabinet’s representation effectively feminizes activists while reinscribing the Cabinet as the rational and unemotional (male) authority.

It is noteworthy that, during the hearings, the Cabinet members who sat at a long table facing the audience were white males. Also, while researching in the Cabinet’s Frankfort office, I noted a gendered division of labor: public relation personnel, secretaries and receptionists were female; employees reporting in from the field were male. This is also the case at the University of Kentucky’s College of Agriculture, which produces much of the research that the Cabinet relies upon. Because the majority of the changes that the Cabinet made to the regulations during the hearing legitimizes KFB and agricultural experts, the Cabinet’s representation of activists as irrational and emotional implicitly implies that KFB and agricultural experts are more rational and unemotional and thus more trustworthy sources of knowledge than are activists and academics whose research challenges that produced by agricultural experts.

I argue that the Cabinet accedes a male role to KFB and agricultural experts because the majority of changes supported the KFB position and because those changes are more substantive than those that supported the activists. It is important to note that the changes that prevent application of swine waste to land used for crops that will be consumed by humans and the prohibition of barns and lagoons in karst areas were requested by (male) authorities—a member of the health cabinet and a geographer with a Ph.D., respectively—as well as by activists. Other changes requested by (male) authorities, however, were denied. Further, at the risk of sounding cynical, some of the changes that supported the activists may be viewed as more of an attempt to

\textsuperscript{725} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 79.
legitimate the Cabinet’s role as protector of the environment and public health than substantive measures. For example, the extension of the time period allowed for public comments will not affect siting of hog CAFOs if the Cabinet continues to dismiss activists’ concerns as overreactions. The right to comment does not necessarily mean that the comment is granted any validity. Also, although the Cabinet increased some setbacks, a comparison of the tables of setbacks recommended indicates that the changes fall far short of those requested by activists and that the majority of setbacks were not changed during the course of the hearings. Similarly, although the Cabinet did increase the frequency of monitoring, it did not increase the scope of elements monitored.

Changes benefiting KFB notwithstanding, on occasion the Cabinet also attempted to distance itself from the group’s agenda. For example, in response to KFB arguments that regulation would impede growth and jeopardize farmers’ livelihoods and that large-scale industrial farming was the only profitable form of farming possible, the Cabinet replied,726

> The intent of the regulation is to prevent environmental harm. There are many issues involved in determining whether or not a swine feeding operation will be profitable. In many instances, the determining factor will be the availability of land suitable for swine feeding operations. Presently there are many operations in the state with fewer than 270 sows farrow to finish. These operations would not exist unless they were valid to some extent.

Although the Cabinet’s response challenges KFB’s representation of industrial farming as the sole rational/profitable method, this rebuttal is not as derogatory as that directed at activists because it does not feminize KFB or agricultural experts. Arguably this is because the search for profits is a rational economic practice and economics is represented as a properly male domain (Irigaray 1985, Cixous 1981a).

The Cabinet attempted to distance itself from the politics of the debate about industrial farming by presenting itself as concerned solely with environmental and public health protection to the exclusion of the debate about farming types.727 Its assertions of neutrality also served as a distancing device.728

> The Cabinet takes the role of protecting human health and the environment seriously. Throughout the regulatory process the Cabinet has carefully crafted standards that will be protective of human health and the environment. The Cabinet will continue to represent all interests involved within the framework if its mandate to protect human health and the environment.

Beyond the failure to construct a final risk assessment, the Cabinet’s framework is embedded within a history of power/knowledge relations that the Cabinet has failed to acknowledge. The primacy of those relations and the economic structures that they benefit are demonstrated by the changes made throughout the hearings.

726 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, pp. 79-80.
727 Ibid, p.4. Similar statements were made on p. 50 of the Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, pp. 2 and 3 of Bowling Green-Paducah, pp. 7 and 8 of Frankfort, and pp. 5 and 6 of Cadiz.
728 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 1.
The Cabinet consistently maintained that the regulations were adequate to avert environmental and public health problems. As previously indicated, the Cabinet asserted that the design and operation standards required by the regulations would “preclude runoff and the addition of pollutants to the waters of the Commonwealth.”\(^729\) It did, however, indicate that it would monitor to ensure that the regulations were functioning as planned.

As the Cabinet precedes with the watershed management approach, the assumption that these facilities result in ‘no discharge’ will be evaluated and modifications to waste management practices and permitting procedures will be made as necessary.\(^730\)

The Cabinet’s belief in its ability to develop and enforce regulations that prevent environmental impacts however was called into question in an August 2001 report issued by the state’s auditor of public accounts. State Auditor Ed Hatchett, Jr. charged\(^731\) that the Cabinet’s “administrative weaknesses” hampered its efforts to protect water quality.

Over a million Kentuckians drink groundwater. They rely on state government to protect them from fecal contamination, acid mine drainage, and other water pollutants. Unfortunately, regulators are not ensuring safe, potable water. According to the report, more than 180 Kentucky CAFOs are operating without the state KPDES permits mandated by the federal EPA. The report stated that the Cabinet has had “limited success in identifying or enforcing compliance with federal and state regulations governing agriculture’s threat to water quality.”\(^732\) Although the report noted that the Cabinet is attempting to “become more compliant with EPA regulations,” it echoed KFTC’s and CFA’s complaints about lack of enforcement of laws on the books by adding, “without active enforcement of these regulations, pollution from animal feeding operations will not be controlled.”\(^733\)

The Cabinet’s statements did not specifically address gendered relations as such. Its categorical boundaries and privileging of the KFB group’s position, however, effectively reinscribed that group’s patriarchal binaries of public/private, male/female, subject/object, expert/lay and rationality/irrationality. The Cabinet’s feminizing of the activist group also further reinforced the patriarchal construction of male as authority.\(^734\)

The Cabinet shares KFB’s representation of the ‘natural’ world as an object that is controllable through surveillance albeit more surveillance than the Farm Bureau group maintains is necessary. Although some of the requirements of the regulations require site-specific information, the Cabinet’s gaze is oddly placeless—the flowing of groundwater, creeks, and rivers, deposition of airborne elements onto soil can be measured (and controlled) anywhere.

729 Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 23.
732 Executive Summary, “Kentucky’s Management of Nonpoint Source Water Pollution,” p. i.
733 Ibid.
734 I will discuss the deeper gendered aspects in the debate in the following chapter.
735 Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 102.
importance of tourism to the economy of western Kentucky, the Cabinet did not reference any specifics of place or of rural spaces. Unlike the activists and Farm Bureau groups who positioned Kentucky within other global systems, the Cabinet drew boundaries about Kentucky’s environment, separating it from the rest of the globe and representing local environmental consequences as of little consequence to global systems. For example, in response to activists concerned about the contribution that from hog CAFOs make to global production of greenhouse gases, the Cabinet replied,

The Cabinet agrees that nitrous oxide, which is 200 to 300 times more potent than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas, is an environmental concern of global importance. However, nitrous oxide sources include combustion of fossil fuels, wood or other biomass, fertilizer use, and natural ocean processes. Anaerobic lagoons also contribute nitrous oxide to the atmosphere though the process of denitrification, which is a ubiquitous process accomplished by a broad range of bacteria, wherever oxygen is absent and nitrogen is present. Swine waste lagoons, however, will be a small contributor in the overall production of nitrous oxide. The proposed regulation would be an ineffective and inappropriate form for addressing this global issue.

The Cabinet’s response gives the impression that because scientists have constructed increases in greenhouse gases as a global-scale problem, it must be solved on a global level. The Cabinet’s construction of these gases as a global problem results from the fact that scientists have used the globe as a measure of analysis. Thus the epistemology of scale is derived from a methodological procedure only. I am not arguing that the gases being measured globally do not exist; rather I am indicating that the Cabinet’s construction masks the complicity of localities in producing this ‘global problem’. The gases that cumulatively are represented as a global problem are the result of emissions from countless localities across the globe. The Cabinet’s reification of this global construction, however, leads to the determination that the problem cannot be solved locally.

This compartmentalized and reductionist thinking is similar to the failure of risk assessors to account for cumulative effects of exposures to environmental contaminants. In this instance, the Cabinet’s assertion of rigid boundaries between the ‘global’ and ‘local’ is used to preclude action on the local level. Although undoubtedly the reduced greenhouse gases that might result from passage of more stringent regulations in Kentucky would not be sufficient to even measure on the global level, were such actions taken in the countless locales that produce such gases, the cumulative reductions would indeed be measurable. Additionally, the Cabinet’s construction of the local as somehow separate from the global sets up a global/local binary in which the locality is represented as less important than the global. This is similar to the problematic of the terms ‘grassroots’ groups and ‘rural’ discussed in the introduction.

736 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 16.
737 Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 89.
738 For discussions of the implications of the failure to account for synergistic effects, see Lappe (1991) and Schrader-Frechette (1991).
More hauntings

It is impossible, without material from other genres, to determine how Cabinet employees construct economic relations. It is clear from Cabinet employee statements and from changes made to the regulations, that the Cabinet is privileging economic over other social relations. It is not apparent, however, if Cabinet employees, like the Farm Bureau, reify the ‘economy’. Like the Farm Bureau, the Cabinet does reify technology which, as indicated by statements quoted previously, it represents as developing almost on its own to meet the needs of ‘progress’. The social relations necessary to create new technologies and sustain existing technologies are not recognized.

In the Cabinet’s formulation of ‘the environment,’ natural systems are, as is the case with KFB’s, hauntings. The activities of natural systems that defy controllability are affronts to the technocratic cognitive grid and to its desires to control. Similarly, the bodies of the hogs themselves, haunt the Cabinet’s regulatory efforts. In the following chapter, I will discuss the Cabinet’s responses to the few comments that attempted to bring the hog itself into the debate, and will examine these hauntings.
Nature was the old enemy that mankind could defeat more effectively by ganging up. Our relationship to nature became increasingly defined in the Cartesian terms of mastery and possession, ownership and domination. Though science and technology . . . we have indeed come back to dominate and possess the worldwide world, and to push back and back the degree to which it limits our activities and capacities.\textsuperscript{740}

I am crowded. I cannot turn around. I am uncomfortable in this cage.

They are coming.

They are taking me out of the cage. Wait, why won’t they let me stretch? My muscles are cramped. It is hard to walk.

Outside of the building now. Too bright. Eyes hurt.

Many of us are here. Some are screaming.

What is that sloped floor? Why are they making us walk up it? What is this building it leads into?\textsuperscript{741}

Dark again. Crowded. I have hurt my leg.

The floor is vibrating. It makes my leg hurt.

Very hot. Some of us have fainted. Hard to breathe. Need air.

The floor has stopped shaking. Leg still hurts.

Even hotter. Some of us are not moving now.

They’re taking us outside. Hard to walk on my leg. Must step over others who do not move.\textsuperscript{742}

\textsuperscript{739} The feeding regime that produces a hog large enough for slaughter is, ironically, called ‘finishing.’
\textsuperscript{740} Moll (1999: 107).
\textsuperscript{741} The ramp that leads into the truck that will take them to slaughter.
\textsuperscript{742} Horwitz (1998) the trucking and slaughter process as the cruelest aspects of livestock production. The animals who are injured or die are called ‘downers’.
Sun is bright. Even hotter.

Why are we here?

They’re taking us inside.

I am hanging upside down now. Why? I don’t like this.

There are men with sharp shiny things. They are hitting me.

I am bleeding.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Ghosts, gender, sexualization and permeabilities

‘Global capitalism’ with all its free trade, has its limit in those who have died willingly or unwillingly in its service.”

In this chapter, I seek to destabilize the modern constitution that is based upon an ontological separation of humans and non-humans, a separation possible only through the denial of the existence of hybrids of ‘nature’ and culture (Latour 1993). Through a discussion of the permeabilities of boundaries posited in the debate, I identify moments of hybridity. I then examine the feminization and sexualization of the physical world implicit in KFB’s and Cabinet’s assertions of rigid and impermeable human-environment boundaries and link them to other gendered systems of representation in the debate. Then, starting from comments made by three participants, I reinsert the corporeal hog into the debate to analyze the gendering and sexualization implicit in the human-animal boundaries asserted by most participants.

I understand the networks of physical systems referred to as the ‘environment’ and the corporeal hogs whose waste has been the subject of the debate as the repressed (Deleuze and Guattari 1983) that return as specters. I argue that the environment and hogs are actual “abjects” (Sibley 1997) who haunt as the result of masculinist practices.

... the phallogocentric edifice yearns for coherence, correspondence, and integrity; yet the repressed will have always already returned to haunt and destabilize the fortified and petrified house of reason (Doel 1999: 87).

Through an interrogation of the hybrid forms that challenge the boundaries asserted in the debate, the intent of this chapter is to facilitate the return of the repressed. This is a tactical maneuver to destabilize the ontologies of separation asserted by many participants in the debate because, like Latour (1993: 42), I argue that it is impossible to change “the social order without modifying the natural order.” Latour (1993) maintains that what we term ‘modernity’ is constituted by two simultaneous practices: 1) “translation” which creates hybrids of nature and culture and 2) “purification” which creates two distinct ontological zones, that of humans and nonhumans. Because the ‘modern’ approach has been to consider the two practices separately (Latour 1993), I will consider them together to demonstrate how the processes of purification that maintain the ontology of separation are undermined by the processes of translation that create the hybrids that give the lie to the ontology.

The birth of ‘humanity’ was possible only in tandem with the birth of ‘nonhumanity’ (Latour 1993). Simultaneously, as humanity was separated from nonhumanity, God was “crossed out” and relocated to the periphery (Latour 1993: 13). Thus discursive shift from ‘nature’ as a creation of the divine to a mechanistic ‘nature’ governed by ‘natural laws’ was enacted and, at the same time, science was separated from politics and nature from culture (Latour 1993). Latour’s investigation of methods by which the ‘modern constitution’ operates to separate and exclude is echoed in recent historiographies of geography produced by geographers (Buttimer,

Brunn and Wardenga 1999; Driver 1994; Godlewska 1994; Gregory 1994; Livingstone 1995, 1998; Pickles and Watts 1992) and other social scientists (King 1996, Pratt 2000, Richards 1993). These scholars have unearthed fractures, fissures and buried knowledges within the discipline by examining the complexities and contestations within the social contexts in which geographers worked. Similarly, in this chapter, I wish to focus upon the fractures, fissures and buried knowledges that facilitate the return of the ‘environment’ and hogs.

The ‘environment’

The term environment is essentially contestible. Barry (1999: 12) notes that it “can be used to simply describe the world” and also “to prescribe how the world ought to be.” He (1999: 12-13) argues that the environment . . . is not just a passive background or context within which something lives or exists. It is also something that is possessed in the sense that to have an environment is an important part of what the creature or entity is . . . We need to know what is surrounded in order to know what the environment in question is. That is, without some specified thing to refer or relate to (a species such as humans, or a culture or place) the term ‘environment’ means very little. In other words, the very idea of an environment is inextricably enmeshed with human notions and practices that constitute culture and place. Further, it is inherently spatial in that it both surrounds and constitutes place.

Our notions of ‘environment’ are linked to those of ‘nature’. The ‘nature’ of the countryside or rural areas, however, is quite different than the ‘nature’ of ‘wilderness’—“the natural environment as ‘countryside’ can be seen as a ‘garden’, a ‘tamed’ or humanized natural environment” (Barry 1999: 24). Conversely, wilderness has been constructed as spaces ‘untouched’ by humans (Barry 1999, Luke 1997). Barry (1999: 36) argues that, although in their secularity, Western societies may be considered “post-Christian,” notions of the countryside were developed within the Jewish and Christian framework of a “giving environment,” an environment created to service human needs. Wilderness, on the other hand, is associated with non-Christian forms of religion and spirituality (Luke 1997, Merchant 1992). The notion of environmental stewardship has changed over time.

As Western Romanticism which had represented the physical world as part of the Great Chain of Being created by God gave way to the instrumental values of the Enlightenment, the Biblical notion of stewardship was reinforced and expanded—if the environment was not a manifestation of God, it was open to human ‘improvement’ without “moral limits” (Barry 1999: 43). This discursive shift was implicated with science and technology: improvements could be determined through scientific investigations to discover “the secrets of nature,” and technology would provide the means to exploit nature’s bounty (Barry 1999: 44-45). This shift created a new category of stewards.

. . . stewardship, deriving as it does from deeply felt cultural traditions with their roots in the Christian myth of the Garden of Eden, does not simply confer preservation of and access to nature. It does more than validate human mastery and domination. It creates a new category of people who have power over, and
control of access to, nature and wildlife . . . scientists and bureaucrats (Bergman 1996: 295-296).

As previously indicated, this is the derivation of KFB’s notion of environmental stewardship that is, in the group’s formulation, amenable to intervention by agricultural ‘experts’.

These dramatic changes in the representation of the environment occurred in tandem with a capitalist discourse that represented the physical world as a series of commodities—land, timber, coal, animals for hunting and livestock. As such, the environment became an important component of networks of capital and was inextricably implicated in the creation of the new liberal political subject as elucidated by Foucault (1991) and Rose (1993). Barry (1999: 48) reports that

[t]his property-based view of democracy was especially clear in the American case, largely because the American democratic revolution was strongly grounded in the political philosophy of John Locke for whom the goal of government was primarily to protect life, individual liberty and private property.

The new political subjects were white property-owning males, those given the right to vote by the American Constitution and other Western nation-states (Johnson 1996, MacKinnon 1987). “. . . property is, in fact, coterminous with the self—where it comes, there comes the self-reliant man” (Wolfe 1998: 35). Thus the nation and its subjects were coded male; those in the background—the environment, property-less males, women, people of color, and animals — were backgrounded, consigned to the private sphere, and feminized (Elder et al. 1998, Plumwood 1993). Latour (1993) and Haraway (1991a) argue that, through their erasures, these others became hybrids. A new ‘natural world’ was created by the new capitalist, secular, technologically-oriented social institutions and “space, place, and the environment” were deployed to maintain it (Benton and Short 1999: 3). Maintenance of this new world relied upon what Latour (1993) describes as ontologies of separation and Plumwood (1993) references as “hyperseparation.” The ‘environment’ was backgrounded where it was frequently conflated with ‘nature’ in representational systems.

Woods (2000: 183) notes that because representation is “multi-faceted,” representations of the environment or nature

. . . can refer both to ‘speaking on behalf of nature’ and symbolizing nature in cultural artifacts and processes – or, indeed, through scientific knowledge (Latour 1993). Moreover, Latour describes how modernist discourse attempts to order these differing forms of representation – humans are represented through political representation (‘speaking for’); non-humans are represented through scientific representation. Science is hence given the responsibility of constructing representations of non-humans which can inform rational decision-making, with any other form of representation of non-humans being dismissed as irrational.

The environment, as a problematic entered the American imaginary with the publication in 1962 of Rachel Carson’s book, Silent Spring, which linked agricultural pesticides

---

744 I am using the term problematic as used by Althusser to “refer to systems of concepts that define both the problems set for intellectual endeavor and the means to provide and verify the answers” (Benton and Short 1999: 2).
(DDT in particular) to the deaths of birds (Murphy 1994). 

During the following decade, new discursive elements entered environmental discourse: killer smog, the Cuyahoga River, Bhopal, toxic waste, PCBs, Love Canal, lead paint, radioactive waste, rain forests, endangered species, strip mines, and the ozone layer (Shabecoff 1993). The new discourse was geographically dispersed—urban and rural areas across the globe were represented at risk from environmental damage.

In the early 1970s, a number of federal environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (commonly called Superfund), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Endangered Species Acts, were adopted (Gaba 1994, Shabecoff 1993). The US EPA was established to oversee enforcement of the new laws. Environmental effects of agriculture in the U.S. were not addressed in a federal Farm Bill until 1985 (Reichelderfer Smith 1994, Zinn and Blodgett 1994).

From the outset, scientific, government, and mainstream environmentalists constructed environmental degradation as a problem that could be solved by technocratic intervention, and, through the new environmental laws, government technocrats were charged with speaking for the environment and, in the case of endangered species, animals. As indicated by Table 7.1, the technocratic imaginary operates according to the ontologies of separation in the modern constitution.

Table 7.1. Assumptions of the technocratic imaginary (Benton and Short 1999: 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Is linear (measured in hours, days, months, years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Is relative and separate; is a practical attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation</td>
<td>Scientific reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Accumulation; growth is both necessary and good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and the Social</td>
<td>Anthropocentric outlook (a hierarchy of living beings with humans at the top of the hierarchy); ‘nature’ is an object, it is not alive; the non-living have no value; nature and culture are opposite and detached; individual rights and freedoms are privileged; tragedy of common spaces; the social is not constrained by ‘natural’ laws or limits; technological optimism (technology solves problems, makes life better); progress is equated with continued technological advances and economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity-Environment</td>
<td>Encourages subduing of environment, improving or controlling ‘nature’; intensive use of earth’s resources, exploitative; humanity’s separateness from environment leads to disregard for ecological integrity; environmental degradation is an acceptable price to pay for ‘progress’; environment is important if use value exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

745 Although the environment had entered American public discourse during the “Dust Bowl,” the discourse was localized, restricted to a distinct geographical area and specific farming practices. This discourse did not engage the broad geographically dispersed spectrum of American citizens who read Silent Spring.

746 For example, the Sierra Club, Greenpeace, the Audubon Society (Luke 1997).

747 Benton and Short’s (1999: 3) table used the term Society. Because, like Laclau and Mouffe (1985), I argue that sufficient fixation to create society is not possible, I have substituted the term Social.
This table is a fair description of KFB’s and the Cabinet’s assumptions (although KFB cedes less latitude to environmental concerns than the Cabinet). It is important to note that these assumptions rest upon a belief that the physical world is ‘knowable’ and that a correspondence between scientific knowledge and the physical world is possible.\textsuperscript{748} It is also notable that this construction makes regulation of the environment feasible.

KFTC and CFA (and other activists) have challenged this imaginary by asserting a number of competing assumptions that call attention to practices of translation. These assumptions are listed in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2. Activists’ assumptions.

| Connections between humans and place are mediated through the ‘environment’ |
| Many branches of science and other forms of knowledge are needed to make valid causal links |
| Economic rationality should not relegate the ‘environment’ and ‘public health’ to externalities |
| The non-living have value |
| ‘Natural’ physical processes are active |
| ‘Nature’ and ‘culture’ are inextricably linked |
| Public/private boundaries are untenable; individual rights should not take precedence over the social |
| ‘Natural’ processes impose constraints upon the social |
| Technologies do not necessarily solve problems or improve conditions for human and non-human life |
| Technology and growth should not be equated with ‘progress’ |
| Less exploitive practices are necessary |
| Environmental degradation is not justified by ‘progress’ |

Though their claims, members of the activist group are challenging the modernist ontological separations of nature and culture (the social) and politics and science. Their focus upon practices of translation calls the possibility of regulating biophysical processes into question.

It is not clear if members of KFTC and CFA (or most other activists) would support the other assumptions of the technocratic imaginary. Given that farming practices (‘traditional’ and industrial alike) are predicated on the use of ‘natural resources’ by humans, the dominance of humans over other life forms is implicit.\textsuperscript{749} Those (especially farmers) who espouse more stringent regulation, however, appear to be accepting constraints upon human dominance and

\textsuperscript{748} I will return to this point later.

\textsuperscript{749} I am not comfortable with the term ‘anthropocentric’ because it implicitly calls into being its binary, ‘biocentric’. Like Whatmore (1999), I argue that our embeddedness within the social precludes any understanding that could be termed ‘biocentric’ thus notions of biocentricity and anthropocentricity are, at best, meaningless, and, at worst, establish an untenable hierarchy (often posited in environmental literature) of the superiority of enlightened humans who adopt a biocentric position over those mired in anthropocentrism. This position is most strongly argued in deep ecology literature and by some environmental philosophers (see discussions on this subject in Light and Katz 1996, Luke 1997, and Murphy 1994). Plumwood (1997), who argues for the political necessity of retaining the term, however, dismisses arguments like mine on the grounds that they are “philosophically naïve.”
thus supporting a lesser form of human privilege, one that stresses human responsibilities to non-human life forms. Similarly, most activists do not appear to support the subduing of the earth; instead they seem to be calling for a more cooperative effort between humans and non-humans that recognizes the primacy of ‘natural’ processes. Many KFTC and CFA members (and other activists) have brought other values to the debate, e.g., the aesthetics of the land and the need to provide viable spaces for wildlife and tourism.

As important as these differences are, the activist argument, to a lesser extent than that of KFB and the Cabinet, also relies upon the ontology of Latour’s modern constitution. The political strategy of casting the debate in terms of ‘traditional farming’ vis-à-vis ‘industrial farming’ has erased the human-machine hybrids that populate so many small non-industrial farms—the farmer wearing prescription sunglasses driving a tractor, injecting an ill animal with medication, keeping records on a computer, using a baler. These are moments of hybridity, mergings of ‘human’-technology that, as Haraway (1991a) and Latour (1993) indicate, need not necessarily translate to subjection of the ‘other’. Rather, they may be open-ended moments of intimacy that create partial identities in situations that are always open to contingency. Examples of such moments might include a parent giving a laboratory-prepared cough medicine to a sick child, a person using a wheelchair to get about, or the filling that stops a toothache.

Latour (1993) is critical of technophobes who, he charges, are attempting to return to the ‘premodern’. Similarly, Haraway (Goodeve 2000: 22) argues:

> In fact, there is a whole tradition of a kind of negativity in relation to science and technology—that it’s the domain of the anti-human—that is part of the problem of trying to be accountable for these kinds of knowledge practices.

Despite the activist’s political tactic of positing a ‘traditional’/industrial farming binary, neither KFTC nor CFA are opposed to technology per se. Across genres, both groups have sought not to outlaw technology but rather to assess the appropriateness of technology by considering possible environmental and social impacts prior to adoption. They argue that those who will live with the effects have the right to determine which technologies to adopt and which to refuse. This argument, which breaches the divide between science and politics, however, assumes a more democratic decision-making process than that used by the Cabinet, KFB, and land grant professionals. In particular, it assumes a potential for equality among participants that stands in direct opposition to KFB’s and Cabinet’s backgrounding of activists and ‘natural’ systems.  

**Gendering and sexualizing the environment**

In the previous chapters, I have indicated that KFB and the Cabinet feminized activists and the environment. The activists were feminized by KFB’s charges that their calls for more stringent regulation resulted from hysterical reactions to industrial hog farming and, to a lesser extent, by Cabinet responses that implicitly ridiculed activists’ recommendations by representing them as unrealistic. Their strategies are consistent with Warren’s (1997: 12) observation that, “The exploitation of nature and animals is justified by feminizing them, the exploitation of women is justified by naturalizing them.” I have also noted that KFB and the Cabinet feminized the environment by representing the physical activities of natural systems as amenable to

---

750 I will discuss the hogs in a later section of this chapter.
technocratic control. Their arguments are founded upon practices of purification that establish a hierarchy between controller and controlled.

Here, following Haraway’s (1991a: 199) advice to activate “previously passive categories or objects of knowledge,” I want to consider the ways in which ongoing processes of physical systems under debate challenge this construction. Throughout the debate, KFTC, CFA and other activists stressed how flows of surface waters, groundwater, and air can alter soil composition and transgress the private/public boundaries posited by the Farm Bureau and Cabinet. Surface and groundwaters are not only a means by which waste may flow from industrial hog farms across property boundaries and, possibly, from one watershed into another or into drinking water supplies. Although the Cabinet has considered human drinking water supplies, it has paid superficial attention only (under the category wildlife) to others (deer, raccoons, possums, for instance) who also drink the water that is simultaneously home to fish, insects, and a host of other life forms. In its references to fish kills, the Cabinet has noted that inhabitants of biologically altered surface waters are at risk. Through movement in their watery habitats, these fish and others also transgress boundaries, crossing property, watershed and county lines, and species boundaries. The fish, when consumed, by other animals (who may also be consumed by humans) and humans cross bodily boundaries to merge with the viscera of others (transient instances of human-other hybridity?). Land animals move across terrains where they may be hunted and eaten miles from the waters they have ingested. Burrowing animals and reptiles may breach lagoon walls.

Similarly, air movements carry organisms across human-constructed boundaries, depositing them on soils where alterations in composition may affect a host of inhabitants in the food chain, from microorganisms to larger animals, who also may become food for yet larger animals and humans. The altered soil may in turn change the composition of vegetation, which may be consumed by animals that are consumed in turn by larger animals and humans. Although the Cabinet has refused to allow human consumption of crops grown on soil that receives hog waste directly, it cannot control airflows that may, as activists charge, move beyond stipulated buffer zones. Additionally, airborne organisms may also be deposited on human skin where they are absorbed through pores or be inhaled into animal and human lungs, again breaching bodily boundaries. Boundaries, however, are even more permeable than represented by activists during the debate.

Although each of us seems to be bounded by his or her skin, this is sheer illusion. When we view our physical boundaries with pinpoint accuracy, they are so fuzzy as to be nonexistent. With each bodily movement, we trail such a haze of chemicals, vapors, and gases behind us that we resemble out-of-focus images.

Not only are we constantly blending physically into the world and our environment, we are blending into each other. Quite literally, we are sharing bodies. How? As writer Guy Murchie has shown, each breath of air we inhale contains a quadrillion or 1015 atoms that have been breathed by the rest of mankind within the past few weeks, and more than a million atoms breathed in by each and every person on earth. These atoms don’t just shuttle in and out of our lungs, they enter our blood and tissue and make up the actual stuff of our bodies. This means that human bodies are constantly being interchanged with those of any and all things that breathe—not just the bodies of humans but those of cows,
crocodiles, serpents, birds, fish, etc. These exhaled ‘pieces’ of our bodies remain after we die to be taken in by other bodies (Dossey, quoted in Martin 1996: 148).

The physical world is a site of activities taking place in countless networks that, through the permeabilities of what modernity has asserted as boundaries, defy technological control. It is not too much of a stretch to imagine elements of the ‘natural’ world chuckling as they subvert their representation as inert and passive.

There are also more boundaries implicated in the debate than have been noted by activists. The modernist assertion of bounded separate bodies operates as a form of psychic protection:

It seems far more likely that the rigidity and permanence of bodily boundaries and psychic systems have been set up by external social constraints and natural adversity—a dam built around flowing desire by hostile forces.

We can perhaps concede to pastor of the ego that this dam also protects us and that we need it. Still, we have to ask what it is protecting us from. Is it the adversities of the outside world or something within ourselves? (Theweleit 1987: 263)

**Desire**

I argue that the efforts of KFB and the Cabinet to control the hearing process and their representations of the environment as amenable to control are expressions of a distinctly gendered (male) desire, or, more properly, male attempts to block flows of desire (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, Irigaray 1985, Theweleit 1987). This is not to say that females could or would not block desires similarly. Rather, I am referring to this economy of desire as male because in Western industrialized capitalist societies, males have established and enforced economies of capital, gender, and desire, among others.

This male intent to block the flows of desire is intimately implicated in male-femal relations. According to Theweleit (1987: 272),

> . . .in all European literature (and literature influenced by it), desire, if it flows at all, flows in a certain sense through women. In some way or other, it always flows in relation to the image of women. (It is far rarer for it to flow aimlessly as a desire for freedom . . .)

In this male imaginary, women are in turn linked to nature, which has been similarly devalued (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Elder et al. 1998, Griffin 1978, Haraway 1991a, Irigaray 1985, Merchant 1980, Plumwood 1993, Whitford 1991).

> . . .anything made under the earth, within that almost-mother, has arguable, and certainly secondary, value, and tends to distract the attention from concerns worthy of consideration (Irigaray 1985: 300).

In these feminist readings, both women and the ‘natural’ world are oppressed by a masculine desire to contain and control. Like Plumwood (1993), I do not wish to conflate these oppressions
in such a way that it can be read as a claim that, to be properly ‘woman’, women must become spokespeople for the ‘environment’ or that women’s abilities to give birth necessarily positions them somehow ‘closer’ to nature (the essentialist stance). Nor do I wish to indicate that, by dint of their oppressions, women are necessarily ‘closer’ to ‘nature’ than men. I support Conley’s (1997: 41) understanding of the complex relation between ‘nature’ and women and control of ‘nature’ and ‘progress’:

The view that nature was to be dominated by science and technology was linked to ideologies that have long equated the domination of nature with the domination of women. But domination of nature also equals ‘progress’. And it is that very ‘progress’ that both enabled and impeded the emancipation of women in the Occident . . . . So that, on the one hand, women most likely do not want to be associated with outworn concepts of nature. On the other, they cannot simply perpetuate a masculinist position and reject nature, a gesture rehearsing the very repression that feminists denounce.

Like Irigaray (1985), Plumwood (1993) and Theweleit (1997), I am merely stressing that, in Western patriarchal social arrangements, representations that feminize indicate domination of those feminized and feminization is not restricted to women but can occur across a multiplicity of sites. Theweleit (1987: 432) argues that the process of feminization occurs when desires are deposited in that which is represented as inferior and thus desire(s) becomes the mark of the oppressed:

In patriarchy, where the work of domination has consisted in subjugating, damming in, and transforming the ‘natural’ energy in society, that desiring-production of the unconscious has been encoded in the subjugated gender, or femaleness; and it has been affirmed and confirmed, over and over again, in the successive forms of female oppression. . . . In its denial of this coupling, male-rationalist thinking repeatedly renews its demand for the oppression of women each time it calls for the subjugation of ‘nature’.

It is notable that KFB’s feminization of the environment is consistent with its representations of women as belonging to subordinate (and bounded) domains (e.g., the private sphere, the home) and that KFTC’s and CFA’s recognition of the autonomy of physical processes is consistent with representations of women as active independent subjects.

---

751 Nor do I mean to conflate forms of oppression into one category of oppression. As Plumwood (1993), Smith (1997), Stacy and Thorne (1993), and Taylor (1997) demonstrate, many women experience multiple forms of oppression simultaneously which results in the creation of multiple subject positions. Some of these oppressions, in particular those experienced by many ‘non-Western’ women are precipitated by ‘Western’ white women (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Plumwood 1993, Stacey and Thorne 1993). I do not attempt to establish equivalencies or hierarchies of oppression because experiences of oppression are not necessarily commensurate. Haraway (1991a: 155) makes this point succinctly: “There is nothing about being ‘female’ that naturally binds women.”

752 It is also noteworthy that, “[a]s states became politically formalized, the household was recognized as an expression of state power” (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000: 64).
Although some ecofeminists\textsuperscript{753} (Griffin 1978, Shiva 1988) have celebrated the linkage between women and ‘nature’, like Conley (1997) and Plumwood (1993), I am troubled by feminist acceptance and valorization of this connection.\textsuperscript{754} Plumwood (1993: 19-20) reports,

Both rationality and nature have a confusing array of meanings; in most of these meanings reason contrasts systematically with nature in one of its many senses. Nature, as the excluded and devalued contrast of reason, includes the emotions, the body, the passions, animality, the primitive or uncivilised, the non-human world, matter, physicality and sense experience, as well as the sphere of irrationality, of faith and of madness. In other words, nature includes everything that reason excludes.

Thus the assertions of linkages between women and ‘nature’ reinscribes two essentializing narratives: the biological narrative of woman as caregiver (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Plumwood 1993) and the social narrative of woman as domestic who will become responsible to ‘clean up’ the mess created of the earth (Biehl 1991, Buckingham-Hatfield 2000, Plumwood 1993). Also, this positioning of women and nature operates to preclude men from environmental activism or, at the least, assigns them an inferior position within environmental thought (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000). Further, as Buckingham-Hatfield (2000: 59) reports, “circumstantial evidence indicates a link between rising reproductive disorders and abnormalities and increases in the amount of oestrogenic substances,” which can alter biological characteristics related to sex assignment. Thus, environmental factors may effectively alter sex. And if, as Butler (1990), argues, gender and sex are socially constructed, “any attempt to ascribe sex-specific attributes (as in the case of essentialist/cultural eco-feminism) becomes impossible” (Buckingham-Hatfield 2000: 47).

Further, the ecofeminist tactic of embracing the linkage of women and nature to valorize the qualities associated with both simply reverses dominant Western discourse of male/female and culture nature binaries in which the male and culture side of the formulations are represented as superior. This tactic leaves the binary formulation itself unchallenged. For those who remain unconvinced by the repositioned binary, the original formulation of devalued women and nature will still stand, and, even if the reversal is broadly accepted, it is always subject to a counter-reversal. So, rather than revel in the purported connection between women and nature, I want to challenge the binary formulation itself by analyzing the binary as it plays out in the debate about regulation.

**Flows, bodies, caves, and wombs**

In his study of the Freikorps, whose members formed much of the early Nazi Party, Theweleit (1987) notes that his male subjects associate women with flows and hybridity. I am

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{753} There are numerous forms of ecofeminism. See Benton and Short (1999), Buckingham-Hatfield (2000), Merchant (1992), and Plumwood (1993).

\textsuperscript{754} It is noteworthy that some males, e.g., Robert Bly, James Hillman, Robert Moore, and Shepherd Bliss, working from an assumption that women are closer to ‘nature’, have encouraged males to reestablish contact with their ‘female’ selves through rituals that celebrate being ‘in’ ‘nature’ (Kimmel 1996, Merchant 1992).
not implying that KFB and the Cabinet are fascists, rather, like Ehrenreich (1987: xvi), I maintain that Theweleit’s analysis “certainly leaves open the path from the ‘inhuman impulse’ of fascism to the most banal sexism.” So, locating KFB and the Cabinet closer to ‘banal sexism’ on this spectrum, I turn to Irigaray’s (1985) and to Theweleit’s (1987) application of Deleuze and Guattari’s (1983) discussion of flows. Theweleit (1987) argues that the Freikorps males feared dissolution at the hands of flows of any sort—streams, floods, oceans, lava—and went to horrifying lengths to protect themselves from flows, and women. Irigaray (1985) explains that, although male bodies are as subject to flows as those of women, it is female bodies that, as a result of menses, childbirth, and the nursing of infants, have become represented as the site of uncontainable flows. Male flows are denied because they are both a source of shame and dangerous.

And there almost nothing happens except the (re)production of the child. And the flow of some shameful liquid. Horrible to see: bloody. Fluid has to remain that secret remainder, of the one. Blood, but also milk, sperm, lymph, saliva, spit, tears, humors, gas, waves, airs, fire . . . light. All threaten to deform, propagate, evaporate, consume him, to flow out of him and into another who cannot be easily held on to. The ‘subject’ identifies himself with/in an almost material consistency that finds everything flowing abhorrent (Irigaray 1985: 237).

Like Deleuze and Guattari (1983), Irigaray (1985) and Theweleit (1987), I read the Western construction of the individual subject, bounded by skin, and Freud’s construction of the ego to contain libidinal desires as strategies to block flows. Just as male status as individual subjects and their egos separated the bounded male body from the female that flowed, the Western patriarchal division of space into male coded public and female coded private spaces intensified the division.

In another sphere of activity—the household—women were the living entities associated with hybrid substances. They turned solids into liquids when they cooked; and when they washed clothes or dishes, or took care of babies, they worked with, and in, things that were swampy, mushy (Theweleit 1987: 409).

I will return to the gendering of the environment later in the chapter. Now, however, with Irigaray’s and Theweleit’s analyses in mind, I return to the discussion about the protection of Kentucky’s karst systems. These systems consist of underground caves created by flows of groundwater that erode limestone material, flows that create hybrids of water and stone. In Kentucky, as indicated previously by the map of the state’s karst landscape, this is a vast underground system that has never been completely mapped. Visitors who take underground tours of the karst system in Mammoth Cave National Park are confronted with narrow tunnels that lead to massive caves, some of which are still undergoing changes in physical form (‘nature’ as shape-shifter) as a result of the relentless dripping of groundwater. Also, as previously indicated, karst landscapes are prone to subsidence—as a result of underground processes, the

755 KFB’s unsuccessful attempts to exclude all but agricultural experts from the regulatory development process and desire for a bill to make criticism of industrial agriculture illegal, however, might well be classified under the heading of fascist-wannabe.
topography of the earth’s crust can be radically altered. The ground under our feet may not be stable because of those flows, past and present, that bear watching.

Throughout the debate, activists unsuccessfully asserted the need to conduct studies of local hydrogeology that could be used to determine the existence of a karst landscape. Their aim was not surveillance *per se* or control. Rather they hoped to preclude construction of lagoons in karst areas and a hydrogeological study was necessary to classify areas as karst. Implicit in the activist argument is an understanding that the groundwater flows are potentially unpredictable and, perhaps, should not be controlled.

Both KFB and the Cabinet denied the necessity for such protection. In keeping with its strategy of backgrounding women and the environment, KFB denied the potential for problems related to underground flows and subsidence. The Cabinet asserted that there was no need to investigate to determine particularities because proper engineering could identify areas in which lagoons should not be constructed and monitoring wells or lysimeters would provide the surveillance necessary to assure that contaminants would be confined within the boundaries the Cabinet established. This surveillance, the Cabinet argued, will provide information to protect a ‘karst system’, a universal model based on typical karst formations and processes. The lack of mapping of Kentucky’s karst system is not an issue for the Cabinet whose employees will analyze surveillance data in terms of similarities to the ‘karst system’ model. Thus, the model (or the ideal) takes precedence over the particularities of material karst systems. Irigaray (1985: 343) argues that the assertion of sameness through the model is an epistemological move.

Thus the sensible must yield and measure up to the specula(riza)tion of the form of sameness in order to enter into knowledge. This is the only way. Though the way is progressive and set out in stages, the approach to it is exclusive. That is to say that the diversity of representations, of fantasies, of sensations, can be traced back to the type alone, which re-produces them as effects as soon as its form is imprinted in the receptacle (of) the other. . . . The type is the source of all these specula(riza)tions.

These specularizations of karst systems, which distance their authors from the actual material caves and flows, are both gendered and sexualized. The linkages between caves and wombs (which, in the male imaginary, are dark, mysterious, and unsettling places) can be found in the word “hysterical” which, Griffin (1978: 13) reports “is taken from the word *hyster*, meaning womb, because it is observed that the womb is the seat of the emotions (and women are more emotional than men).” The darkness of the cave (womb) obscures the capacity for reason that is necessary to discern ‘true’ forms from the shadows on the walls of the cave (Irigaray 1985). Griffin (1978: 5) connects the cave (womb) to notions of matter and women:

It is decided that matter is transitory and illusory like the shadows on a wall cast by firelight; that we dwell in a cave, in the cave of our flesh, which is also matter, also illusory; it is decided that what is real is outside the cave, in a light brighter than we can imagine, that matter traps us in darkness.

It is decided that matter is passive and inert, and that all motion originates from outside matter.
That matter is only a potential for form or a potential for movement. It is decided that the nature of women is passive, that she is a vessel waiting to be filled.

Woman is defined by what she, and ‘nature’ lack—agency, and a penis. And by those dreaded flows.

At the gate of her womb is a wound which bleeds freely. It is a wound that will never heal. She is mutilated. She is damaged. She will never forgive existence for this. Her every act is an act of mutilation, of distortion. She is a plague. A disease. The blood from her wound will sour milk. It will spoil fruit or the fermentation of wine; it will break the strings of a violin; it will poison food; cause disease, death in battle, impotence and shrinking (Griffin 1978: 83).

Things that flow, especially those that have their origins in the dark and mysterious cave (womb), must be controlled or avoided.

... it seems to me that as long as women care what we are in this world—at best, ‘social inferiors,’ and at worst, a form of filth—then the male ego will be formed by, and bounded by, hideous dread. For that which they loved first—woman and mother—is that which they must learn to despise in others and suppress within themselves. Under these conditions, which are all we know, so far, as the human condition, men will continue to see the world divided into ‘them’ and ‘us,’ male and female, hard and soft, solid and liquid—and they will, in every way possible, fight and flee the threat of submersion. They will build dykes against the ‘streaming’ of their own desire. They will level the forests and pave the earth. They will turn viciously against every revolution from below—and every revolution starts with a disorderly bubbling over of passion and need (Ehrenreich 1987: xvi).

I argue that KFB’s insistence upon firm borders (e.g., between ‘expert’ and lay knowledges, property and disciplinary boundaries, rationality and irrationality, human and animal, and male and female) reflects a dread of flows and hybridity. So KFB’s desire to ‘improve’ nature to increase productivity is not the sole reason for its historic animosity to environmental regulation. For example, the group’s vehement attack on environmentalists’ efforts to protect the wetlands and swamps that farmers were prone to fill was not solely based upon perceived threats to profits because:

... hybrid, fluid substances such as swamps or mire were regularly used to signify something other than themselves. They had nothing to do with geographical or meteorological phenomena or events; they always stood for something” (Theweleit 1987: 408).

KFB’s previously referenced adamant resistance to protecting endangered species, such as the snail darter and snakes, can now be understood as dread of the swamps and mire in river beds that these species inhabit. Their protection requires the maintenance of substances that KFB
asserts must be removed or avoided at all costs by practices of purification. In the group’s imaginary, environmental protection is conceived as a practice of translation that encourages hybrid forms that threaten the group’s ontologies of separation. In this instance, “‘[d]ifference becomes ‘distance’ from the self” (Rose 1999: 256), a self bounded by a rigidly constructed ego that protects males from immersion in these hybrid flowing spaces. Thus, for KFB, there is far more at stake in this debate than a loss of profits, the carefully bounded male ‘subject’ is under attack by the protection of that which is dreaded.

Although charged with environmental protection, the Cabinet has maintained ontologies of separation through three strategies. First, the Cabinet has consistently asserted the modernist divide between science and politics (Latour 1993) by insisting that its role and motivation are not political but rather a neutral application of scientific knowledges. This is closely related to its second tactic of asserting the right to determine which knowledges it will legitimate as science. Objectivity is often counterposed to subjectivity, a formulation in which objectivity is deployed through “the larger discourses of science” as a boundary against “what for some are the perceived consequences of its abandonment: irrationality, nihilism, relativism, and anarchy” (Jones 1995: 68-69). As importantly, the insistence upon the possibility of objectivity erases the linkages between discourse and power/knowledge that Foucault (1972: 131) called “regimes of truth.” The deployment of ‘science’ as the only objective (therefore neutral) means to develop knowledge has allowed the establishment of a hierarchy of knowledges with that produced by ‘experts’ at the summit. Thus, objectivity is manifested as a power relationship (Jones 1995).

Enlightenment notions of objectivity have been critiqued by a number of academics (Haraway 1991, 1991a; Harding 1991; Jones 1995; Latour and Woolgar 1986; Natter, Schatzki and Jones 1995; Pickles and Watts 1992; Whatmore 1999) who maintain that all knowledges are always partial and situated. It is not possible for anyone to produce knowledges outside of the social context in which she/he lives and works, they argue. Natter, Schatzki, and Jones (1995) point to a number of subject positions—gender, sexuality, researchers’ emotionality, among them—that influence knowledge production. Additionally, knowledges produced rely upon discursive practices that are embedded in power relations (Natter, Schatzki, and Jones 1995).

As deployed by the Cabinet, the discourse of objectivity also assumes that the ‘natural’ world is knowable through scientific models, and that there is a correspondence between that which is studied objectively and the knowledge produced by scientists who ‘speak for’ that natural world. This correspondence principle has also been critiqued (Conley 1997; Hall 1997; Haraway 1991; Latour 1993, 1999; Waley 2000; Whatmore 1999; Woods 2000), again, because our understandings of the physical world are mediated through language and “multiple modes of embedding that are about both place and space” in the manner in which geographers draw that distinction” (Haraway 1991: 71).

The Cabinet’s third strategy is the creation of subjects through regulation. Previously, I have emphasized how the Cabinet’s regulations have constructed an environment that is amenable to regulation and to the creation of subject positions within the parameters of debate that the Cabinet established. Delaney (2001) directs our attention to law as a site of cultural production of ‘nature’ and to the fact that, like science, legal discourse is embedded within an institutional context and within the individual contexts of legal professionals. He (2001: 489)

756 Although members of KFTC and CFA, and other activists, have pushed the Cabinet to include more diverse knowledges in the construction of the regulations, they too seem to be assuming that they biophysical world is knowable.

757 I will return to these forms of embedding in the next chapter.
also emphasizes that legal discourse, like scientific discourse, is not something apart from the day-to-day realities of citizens rather it helps to shape those realities.

Law is also more than a forum for the resolution of disputes that produces interesting representations. Law is power . . . Law is authority. What law says is, well, the law. It demands and extracts obedience. What it says about nature is enforced by the organized violence of the centralized state. This force is frequently realized in the physical world, on landscapes, and on bodies.

One of the most important tenets that maintains the divide in Latour’s modern constitutions is the notion that the ‘other’—women, land, animals, ‘natural resources’—is property and the individual right to use property in whatever way the individual deems proper, or profitable (Delaney 2001). The Cabinet’s proposed regulations follow typical legal format—the number of pages that stipulate definitions almost equal the number of pages in the regulations. The definitions are categories—of swine units, the numbers of swine units that fall under the regulation, landscape features, the farming practices that fall under regulation, techniques for surveillance. All of these categories have been constructed to sustain a legal argument, “a conceptual map of categorical inclusions and exclusions” (Delaney 2001: 489).

The authority of these legal discursive practices is amplified in environmental law by its amplification through scientific and economic discourses and shared notions of objectivity as the foundation on which ‘reason’ is constructed. Plumwood (1993: 5) argues that

[m]uch feminist theory has detected a masculine presence in the officially gender-neutral concept of reason. In contrast my account suggests that it is not a masculine identity pure and simply, but the multiple, complex cultural identity of the master formed in the context of class, race species and gender domination, which is at issue.

I take Plumwood’s notion of the master identity as one constructed within multiple power relations produced within multiple sites of discursivity and associated practices. Thus, I would be more comfortable describing this as master subject positions rather than as a master identity, which could be read as a unitary subject. The shifting formations of master identity subject positions across socio-spatial formations are the result of what Hall refers to as a process of ‘inter-textuality’ in which meanings produced at each site engage with meanings produced at others. In the process of engagement, meanings accumulate across sites, and there is always the possibility that meanings, and thus subject positions created within those meaning systems, will be changed or amplified (Hall 1997). I am arguing that there are multiple sources of male-coded and female-coded identities and that what feminists call ‘patriarchy’ is a complex network of discursive sites.

Thus, legal categories (like other discursive elements) are interpreted across a multitude of sites, each with its own system of representation and meanings. In environmental law, scientific discourses ‘speak for’ the other and economic principles guide the construction of cost-benefit analyses that determine the amount (if any) protection that will be afforded. Thus, the assumptions of the law are strengthened by its engagement with two other disciplines with similar assumptions. In the industrial West, the hegemonic systems of representation used by the
disciplines of law, science, and economics\textsuperscript{758} are constructed from similar discursive elements and practices—atomism, reductionism, empiricism, among them.

In situations where the law is used to mediate conflict, or where law is being developed through a public hearing process, participants who share the assumptions of the lawmakers will be privileged. This privileging is not simply the result of economic power relations; the fact that lawmakers and some participants speak the ‘same language’ and share similar epistemologies plays a large role in establishing conditions of privilege. The Cabinet’s epistemology is closer to that of KFB than to that of CFA and KFTC. Thus CFA, KFTC, and the other activists are as much of the other as is the ‘natural’ world and the hogs.

Hog calling

In this debate, the hog has been even more backgrounded than the ’environment’. Although physical features of the environment have been discussed, with few exceptions, the animals themselves have been reduced to the urine and waste that they produce. In a previous chapter, I cited two exceptions to the erasure of the bodies of hogs: a story told during a CFA-KFTC “Swine Safari” and a letter in KFTC’s newspaper, both of which represented industrial farming as cruelty to hogs. During the hearings, the hog as a living being, was mentioned only by three people (two females, one male). The first comment\textsuperscript{759} addressed the effects of industrial hog farming in terms of their effect upon the health of the animal:

It is a known fact that factory farm operations are not humane. A sow spends her entire pregnancy (four months) in a metal gestation crate 18-24 inches wide and barely longer than her body. She is unable to walk around during this period of time. Her head is positioned at one end of the crate for feeding, her feces is [sic] collected at the other end of the crate. Laws are being enacted in Europe to outlaw such inhumane treatment of these animals.

Hogs being fattened for slaughter are crowded into small pens, which allows a 2000-plus\textsuperscript{760} pound hog only a few inches to move around, with no room to lie down. They are washed, fed, watered, and medicated by machines. Their life is spent in buildings filled with ammonia and hydrogen sulfide fumes.

By living an inhumane life, how can these hogs be healthy?
This matter should be addressed in the regulations.

The Cabinet replied that the “humane or inhumane method of raising swine is beyond the Cabinet’s purview,” so could not be addressed.\textsuperscript{761}

\textsuperscript{758} It is important to note that there is no such singular entity entity such as the ‘law,’ ‘science,’ and ‘economics’ because individual lawyers, scientists and economists work within different subareas and hold numerous subject positions within their subareas and other sites through which subjectivities are produced. Thus although there are dominant discourses in all three areas, the meaning systems promulgated by those discourses cannot be fixed.
\textsuperscript{759} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{760} Given that hogs ready for slaughter generally weigh about 250 pounds (Hart 1998), this figure may either be a typographic error by a Cabinet employee who entered the comment into the transcript or an error on the part of the person who made the comment.
\textsuperscript{761} Hopkinsville public hearing transcript, p. 18.
Another participant\(^{762}\) said,

Large hog operations are feeding hog feces, manure, to cattle. Where does the Cabinet stand on this revolting issue?

The Cabinet replied it does not have authority to regulate livestock practices or the content of feed.\(^{763}\)

At a later hearing, the person just quoted\(^{764}\) brought up the deaths of hogs:

The issue of large swine die-offs and the manner of disposal has not been addressed in the regulation. One farm had an instance of 8,000 hogs dead when cooling fans failed. In another instance, dead animals were dumped in the lagoons, as well as medical instruments and birthing waste.

The Cabinet responded that the disposal of dead animals lay with another government agency.\(^{765}\)

A third commenter\(^{766}\) argued that improving conditions for the hogs in captivity would be cost effective.

Respiratory diseases and bacterial infections are increased by high ammonia levels, high humidity, chilling, temperature fluctuations, and overcrowding. The cost of adequate space and environmental monitoring and controls can be recovered by lower treatment costs, reduced mortality, and better weight gain. Small free-ranging swine groups should be considered as a preferable model to concentrated swine operations from the perspective of environmental protection, genesis of human-risk diseases, etc. Viral pathogens must be recognized as successful in the concentrated animal operation. They are surviving all treatment methods and increasing in virulence.

The Cabinet again cited jurisdictional constraints.\(^{767}\)

As previously indicated, it is possible that other participants had similar concerns about hogs but, recognizing that both the treatment and experiences of animals were outside of Cabinet-sanctioned discourse, did not bring those concerns to the fore. It is also possible that, like the Cabinet’s (and KFB’s) erasure of the hogs themselves, the erasure of the corporeal hog in activist comments, is indicative of a representational division between ‘humans’ and ‘animals’.

\(^{762}\) Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 52.
\(^{763}\) Ibid, Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 74.
\(^{764}\) Frankfort public hearing transcript, p. 94-95.
\(^{765}\) Ibid, Cadiz public hearing transcript, p. 34.
\(^{766}\) Bowling Green-Paducah public hearing transcript, p. 98.
\(^{767}\) Ibid.
Constructing animals

The human-animal divide is a dominant theme in Western thought (Anderson 1998, Elder et al. 1998, Ingold 1988, Philo and Wilbert 2000). Categorizations of animals, however, existed prior to ‘modernity, being found in Neolithic and Biblical thought, and, as previously mentioned, in medieval notions of the “great chain of being,” and Linneaus’s classificatory system (Philo and Wilbert 2000). These categorical systems have changed over time. Although both Plato and Aristotle had posited a differentiation between humans and animals, the “original rationalist dualism of human nature began to congeal” in the fifteenth century in Christian and humanist thought (Anderson 1998: 30). When, in the seventeenth century, Descartes overlaid the human/animal binary with one of mind/body, “thinking, sentient, intentional, and animal creatures called ‘animals’,” were accorded a ‘nature’ distinct from that of humans (Anderson 1998: 30):

While both humans and animals were believed to be capable of physical sensation, Descartes deduced that since animals lack reasoning capacity, their sensations are merely ‘bodily’ (physical/mechanical), of which they can’t be ‘aware’ or ‘conscious.’ Henceforth, the conceptual boundaries between ‘animal’ and ‘human’ were increasingly chauvinistically drawn within the larger Cartesian framework of Western dualistic thought. In a boundary-making exercise of ‘hyperseparation,’ animals were not only opposed to humans, they were consigned to the already inferiorized and homogenized sphere of ‘dead’ (unconscious) nature—that residual realm inhabited by such diverse things as plants, soils, stones, the elements, and the land.

Through this categorical scheme, “animal spaces” were created, carved out of “the messy time-space contexts, or concrete places in which these animals actually live out their lives as beings in the world” (Philo and Wilbert 2000: 7). This classificatory system, however, “always runs up against the inevitable and fundamental question of just ‘what is an animal’ ” (Philo and Wilbert 2000: 7).

Initially, Christian theology distinguished animals from humans on the basis of the human soul (Anderson 1998). As Western scientific discourses became established, human-animal differences became articulated through differences resting on (human) language and intentionality, a classificatory scheme that, after Darwin proposed his theory of evolution, became embedded in notions of evolutionary ‘progress’.

The boundary distinguishing humans and animals was reinterpreted in the West to involve not only differences in kind but also differences in progress along an evolutionary path. This path began with ‘lower’ life forms, proceeded through intermediate states inhabited by ‘higher’ animals, and reached its pinnacle with (white) man (Anderson 1998: 80).

Animals, like women, were defined by what they were represented as lacking. Ingold (1998) points to problems with this formulation: some humans are incapable of language; we
attribute ‘animal’ qualities (e.g., impulsiveness, irrationality) to some humans yet avoid inquiry into the ‘humanity’ of animals; and we assume that all human actions are intentional. The notion of language as a basis of difference rests upon human use of words and syntax because “in common with other animals, humans communicate by means of an extensive repertoire of non-verbal signs,” and, although there is some disagreement about this, because language is not merely a means to communicate but is also a form of cognition that allows humans to construct their worlds (Ingold 1998: 7). The assumption of intentionality is

. . . rather ironic . . . [since] as a condition of being considered conscious—the animal should be supposed always to think before it acts, when we know very well that much of what we ourselves do, quite consciously and intentionally, is not so premeditated (Ingold 1998: 8).

The assumption of intentionality has operated to preclude attribution of ‘agency’ to animals, reinforcing the human-animal divide. I will return to the issue of intentionality later in this chapter. Now, however, I want to turn to another divide within the category ‘animal’.

Producing ‘livestock’. The power of the category is demonstrated in the fact that animals classified as ‘livestock’ are treated quite differently than those categorized as pets or wildlife (Emel and Wolch 1998, Jones 2000, Philo and Wilbert 2000, Wolch 1998, Yarwood and Evans 2000). Because hogs, as ‘livestock’, have been part of the agricultural landscape, some activists who farm may also think of the animals as “swine units” that are ‘grown’ by farmers or, as Adams (1993: 68) puts it, as:

. . . ‘a machine in a factory.’ She becomes a food-producing unit, a protein harvester, an object, product, computerized unit in a factory environment, egg-producing machine, converting machine, a biomachine, a crop. A recent example of erasure of animals can be found in the United States Department of Agriculture’s description of cows, pigs, and chickens as animals as ‘grain-consuming animal units.’ These names eliminate the animals as animals; instead they become bearers of our food.

In their argument that within the domain of production, there is no distinction between man and nature, Deleuze and Guattari (1983: 4) make a similar point (although they extend it beyond the agricultural practices I am analyzing here):

[T]he human essence of nature and the natural essence of man become one within nature in the form of production or industry, just as they do within the life of man as a species. Industry is then no longer considered from extrinsic point of view of utility, but rather from the extrinsic view of its fundamental identity with nature as the production of man and by man.


769 I will return to Adams’ use of the feminine pronoun later in this chapter.
As ‘livestock’, these animals “have, quite literally, been constructed by people to fit into particular rural spaces. . . .” (Yarwood and Evans 2000: 99). They have been part of the background of much rural and agricultural geography. Philo (1998: 54) notes that, although “animals such as cows, sheep, and pigs, have figured quite prominently in agricultural geography, as well as being present in the background of studies in rural geography,” something is missing. The literature lacks:

. . . a sense of animals as animals; as beings with their own lives, needs, and (perhaps) self-awarenesses, rather than merely as entities to be trapped, counted, mapped, and analyzed; as beings whose lives are indelibly shaped by the uses that humans formulate for them, but whose fates resulting from these taken-for-granted uses (along with the human rationales behind these uses) are almost never subjected to critical scrutiny (Philo 1998: 54).

Emel and Wolch (1998: 20) note that animals have become “part of the stories of progress, rationality, [and] economic growth.” As previously indicated, KFB, agricultural experts (e.g., land grant and USDA professionals), and some other academics (Cochrane 1993, Hart 1998) have consistently represented industrial farming practices as indicators of agricultural ‘progress’, rationality, and economic growth, backgrounding the ways in which the shift to industrial farming has drastically changed both the agricultural landscape and the life conditions of hogs in these landscapes. The former agricultural landscape, evoked by CFA’s logo, typically was composed of house, barn(s), and, depending upon the type of farm, pasture, livestock pens, and chicken houses. Animals in this landscape spent much time outside, mated seasonally, and generations of livestock lived together. Emel and Wolch (1998: 22) note that this new industrial landscape that encloses the hogs in buildings erases the animals’ presence.

Artfully hidden behind factory-farm gates or research-lab doors, obscured by disembodiment and endless processing, and normalized by institutional routines and procedures, the thoroughly modern instrumental rationality that characterizes contemporary human-animal dependency has rendered animals both spatially and morally invisible.

Industrial farms have a very different landscape that is far less welcoming to visitors than the farm pictured on the CFA logo, which is open to visitors. Industrial hog farms are not welcoming operations. The buildings of many of Kentucky’s CAFO’s are set well off the road and drivers-by see only gates. Because hogs are extremely susceptible to potentially deadly diseases, visitors are not encouraged (Hart 1998, Horwitz 1998). Producers attempt to control exposure to these diseases “with a strict ‘shower in, shower out’ policy” (Hart 1998: 236)—visitors must “strip to the skin, take a thorough shower, wash his or her hair, and put on a set of completely clean clothes” every time they enter and leave a building with hogs. Figure 7.1 is the layout of a thousand-sow farrow-to-finish hog operation.
Horwitz (1998: 78-79) argues that the new technologies of industrial agriculture do not represent as dramatic a change in farming practices as some have represented.

There are no robots raising commercial pigs. One of the very few gizmos to have much effect is ‘real-time (B-mode) ultrasound,’ a sort of sonar that can be used to measure the ‘finish’ (the amount, location, and distribution of fat to muscle) in a living animal. But so far only breeders, researchers, and an occasional buyer seem high on the device. People still scoop manure with a shovel and sort hogs by eye. Also contrary to Luddite fears, most innovations in hog handling entail both aiming for uniformity and responding to diversity among stock. Finally, it must be emphasized that the association between the integrators and ‘confinement’ (raising hogs in specialized buildings, where they may ‘never see the light of day’) is routinely overstated. Most sows have been farrowing indoors since the 1960s, and most feeder pigs have been finished indoors for nearly that long.

Horwitz (1998) does not appear to comprehend this deepening of the relationship between agriculture, science, and technology. He is ignoring alterations in both signifier and signified. The discourse of industrial livestock farming is impossible without the discourses of

---

770 The similarity of Horwitz’s description of industrial farming practices to Foucault’s (1977) discussion of the ways in which subjects are created through processes of power that both normalize and individualize is noteworthy. For example, the grouping of people or practices in a bell curve both normalizes them by representing that captured in the curve as homogenous while at the same time individualizing those people or events that fall into the tails of the curve because they deviate from the norm established by the curve.

[the sows spend five to six weeks in the breeding barn, 109 days in the gestation barn, and four weeks in the farrowing house before they return to the breeding barn. The piglets are moved from the farrowing house to the nursery, where they stay for six weeks until they weigh 50 pounds. Then they are moved to one of the nine finishing barns, where they eat like hogs for sixteen weeks until they weigh 260 pounds and are ready to be processed.

Hart’s (1998) description erases altered practices. First, because the scale of hog farming has changed and many more hogs are now gathered together in one locale, antibiotics are more regularly administered to avert outbreaks of disease that could quickly decimate the herd and, as activists mentioned during the hearings, are also dispensed routinely in low doses in feed (Braun and Braun 1998; Donham 1998; Horwitz 1998; Ufkes 1995, 1998). (One of the comments quoted earlier in this chapter, refers to concern about increased pathogen resistance to antibiotics.)

Horwitz (1998: 38) recognizes that the use of antibiotics may be grounds for concern and notes that many hog producers are ambivalent about their use, but adds that farmers, struggling to maintain cash flow, do not have the luxury of adopting a “wait and see” attitude toward antibiotic use.

My main fear is that routine use of antibiotics will remain economically essential for hog operations long after it reeks [sic] havoc on the ecology linking pathogens and hosts. Yet, too, any change in public health routines, every protocol to combat infection, entails such risk (Horwitz 1998: 38).

Second, Hart’s account erases both the technologically-induced genetic changes and the adoption of artificial insemination (called AI and accomplished by AI technicians) to ensure production of lean ‘designer’ pigs (Braun and Braun 1998; Ufkes 1995, 1998). Although Horwitz (1998) represents these changes as minimal at best, Ufkes (1995) sees them as important.

By using lasers, nuclear magnetic resonance, and other noninvasive probes, they [producers] are now able to measure leanness reliably and to reward producers for raising animals with specific carcass leanness traits. . . as feeders alter genetics, nutritional and medicinal regimes, and management practices to ‘build a better pig’ (Ufkes 1995: 864).

In Ufkes’ (1998: 241) account, these changes are altering “the interior geography of the pig.” Like Watts (2000) who describes genetically altered, factory farmed chickens as hybrids, I see these “better pigs” as hybrids or cyborgs, the literal embodiment of animal and technology. Drawing from Harvey’s (1998) analysis of the body as a site of accumulation, Watts (2000: 100)

771 Although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, Hart’s account also erases the hog industry’s increased use of low-paid, often foreign-born workers (Grey 1998).
finds “striking the extent to which” animals’ ‘working bod[ies]’ “have not simply been
‘Taylorised’ in some way, but actually constructed physically to meet the needs of the industrial
labour process,” in the meat industry.

Where it was possible to speak of the hog(s) raised in more ‘traditional’ ways as 4-H
projects and even pets, as individual pigs with their own personalities in the ways in which they
interacted with other pigs, as offspring of other known individual pigs, and as the family’s future
supply of pork, it is not possible to speak of hogs grown in industrial facilities outside of the
scientific and economic discourses necessary for their production. The ‘traditionally’ raised hogs
operated under the signifier of livestock and animal, and signified animal, project, pet, individual
porcine histories, and food supply. The hybrid pigs are the artificially inseminated offspring of
anonymous genetically altered pigs whose sperm was gathered by a human agent and injected
into a sow reducing the need for pig-to-pig contact. Taken from their equally anonymous
mothers (who have become little more than breathing temporary containers), the piglets then
become hogs who cannot be located within other spaces (pens, 4-H rings, children’s histories, or
even the dinner tables of their owners). They can be described only by scientific discourses of
genetic strains, antibiotics, and dietary supplements, by the technological discourse of their
technologically altered “interior geographies,” and by the economics of the contracts that
stipulate the conditions of (re)production that have brought them into being. The signifier is a
hybrid of animal and technology that signifies the science of genetics, medications, and diet,772
technological controls, and economics. This is a dramatic change that affirms Haraway’s
assessment of the changing relationship between humans and animals.

The fact is there are currently new—or at least mutated—ways in which technoscientific
people relate to other animals and organisms. It means there has been a deepening of how we turn ourselves, and other organisms, into instruments for our own ends (quoted in
Goodeve 2000: 143).

Interestingly, although Horwitz (1998) is very much aware of the differences in
understandings of livestock farming, especially those between livestock farmers and those who
do not farm, he does not seem to understand that these changing spatial arrangements further
distance farmers from nonfarmers.773 Also, like KFB, Horwitz (1998) who has worked in Iowa
for years both as a college professor of American literature and employee on a pig farm,
represents critics of industrial farming practices as “Luddites” opposed to all technology. Those
who, like CFA and KFTC, are calling for assessment prior to adoption of technologies are erased
in his pro/anti technology binary.

Although Horwitz (1998) refers to occupational safety issues for workers in CAFOs,
Hart’s (1998) account ignores them. I have referred previously to research about the health
effects on workers in such facilities. Here, I want to consider these health effects in terms of their
challenge to the human-animal boundary asserted by KFB and the Cabinet.

772 Hormones, such as Bovine Growth Hormone, have not been developed for hogs. “When pork producers talk
about growth ‘promoters’ or ‘promotants,’ they are referring to very small (if only because also very expensive)
concentrations of ‘subtherapeutic antibiotics’ that they add to rations... to keep the lining of hogs’ intestines from
thickening (and hence interfering with nutrient absorption) in response to common, low-level gut infections”
(Horwitz 1998: 38).
773 Although he is uncomfortable with animal rights activists, unlike KFB, Horwitz (1998) does concede that the
production of animals for food involves ethical issues.
Horwitz (1998: 53) says, after chores, workers “are likely to have a persistent cough combined with body aches, fever, and fatigue, a condition known as ‘organic dust toxic syndrome’.”

About 55 percent of workers in swine CAFOS suffer from chronic bronchitis (Donham 1998). According to Donham (1998: 80), people who work in confinement buildings “for more than two hours per day for six or more years are at higher risk for severe respiratory problems.” Although owners of small CAFOs may spend only a few hours daily in these buildings, large facility operators and managers often spend five to seven hours a day inside which could lead to long-term health effects (Donham 1998).

As indicated in Table 7.3, many of the potentially hazardous agents in swine CAFOs are airborne and microscopic. Donham (1998: 77) reports that

. . . one-third of these breathed particles are so small they are not filtered out in the nose and throat and enter their airways; the smallest particles reach the lungs . . .

The largest particles are mainly from feed grain and are a problem in the upper airways of the nose, sinus cavities, and throat.

Table 7.3. Potential airborne agents in swine CAFOs (Donham 1998: 77).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microbes and their metabolites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infectious agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed particles: grain dust, antibiotics, and growth promotants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dried livestock or poultry proteins (urine, dander, serum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine feces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain mites, insect parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia absorbed to particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold (spores, sporangia, hyphae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These moments of engagement of workers’ bodies, biological agents expelled from the bodies of the hogs, and chemical residues from feeds and medications are further indication of the permeability of bodily boundaries. A similar situation occurs when the gases produced in these operations enters workers’ nasal passages and lungs, and as hog odors permeate workers’ pores and hair. Because it is this permeability that results in human contact with these ‘contaminants’ expelled from the hogs, it is understandable that the hogs’ urine and feces stand for the corporeal hogs in the debate. I maintain, however, that permeability is not the sole reason that the corporeal hogs have been erased. Popular representations of these animals have also facilitated the discursive move of substituting their waste for their beings.

774 Adams (1993) also notes the exploitation of workers in the livestock industry, although her comment is directed toward those who work in slaughterhouses.
Metaphorical pigs, hogs, and swine

Animals loom large in human imaginaries (Emel and Wolch 1998, Philo and Wilbert 2000). Horwitz (1998) declares pigs are both animals and tropes extraordinaire. Adams (1993: 64-65) reports that the use of animals as metaphors and similes further distances humans from animals because they

. . . distort the reality of other animals’ lives. Our representations of animals make them refer to human beings rather than to themselves: one is sly as a fox, hungry as a bear, pretty as a filly. When we talk about the victimization of humans we use animal metaphors derived from animal sacrifice and animal experimentation: someone is a scapegoat or a guinea pig. Violence undergirds some of our most commonly used metaphors that cannibalize the experiences of animals: beating a dead horse, a bird in the hand, I have a bone to pick with you.

I am not arguing that the materiality of animals is unimportant; quite the contrary. Like Gullo et al. (1998: 140), I argue that we must heed the ways in which animals are represented because

. . . many ideas about animals and what they mean are in some measure social fabrications. In so-called modern societies, the social construction of animals goes largely unmediated by concrete experience, lending the social imaginary even greater constitutive force. It is the form that these social constructions should take in the future, and their implications for policy, that lies at the heart of contemporary debates over relations between people and animals.

Horwitz (1998) lists common phrases, sweating like a pig, happy as a pig in shit as examples of pig tropes. In his study of animal tropes in human conversation, Lyman (1983: 137) reports that

[the pig, a young hog, is commonly regarded as a dirty, gluttonous animal. Therefore, a dirty, gluttonous, or fat person can be called a pig. But the pig also has a more general reputation for leading a low, coarse way of life. Anyone who is disliked for almost any reason at all is sometimes called a pig.

He (Lyman 1983) refers to ‘buying a pig in a poke’ (as in ‘letting the cat out of the bag’), ‘in a pig’s eye’ (to make negative a previous affirmative statement and/or uttering something impossible), ‘pigheaded” (to be stupid and stubborn), pig iron (crude iron, so called because of its shape which resembles a sow and suckling shoats), and pigtails as examples of the ways in which these animals are part of daily life. To these common phrases, we can add ‘pigging out’ (gluttony), and ‘making a silk purse out of a sow’s ear’ (accomplishing the impossible). Under the classification pig, Bartlett (1980) references scenes in Alice’s Adventures

775 But, Horwirtz (1998) reports, pigs don’t sweat.
776 But, pigs carefully allocate their spaces for eating, eliminating waste, lounging.
777 My committee members’ understanding of the phrase differed; the meaning they knew was to buy something without first examining it.
in Wonderland, children’s rhymes, The Merchant of Venice, a definition of a lawsuit as “a machine which you go into as a pig and come out as a sausage” (Bartlett 1980: 647), quotations from John Stuart Mill, Ambrose Bierce, and Mishima Yukio. Webster’s Dictionary (1996: 499) defines a pig as

\[ n. \quad v. \] pigged, pig-ging. 1. any swine, esp. a young domesticated hog weighing less than 120 lb. (54 kg). 2. a person who is gluttonous or slovenly. 3. an oblong mass of metal run while still molten into a mold. –v. 4. pig out, Slang; to overindulge in eating.

A search for ‘pigs’ using Google, found 91 pages of sites and a total of 1,040,000 associated sites devoted to subjects ranging from breeds and breeding, pig diseases, the Bay of Pigs, sanctuaries for pot-bellied pigs who were abandoned by their owners, instructions for preparing whole roasting pigs, games (“Pass the Pig” and “Galloping Pigs”), Guinea pigs, the Muppets, pro- and anti-industrial farming, the “Three Little Pigs,” federal and state livestock statistics, news stories about pigs, the sale of pig paraphernalia, xenotransplantation, a Dane who wants to produce schizophrenic pigs to study the illness, and a report on corporate welfare titled “Pigs at the Trough.” A site, called “Pigs in Cyberspace,” advanced the use of pigs for space exploration, another reported on pigs in Iowa that pray before they eat, and sites were devoted to city celebrations with pig themes—“Pigs on Parade” in Seattle and “The Big Pig Gig” in Cincinnati. Some sites celebrated National Pig Day (March 1). Other sites referred to a comedy group called Corky and the Pigs, bands, and horror. A woman established her own site as a self-declared female ‘chauvinist pig’ and an anarchist group featured a discussion of police as pigs.

Although Horwitz (1998) does not refer to the ways in which hogs have entered the vernacular, he titled his book Hog Ties. Layman (1983) references ‘hog wild’ (wildly excited), ‘whole hog’ (doing something completely), ‘hottie’ (to make helpless), ‘hogwash’ (meaningless), ‘independent as a hog on ice’ and ‘like a hog on ice’ (awkward, insecure), ‘live high off the hog’ (live well), and ‘roadhog’ (a selfish driver). Webster’s Dictionary (1996: 314) defines hog as

\[ n. \quad v. \] hogged, hog-ging. –n. 1. any swine, esp. a domesticated adult swine raised for market. 2. a selfish, gluttonous, or filthy person. –v.t. 3. to take more than one’s share of. –Idiom. 4. go (the) whole hog, to do something thoroughly.

778 To Market, To Market, Tom, Tom, the Piper’s Son, This Little Pig Went to Market, 779 Most sites gave information about the animals but some opposed the use of humans, called ‘Guinea pigs’, in medical tests. 780 Most of these sites were about the children’s story but one was titled “The Pigs of Wrath: Three Little Pigs and They All Hate Capitalism” (www.unel.brandeis.edu/~jmorrow/comedy/pigs). 781 The strangest news story reported an incident in which a pig bit off a man’s ear, testicle and part of his scalp (www.anova.com/news/story/sm_214001). 782 www.anova.com/news/story/sm_312961. 783 www.impactpress.com/febmar01/corpwelfare020301. 784 www.web2.ladfw.net/e/o/news/pigspray. 785 “When Pigs Fly,” “Maledictive Pigs,” “The 4 Pigs,” “Vomit Pigs,” “Whistle Pigs,” “The Range Pigs,” “The Pigs,” “Liquor Pigs,” “The Forbidden Pigs,” “Blind Pigs,” and “Dogs and Pigs.” 786 “Of Pigs and Spiders.” 787 I would add ‘hog heaven’ to his list.
live high off (or on) the hog, to live prosperously.

\[\text{hog-ger, } n. \text{-- hog-gish, } adj. \text{-- hog-gishly, } adv.\]

A search under ‘hogs’ on Google located 88 pages of sites with 316,000 associated sites. Again, sites included agricultural practices and statistics, diseases, games, and bands. Hogs as a category included some subjects that did not appear under ‘pigs’: feral hogs and hunting, sports teams, and Harley motorcycle sites. One man established a site “Where the Adult Male Rules.”

Horwitz (1998) refers to swine in his characterization of pig paraphernalia as ‘swinalia’, and Layman includes the expression ‘casting pearls before swine’ (giving to the unappreciative). Bartlett (1980) also references the phrase ‘pearls before swine’, quotes Leviticus’ warning to avoid eating the flesh of swine because it is unclean, and cites Samuel Butler’s reference to swine as carnal, the children’s story Curlylocks, the New Testament tale of unclean spirits entering swine, and Victor Hugo’s ranking of wine in which swine wine is that “which brutalizes” (Barlett 1980 : 491). Webster’s Dictionary (1996: 668) defines swine as

\[n., \text{pl. swine. 1. any of a family of hoofed mammals with a dislike snout and a thick hide, esp. the domestic hog. 2. a coarse, gross, or contemptible person. -- swin-ish, } adj.\]

A search on Google under ‘swine’ found 83 pages with 397,000 associated sites. As was the case with ‘pigs’, many of these sites were devoted to agriculture, biomedical research, breeds and genetics, bands, pot-bellied pigs, diseases, and barbecuing. This category, however, also featured Extension Service and land grant university publications, technologies for industrial swine operations, and 4-H material that was not found under the other two categories.

These animals have displayed their less-than-desirable qualities in literature beyond that cited above: for example, Lord of the Flies, Animal Farm, Hannibal (the sequel to Silence of the Lambs), and the pig costume in Gravity’s Rainbow. Yet, these animals have also been represented as lovable and wise in books, films, and television shows: Charlotte’s Web, The Day The Pigs Would Not Die, Pigs is Pigs, Winnie-the-Pooh, and The Death of a Pig; Miss Piggy of Muppet fame, Babe, Arnold of Green Acres, the pot-bellied pig of Designing Women, and a documentary-type program titled The Joy of Pigs.

The animals’ lovable qualities are displayed in what Horwitz (1998: 25) describes as an astonishing amount of “swinalia” and “tchotchkes.”

. . . figurines, greeting cars, joke books, coffee mugs, posters, T-shirts, jewelry, and windup toys, all with snouts and curly tails and the like. Some of them even oink in harmony with a digitized recording that my computer plays back, . . . my truck with its “Proudly Producing Pork” bumper sticker. . . . At last count I had about a half-dozen sow pinup calendars at work and a couple more at home.

788 “Play Ball Hogs,” “Feral Hogs,” and “Hogs of War.”
791 “The Fattening Swine,” and “Generation Swine.” There is also a record label called “Pearls Before Swine.”
When I began to pray that the supply of novelties might be depleted, I
discovered a mail-order outfit that sold only swinalia and hence had a vested
interest in new product lines and inexhaustible supplies.

Although he interviewed people who collected swinalia, Horwitz (1998) found that
they had no compelling reasons for doing so. I understand how these collections just happen.
Some twenty years ago, my mother became smitten792 with pigs after being bitten by one in a
petting zoo. That incident was the beginning of a pig collection that included Christmas
ornaments, stuffed animals, and a Beleek china pig. Similarly, because of this project, I am
now the bemused owner of porcine postcards, books, films, a pillow, a wooden sculpture, a
stuffed animal, a trivet, Christmas ornaments, calendars, slippers, figurines, and a painting.
Disconcertingly, friends tell me that when they see a pig of any sort they think of me.
I deliberately refer to ‘pig paraphenalia’ rather than ‘swinalia’ because it seems to me
that there is a hierarchy of these animals that ranges (in order of less to most undesirable) from
pig to hog to swine. Horwitz (1998: 25) alludes to this when he notes that “Los Angeles mass-
marketers have at times visibly struggled to make their pig products asexual, prepubescent, or
androgy nous.” Pigs, rather than adult hogs and swine, can, like children, be cute like the
gilts793 cast to play Babe in the movie named after the heroine pig. They can be cute because
they are not overtly gendered and/or sexualized.

**Gendering and sexualizing hogs**

As the ‘other’, animals are associated with the qualities that humans do not have. So, in
contradistinction to their human (male) ‘masters’, animals are irrational, immersed in the
(lower) physical world and captive to their own bodily sensations. Anderson (1998: 30-31)
describes how this discourse of ‘human’ identity is constructed on a notion of reason that
excludes “emotion, imagination, sensation, and attributes we share with other sentient
creatures,” became entwined with discourses of science and technology.

In time, with the rise of weapons of mass destruction and other technology, as
well as scientific enterprises, teleological conceptions of the rational human
afforded it the justification to order and control other spheres of life. These
included the feminine (equated with the body, the irrational, and nature), the
racialized slave, the animal, and the environment in general. In concepts of
power-differentiated relations, the rational (male) subject’s perspective began to
be set up as universal, as the generic ‘human’ gaze around which all else turned.
Indeed it set *itself* up as neutral, objective, panoramic, and all-knowing—as
history’s master subjectivity—when in reality it was a ‘partial perspective’ that
relied on various strategies of denial, exclusion, spatial separation, and
stereotyping of women, racialized peoples, nonhuman animals, and ‘nature’
more generally.

---

792 She never explained how she was so charmed by an animal that bit her.
793 Young female pigs.
‘Dis’ing the hog. Like other animals categorized as livestock, the hog is ‘dis’ed. These discursive moves are gendered.

Not only is our language male-centered, it is human-centered as well. When we use the adjective ‘male’ . . . , we assume that it is referring solely to human males. Besides the human-oriented notions that accompany our use of words such as male and female, we use the world ‘animal’ as though it did not refer to human beings, as though we too are not animals. All that is implied when the words ‘animal’ and ‘beast’ are used as insults maintains separation between human animals and nonhuman animals. We have structured our language to avoid the acknowledgment of our biological similarity.

Language distances us further from animals by naming them as objects, as ‘its.’ . . . Patriarchal language insists that the male pronoun is both generic, referring to all human beings, and specific, referring only to males. Similarly, ‘it’ refers either to non-animate things or to animate beings whose gender identity is irrelevant or unknown. But just as the generic ‘he’ erases female presence, the generic ‘it’ erases the living, breathing nature of the animals and reifies their object status. The absence of a non-sexist pronoun allows us to objectify the animal world by considering all animals as ‘its’ (Adams 1993: 64).

These cyborg hogs have been designed for butchering, an act that is now called ‘disassembly’ (Adams 1993, Wolch 1998). Their physical attributes have been standardized so that after dismemberment, the animal’s parts can be packed as ‘boxed meat’, packages of cuts that have eliminated the need for the butchers in supermarkets. Like the use of the verb grown rather than raised, the use of disassembly rather than butchering distances humans from the living hog and disassociates the whole hog from the violent dismembering that is necessary to create the end product ‘meat’ by implying that the animal was previously ‘assembled’ and thus can be easily ‘disassembled’. In Figure 7.2, the corporeal hog is outlined around the cuts into which it will be dismembered to make the transition into pork.

---

794 In the vernacular of urban African-Americans to ‘dis’ is to disrespect.
795 Haraway (2000: 145) also refers to the importance of language when she says, “The issue is that we must remember the ‘it’ in all of these sentences is, of course, a living being.”
Descriptions of the ‘disassembly’ process are also gendered. In order to avoid the premature release of glycogen, a preservative, and to assure that the final product is good quality ‘meat’, the animal must be allowed to bleed fully, releasing the feminized flows. Then, in a discursive move very similar to that of rapists who argue that ‘she really meant yes’ or ‘she really wanted it’, Adams reports that the animal is made to appear to go willingly to its death.

Curiously, as the animals move closer to the actual act of slaughter, the descriptions of the meat industry use language that implies the animals are willing their own actions. The more immobilized the animals become the more likely the words describing the slaughtering process will refer to them as though they were mobile, so their movements appear entirely their own: ‘emerging,’ facing in the same direction, and ‘sliding’. The concept of seduction has prevailed: animals appear to be active and willing agents in the rape of their lives (1993: 56).

After the hog has been slaughtered and packaged as pork, the animal is further erased by “gastronomic language” that connotes “cuisine” rather than “dead, butchered animals” (Adams 1993: 40). The living hog has become crown roast of pork, loin of pork, pork chops, bacon, sausage, and ribs. As meat, the dead animal is incorporated into gendered and racialized food practices. As previously noted, vegetables represent “passivity or the dullness of existence,” while meat “represents the essence of principal part of something” (Adams 1993: 36). So meat is masculine and needed by men; vegetables are feminine thus women do not need meat.

---

796 I cannot comment on current linguistic practices because I was unable to locate literature on slaughtering on the Internet or through livestock commodity groups.
797 Italics are the authors.
Meat has been the choice of people with power. Adams (1993: 38) notes that male batterers “have often used the absence of meat as a pretext for violence against women.”

Horwitz (1998: 39) reports that, despite the National Pork Producers Council’s expenditure of huge sums of money to convince the American public that pork is ‘white’ rather than ‘red’ meat, “[m]ost people still see pork, even if ‘white,’ as less nourishing and higher in calories, cholesterol, and fat than chicken.” This is interesting because the rationale given by promoters of industrial hog farming is that their genetically altered hogs produce ‘lean’ meat and thus answers a consumer demand for meat with fewer calories, cholesterol, and fat. Their campaign has not been successful due, in part, to gender preferences in diet. Horwitz (1998: 39) reports that “[h]eavy pork eaters are more apt to be male and have less income and schooling than the more female, wealthy, and educated people who have suspicions about the stuff . . . and who spend more per capita at the grocery store.”

Although pork may be ‘leaner’ and is certainly ‘whiter’ than say beef, the National Pork Producers Council’s campaign built around the slogan “Pork—The Other White Meat” must be considered within the social context of white privilege and gender. Since the colonial era, white people have asserted their superiority by marking people of color and leaving whites, as superiors, unmarked (Babb 1998; Delgado and Stefanić 1997; Frankenberg 1993; Rodriguez and Villaverde 1997; Roediger 1991, 1994, 1998). Thus the use of white to signify superiority of this meat can be read only within the context of a global regime of racial hierarchies. Adams (1993) and Plumwood (1993) note that meat eating is intimately connected to white male Western domination not only of women but also of people of color. Similarly Adams (1993), Elder et al. (1998), Plumwood (1993), and Wolch and Lassiter (2000) discuss how cultural practices regarding the use of animals for food have also been deployed to represent white superiority. It is not much of a stretch to read the superiority of ‘white’ meat as an assertion of the superiority of the white ‘race’.

Within context of Theweleit’s (1997) analysis of the Freikorps’ males division of women into categories of ‘red’ and ‘white’, the campaign to ‘whiten’ pork can also be read as gendered. In the Freikorps’ classificatory scheme, ‘red’ women were poor and working class highly sexualized and racialized revolutionary activists pushing, like a flood, against social boundaries. These women, often members of the Red Army were categorized as “rifle-women” whose sexual and political practices threatened Freikorps males (Theweleit 1987: 181). In this formulation, ‘red’ women became “prostitutes, filthy animals; castrating and murdering men” who were associated with the flood of communism (Theweleit 1987: 181). ‘White’ women were upper class women, often ‘pure’ mothers, sisters, and nurses at the front. These ‘white’ women were idealized, operating much as Spivak’s

---

798 Adams (1993) notes that meat has been the purview of white males and, as such, has been deeply implicated in Western white men’s domination of the ‘non-Western’ world. Thus, “[t]he hierarchy of meat protein reinforces a hierarchy of race, class, and sex” (Adams 1993: 30).
799 And for divorce also. I remember a conversation between two men that I overheard on a subway in Boston. One man explained to the other that he had filed for divorce because “the bitch [assumedly his soon to be ex-wife] gave me lamb without mint sauce.” The incident struck me as so bizarre, I never forgot it.
800 Much of this money is taxpayers’ rather than pork producers’. The revenue comes from a “$200 million-a-year government venture called the Market Promotion Program. Better known among industry recipients by its old name, Targeted Export Assistance, the program has spent about $1 billion since 1986 for foreign television commercials, grocery displays, wine tastings and other promotions in markets around the world” (Taylor and McGraw 1991: 12).
801 I use ‘scare quotes’ because like Memmi (2000) and the academics cited in the first sentence in this paragraph, I take the position that ‘race’ does not refer to an existing biology but is instead socially constructed.
(1993) notion of woman as metaphor. Theweleit (1997: 107) describes these ‘white’ women as having been through a process of “devivification,” which turns them into specters by draining them of bodily fluids, especially ‘red’ blood. Irigaray (1985: 220) describes devivification as a splitting of male and female:

The wife-mother will henceforward become more and more associated with nourishing and liquefying lymph, almost white while she loses her blood in cyclic hemorrhages, neuter and passive enough in her matter for various members and organs of society to incorporate her and use her for their own subsistence.

This metaphorical process is strikingly similar to that of sedating the hogs to avoid the premature release of glycogen that turns the animals’ flesh into “pale soft exudative” meat that is not attractive to consumers (Horwitz 1998). The result of these practices of devivification is ‘white’ flesh that is dismembered into ‘cuts’ of ‘meat’. The cutting is performed with a knife, an implement that Adams (1993) notes functions as a phallic symbol. In a process similar to that of the dismembering of the female body that occurs in pornography where portions of the female body—genitalia, breasts, buttocks—stand for the whole female, the cut—loin, rib, roast—then stands for the whole hog (Adams 1993). In both cases, women and hogs, become objects for sacrifice.

**Sacrifice and the problematic of calculability**

These sacrifices of women and hogs, and others who have been excluded, effectively sustain a homosocial domain (Adams 1993, Elder et al. 1998, Irigaray 1985, Lee and Stenner 1999, Plumwood 1993, Theweleit 1997). It is important to remember that other cultural forms that did not require sacrifices could have occurred. “Culture could have arisen without that sacrifice, but men could not have remained dominant” (Theweleit 1987: 355). To sustain this dominance, it is necessary that the sacrifices on which the patriarchal culture is erected be erased.

Adams notes that just as animals are represented as desiring to be sacrificed, women are represented this way also:

One of the mythologies of a rapist culture is that women not only ask for rape, they also enjoy it; that they are continually seeking out the butcher’s knife. Similarly, advertisements and popular culture tell us that animals like Charlie the Tuna and Al Capp’s Shmoo wish to eaten. The implication is that women and animals willingly participate in the process that renders them absent (Adams 1993: 55).

Unlike the accommodatingly soon-to-be-beef steer in the *Restaurant at the End of the Universe*, a recent campaign to promote the consumption of chicken, represented cows as unwilling to be eaten: billboards around the US featured a black and white cow telling people to eat more chicken.

---

802 The phrase appears in a footnote.
803 I will return to this dismembering in terms of the operations of capitalism in the next chapter.
Adams (1993: 72) asserts that, although the majority of animals we eat are female, during the transformation from animal to ‘meat, even male animals are feminized:

‘She’ represents not only a ‘minor power,’ but a vanquished power, a soon-to-be-killed powerless animal. Male animals become symbolically female, representing the violated victim of male violence. In fact, the bloody flesh of the animal recalls the sex who cyclically bleeds. In this case, the symbolic rendering of animals’ fate as female resonates with the literal facts about animals used for food. The sexual politics of meat is reinforced in the literal oppression of female animals.

Adams’ analysis overlooks the common practice of castrating male animals bred as livestock. The castrated males are neutered. The feminization to which she refers, however, does occur on a less-than-conscious level. During a discussion about this project, my chair reminded me of a scene in *The Restaurant at the End of the Universe* where astonished and horrified restaurant-goers are met by an animal who happily offers her flesh for their dinner.804 Although we both remembered the animal as female (cow), when I checked the text, I found that the animal was male (steer). Because the animal was destined to be slaughtered for food, we both remembered the animal as female.

“Generally, animals are part of the stories of progress, rationality, economic growth, and emancipation only by their eradication, sacrifices, bred domesticity, and genetic transfiguration” (Emel and Wolch 1998: 20). Hogs, and other animals, are not sacrificed solely to feed humans, they are also sacrificed in medical trials and as potential organ donors for humans (Adams 1993, Emel and Wolch 1998, Horwitz 1998, Philo and Wilbert 2000). Here, the human/animal boundary is breached even prior to transplant: the possibility of transplant exists only because of similarities between humans and hogs. “Swine in particular are pretty decent as model people” (Horwitz 1998: 201).

In the spring of 2001, *Frontline* reported on a project, funded in part by the federal Food and Drug Administration, in which pigs are grown as potential sources of organs for people. The telecast precipitated a volume of letters, ranging from horror to endorsement of the project.805 Emel and Wolch (1998: 20) describe “the extent” of animal sacrifice to “shield people from death” as “stunning.”

The American Medical Association likes to point to the enormous importance of animals in medicine by observing that fifty-four of the seventy-six Nobel Prizes awarded in physiology or medicine between 1901 and 1989 were for discoveries and advances made through the use of experimentation on animals. Neglected in the pro-experiment arguments are the billions of dollars earned by the drug companies (not to mention the medical industry) in selling vaccines and other chemical substances derived from animal lives (Emel and Wolch 1998: 20-21).

These, of course, are more instances of human-animal hybrids.

804 This scene is reproduced as an interpolation.
805 [http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/organfarm/talk](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/organfarm/talk). Retrieved 4 April 2001. Thirteen letters endorsed the project, one was uncertain, and 29, three of which expressed fears of viruses, were opposed.
These excluded and silenced others, including hybrids, “do the work for our belonging [to modernity], and this injustice is the condition on which our belonging depends” (Lee and Stenner 1999: 95). These others, especially those who have been put to death, bring “a limit to calculability of restitution and to moral sense-making” (Lee and Stenner 1999: 106). Emel and Wolch (1998: 14) note that “[t]he status of commodified domestic animals such as cattle, sheep, pigs, and chickens, once excluded from spheres of moral concern and legal protections, is being re-evaluated.” Large-scale industrial farming is increasingly being opposed by “coalitions of greens and wildlife conservation groups on the one hand, and animal welfare/rights organizations on the other” (Emel and Wolch 1998: 15). Middle-class women constitute the majority of animal welfare and rights activists in the U.S. and Britain (Emel and Wolch 1998). For reasons stated earlier, I am hesitant to assume that these activists are more likely to identify with an abused group because of their female status. The fact that women are the majority, however, is noteworthy and certainly would be an important area for future feminist ethnographic research that approaches the issue without essentializing women. It is also important to note that animal rights organizations tend to be urban-based. This urban focus was likely one of the reasons that ‘livestock’ which were associated with rurality were overlooked for so long.806

There are more specters than the repressed ‘environment’ and hogs discussed in this chapter. In the next chapter, I will consider the other specters that haunted the debate to link these recently returned repressed to the political economy, religious imaginaries, and gender relations within the Western nuclear family.

806 I will turn to the issue of animal rights in the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion:
Desire, religion, family and imaginative geographies

. . . the fact that space and place are in a constant process of being made retains in them that element of openness which is essential to the reimagining of the democratic-political. Moreover, taking seriously this relationality and the constant process of practicing/performing space/place means two things (at least) for us as intellectuals. First, we ourselves are embedded in the making and practicing of these relations. Second, and flowing from that, the very act of understanding/describing will itself alter the configuration of those relations. Both of these things in turn imply a necessary caution about ‘knowledge claims’ and lead us perhaps to be critical of those approaches which center on discourse and representation either as the totality of what is available or as a level somehow detached from something else called the ‘real practice of life’.  

In previous chapters, I have analyzed the risk discourses of participants in the debate to identify the notions of farming, farmers, rurality, and Kentucky embedded within the discourses, and, through interrogations of other genres, traced the genealogy of their discourses. In particular, I have focused upon the gendering and sexualization implicit in participants’ constructions of the ‘environment,’ and the hogs. In the previous chapter, using actor network and feminist theory, I brought the ‘environment’ and hogs into the debate as subjects by examining the permeabilities in the human-environment-animal boundaries asserted by participants. I introduced an analytic method, which, in relying upon the notion of intertextuality, conceptualizes patriarchal relations as fluid productions emanating from numerous discursive sites where meanings are changed and/or accumulated across sites. I argue that this approach is consistent with an understanding of subject positions vis-à-vis an essentialized unitary subject. It is also facilitates an understanding of what might, in a more essentialized account, be read as ‘inconsistencies’ or ‘contradictions’ in participants’ positions during the debate.

Also, in the previous chapter, I indicated the presence of specters that haunt the debate. In this chapter, after locating the repressed in participants’ imaginaries of economic, religious and familial relations, I return to the themes of governmentality and power/knowledge to assess the potential for ‘radical democracy’ (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) in the practices of participants. Here, through a discussion of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, I focus upon the importance of space in the expression of difference. In conclusion, I identify further areas of study indicated by my research.

More hauntings

As in Chapter Seven, here I examine ‘hauntings’ to challenge the “certainties of ontology” (Machery 1999: 20). Again, this is not a denial of materiality or of the importance of bodies (both human and non-human). Rather, I am arguing that our understandings of material ‘things’ (including bodies) are embodied and socially mediated in that they are produced within the multitude of locales, both material and discursive, in which we move and think. Further, our understandings are mediated within numerous fluid, overlapping, sometimes contradictory subject positions which are produced within equally numerous constantly shifting networks of power relations. The hauntings, which Derrida (1994) terms spectrality, that I discuss here... are these moments in which the present—and above all our current present, the wealthy, sunny, gleaming world of the postmodern and the end of history, of the new world system of late capitalism—unexpectedly betrays us (Jameson 1999: 39).

In this debate, KFB represents the regulations as too extreme and as such as betrayals of a contract between state agencies and capital. In KFB’s discourse, the regulations represent an impediment to ‘the new world system of late capitalism’—they jeopardize growth and the profits that accrue from constant expansion of production. Similarly, the group sees KFTC’s and CFA’s arguments for sustainability as the return of farming practices KFB had consigned to the past—another betrayal.

KFTC and CFA see the technologies associated with industrial farming and relied upon by the Cabinet as betrayals of the farmer’s autonomy, which they argue is essential to produce safe food for consumers. They represent KFB’s influence in the debate as a betrayal of both the authority of localities to determine the types of practices allowed and of the government’s role to protect the environment and public health. They also see the linkages between the land grant university and agribusinesses as a betrayal of the small- and mid-sized farmer. Because they represent biophysical media as active, the failure of the regulations to provide the level of protection that they seek makes the specter of contaminants more real to activists than to KFB or even the Cabinet.

Modernity wants no truck with ghosts. The desire to banish them to a distant pre-modern past indicates a desire to locate origins, to ascertain a certain final ontological solution:

... the very fear of ghosts that ‘haunts’ the heart of such an attempt, offers a signal exemplification of such a longing for primary realities, original simplicities, full presences, and self-sufficient phenomena cleansed of the extraneous or the residual, the new itself, the origin, from which one can begin from scratch (Jameson 1999: 45).

This desire for ontological certainty and transparency is inextricably linked to a modern fear not only of ghosts but also of chaos. Previously, I have indicated the (gendered and sexualized) desires of KFB and the Cabinet to exert control across a number of sites vis-à-vis the activists’ focus upon contingency and difference that challenge claims to control. Although activists stressed the activity of physical processes, however, with few exceptions, the corporeal hogs
were as backgrounded in activists’ discourse as they were in KFB’s and Cabinets. ‘Nature’ and hogs, however, are not the only hauntings in this debate.

**Imaginative geographies**

Allen (1999: 43) notes that the imaginary, as a form of knowledge, consists of more than “a series of representations.” He argues that the reason that “certain groups are able to lay claim to particular territories and the spaces of others, and why they may actually feel entitled to do so, owes much to the authority vested in their imaginative stories, descriptions, and organizing views.” Through apparatuses of power and authority, these groups use “geography both to normalize and legitimate a particular world view” (Allen 1999: 44). In the following sections, I will analyze participants’ imaginative geographies, additional imaginaries that contribute to the production of these geographies, and then examine how participants conceptualize and deploy space and/or spatiality politically.

**KFB’s geography.** KFB’s imaginative physical geography of Kentucky consists of property lines that delineate spaces of property owners’ autonomy. Although some group members have grudgingly accepted that the environmental effects of agricultural operations may have the potential to cross property lines, all who submitted comments argued that technological intervention (albeit less extensive technology than called for by the Cabinet) could preclude the possibility that contaminants escaped property boundaries. The group asserts an economic geography that stresses profit and loss statements of Kentucky farms while downplaying the ways in which those individual statements are linked to the activities of national and global agribusiness firms, labor-management relations, and North-South inequities. Instead, a map of the group’s representations of Kentucky’s global relationships would consist only of arrows of varying width to represent the amount of agricultural exports from Kentucky to sites across the globe. The group’s political geography tends to valorize state boundaries over against local mainly because the group has been able to exert more control at the state level than it has at the local or national level.

**Cabinet’s geography.** The Cabinet’s imaginative physical geography is more complex than that of the Farm Bureau’s. Physical geographies vary by Cabinet division—for example, the Division of Water’s geography consists of surface and groundwater while the Division of Air’s consists of air flows across the state. The previously discussed Cabinet response to the activist comment that directed attention to global warming indicates that the Cabinet’s physical geography does not extend past state boundaries. Given the Cabinet’s concern with facilitating processes of capital accumulation that provide the tax revenues that support its operations, its economic geography is also based on property lines. The Cabinet’s political geography is derived from shared jurisdictions with other states as well as federal and local agencies.

**Activists’ geographies.** The activists’ imaginative geographies are much more complicated than KFB’s or the Cabinet’s. Broadly speaking, the activists’ physical geography consists of complex relations between surface and groundwater and air flows which are not constrained by property lines. Their economic geographies are also complex, focusing upon the linkages between corporate practices at local, state, federal, and international sites to resource
extraction and labor policies that result in social inequalities. An activist map of Kentucky’s position in a global economy would connect human misery and environmental degradation to corporate activities and lack of governmental regulation across the globe. The activists’ political geography stresses the local and national mainly because they have had such difficulties working at the state level. Their geography can be described as a “politics of location” in which location is

the active constitution of the grounds on which political struggles are to be fought and the identities through which people come to adopt political stances, [rather] than the latitude and longitude of experiences of circumscription, marginalisation and exclusion. . . . The imagined political geography of location is intended to resist a politics where the spaces of difference and differentiation are erased, where the experiences of power relations are universalized, where struggles are organised only through one experience of injustice, injury and inequality (Pile: 1997: 27-28).

In this sense, the activists’ geography, which accounts for ‘spaces of difference’ that have been experienced as oppression through systems of economics, politics, race, and gender differs dramatically from the more universalized geographies of KFB and the Cabinet.

The geographies of all three groups are produced within a number of imaginaries—economic, religious, gender, and technological, among them—which differ dramatically and vary in importance to participants. Because I do not have sufficient information related to Cabinet members’ opinions to assess their economic, religious, and family imaginaries, in these sections, I will discuss only KFB’s and KFTC’s and CFA’s imaginaries.

**Economic imaginaries**

Despite its discourse of “market triumphalism” (Peet and Watts 1993), KFB’s neoliberal economic imaginary is haunted by the specter of alternative economic systems. As previously indicated, from its beginning the group represented values and/or interests other than its own as “selfish” (Stanford 1957: 1) and characterized social reforms (e.g., increases in the minimum wage and unionization) as “steps toward socialism.” It has consistently deployed a discourse sufficiently narrow to screen out all social context. Jameson (1999: 52-53) argues that this narrowing renders the social itself a specter:

> When it comes to ‘content’ in the social sense—and in a certain way since Marx, all content is social in this sense, or better still, the privilege of the Marxian discourse is to mark the movement in which all content is revealed to be social and secular—the triumph of market ideology and the immense movement of demarxification can also be seen as the novel kinds of epistemological repression in which it is precisely the sociality of all content, its deeper link to political economy as such, which is occulted.

KFB has been able to maintain its repressive epistemology through its ties to knowledge production at the University of Kentucky’s College of Agriculture, the state

---

department of agriculture, the USDA and agribusiness firms. As a result, in this debate to date, KFB has successfully separated the economic from the social primarily through a strategy of screening out other knowledges, including those of economists that question such neoliberal assumptions. Thus, the economic imaginaries of KFTC and CFA are anathema to KFB.

Theweleit (1987: 271) notes that, as capitalism (as a system) took root, “[s]treams of desire were encoded as streams of money, and circulation replaced free trajectories.” Delueze and Guattari (1983: 33) argue that capitalism entails “the encounter of two sorts of flows: the decoded flows of production the form of money-capital, and the decoded flows of labor in the form of the ‘free worker’.”

Capitalism institutes or restores all sorts of residual and artificial, imaginary, or symbolic territories, thereby attempting, as best it can, to recode, to rechannel persons who have been defined in terms of abstract quantities. Everything returns or recurs: States, nations, families. That is what makes the ideology of capitalism ‘a motley painting of everything that has ever been believed’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 34).

Thus, economic exchange became a primary site for both shaping and articulating desires within constantly shifting configurations of production that, more and more, became articulated through technologies that alter social relationships. Yet, at the same time, representations of states, nations and families as fixed and eternal, assert that little or no change has actually occurred.

Deleuze and Guattari (1983) assert that the production of desire has always occurred in the domain of the social (e.g., religious or social norms). The rise of capitalism, however, brought about a deterritorialization in which former flows of desire were liberated because former desire-coding agents were weakened or met their demise and a reterritorialization in which desire coding was allocated to two agents: 1) the social (channeled into economics since capitalism) and 2) the family. They refer to the channeling of desires into the economic stream as social repression and the family’s role in desire production as psychic repression. In this new role as desire producer, the family became the enforcer of the ‘Oedipalization’ of children.

It is in one and the same movement that the repressive social production is replaced by the repressing family, and that the latter offers a displaced image of desiring production that represents the repressed as incestuous familial drives. In this way the family/drives relationship is substituted for the relationship between the two orders of production (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 119-120). Emphasis is authors’.

Thus, desires that were not channeled into economic streams were stigmatized by association with the tabu of incest. This equation “shamed” and “stupified” desire which was “placed in a situation without exit” (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 120). In this way, desires that were not channeled into “libidinal investments in the economic and political spheres” and repressed desires were denied, creating a situation in which “desire can be made to desire its own repression” (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 105).

Like Deleuze and Guattari (1983), Theweleit (1987: 264-265) argues that, although initially, humans saw themselves as the masters of technologies they created to facilitate economic accumulation, the effect of creating this new channel for desire was “reactionary”
because “such efforts” blocked the free flow of the unconscious, “while streams of money flow on.” If this is indeed the case (for some), then KFB’s assertion of the ‘market’ as the determinant of rational actions is more than simple reification or a process through which advertising creates desire such as that documented by Ewen (1976, 1988). Instead, it is an assertion of properly channeled desire. So, desire is always already political, and repressed [or rigidly channeled] desires, which become specters, are potentially incendiary.

If desire is repressed, it is because every position of desire, no matter how small, is capable of calling into question the established order of a society: not that desire is asocial; on the contrary. But it is explosive; there is no desiring-machine capable of being assembled without demolishing entire social sectors (Foucault 1983: xxiii).

For this reason, it is important to analyze the political implications of KFB’s insistence that desire be articulated within and channeled into neoliberal economic arrangements.

For KFB, the creation of the ‘market’ as agent and arbiter of individual desires, serves two important ends: 1) it absolves individuals of responsibility for their decisions; and 2) it masks the role of individual desires in members’ economic transactions, allowing them to locate their desires in the sphere of the feminine irrational. I am not arguing that KFB members are aware (or even need to be aware) of the ways in which they benefit (beyond the possibility of profits) from their notion of ‘the market’. Rather I am saying that their single-minded devotion to the discourse of neoliberal economics may well be the result of these displaced and obscured desires which allows the group to argue (and even believe) that activists’ concerns emanate from “selfish” irrational feminine desires.

In the previous paragraph, I added a qualification to Theweleit’s argument about the channeling of desire into economic transactions because, in their critiques of neoliberal assumptions and the types of development that results from those assumptions, KFTC and CFA (as well as many other groups across the globe) have expressed desires that flow far outside of the economic channel. In KFTC’s and CFA’s economic imaginaries, ‘the market’ is a social relation, albeit a relation that tends to exert a powerful influence upon other social relations. Both groups regard the ‘laws of the market’ as human constructions that can be changed; these ‘laws’ are not inexorable. Additionally, neither group posits the primacy of an economic stream nor asserts that this stream can somehow be channeled in such a way that it can be separated from other flows as is the case with neoliberal economic discourse. Thus, especially through KFTC’s and CFA’s collaboration with other members of KEJA, they have fought for the types of reforms that recognize the intermingling of economic with other flows. I argue that one of the primary reasons that KFB regards the agendas of these groups as “steps toward socialism” is that the groups’ desires cannot be contained but instead flow through campaigns for economic, social, and environmental justice which merge into the types of larger and constantly shifting campaigns discussed in the chapters that focused upon activists.

Across genres, neither KFTC nor CFA has disavowed capitalism as a system; rather both groups have approached capitalism much as a ‘wild beast’ in need of restraints. It is not possible, however, to assume that members of both groups would restrict themselves to reforms only—democratic socialism would be compatible with the groups’ critiques. However, both groups also must adjust their discourse to participate in debates with state agencies and other groups, such as KFB. Both groups are sufficiently politically astute to recognize that they
could not mobilize the type of widespread support they need to accomplish their agendas if their economic discourse becomes too radical. Thus, the boldest critiques occur in the publications that they produce for members.

Although CFA has allied itself with author Wendell Berry who often speaks and/or signs books at the group’s fundraisers, CFA’s economic imaginary is more complex than that articulated by Berry (1957, 1981, 1995). Whereas Berry valorizes a ‘simpler’ less technologically-oriented and more self-reliant past that tends to evoke agriculture “before the market” (Jameson 1999: 56) and focuses upon the geographies of individual farms, CFA members do not preclude the use of technology to achieve less environmentally destructive agricultural practices and position themselves within a nexus of rural/urban and local/global relations. Berry’s vision of farmers’ producing for themselves and others in their locale, implicitly evokes a Marxian distinction between use and surplus value, a distinction that CFA members have not made in the genres analyzed.

Importantly, Derrida (1994) and Jameson (1999) connect the distinction between use and surplus value to Marx’s notion of commodity fetishism, which he saw as the successor of a religious imaginary.

Capitalism . . . as in the historical narrative we have inherited from the triumphant bourgeoisie and the great bourgeois revolutions, is the first social form to have eliminated religion as such and to have entered on the purely secular vocation of human life and human society. Yet, according to Marx, religion knows an immediate ‘return of the repressed’ at the very moment of the coming into being of such a secular society, which, imagining that it has done away with the sacred, then at once unconsciously sets itself in pursuit of the ‘fetishism of commodities’. The incoherence is resolved if we understand that a truly secular society is yet to come, lies in the future; and that the end of the fetishism of commodities may well be connected to some conquest of social transparencies (provided that we understand that such transparency has never yet existed anywhere): in which the collective labour stored in a given commodity is always and everywhere visible to its consumers and users. This is also to resolve the problem of ‘use-value’, which seems like a nostalgic survival only if we project it into what we imagine to be a simpler past, ‘before the market’, in which objects are somehow used and valued for themselves . . . (Jameson 1999: 55).

Religious imaginaries

Previously, I have noted the differences in the religious imaginaries of KFB, and KFTC and CFA. Here, through a discussion of religion as a specter, I want to discuss the ways in which these religious imaginaries intersect with economic imaginaries. Although both imaginaries are based in Christianity, I have indicated substantial differences between them. KFTC and CFA members’ religious imaginary bears a strong resemblance to liberation or process theology. Although liberation theology has been significant in the Central and South American Catholic Church, process theologians can be found in North America in both Roman Catholic and Protestant forms of Christianity. Thus, although the development of Protestantism has been associated with the rise of capitalism just as the Catholicism of the Medieval Roman Catholic Church (in particular the Church’s ban on usury) has been associated with a pre-
capitalist economic system (Hunt 1990, Weber 1976), the Protestant imaginary has not been completely fixed to capitalism.

KFTC’s and CFA’s religious imaginaries are articulated through a concern about inequalities produced by economic, race, gender, sex, and global relations. As previously indicated, both groups have fought sexism and racism, and KFTC has also taken on heterosexism. The groups’ religious imaginaries work in (at least) two ways: 1) as an organizing system within which members can assert a hierarchy of priorities and 2) as an established ethical system from which members can argue for a politics of care for both humans and the environment. Thus, ironically, that which was supposedly eliminated by the rise of the secular state, has returned in a form that challenges both the economic system that sustains the state and its ethical priorities. Even those arguments made by participants who did not explicitly refer to Christianity or use Christian metaphors relied upon an ethics of responsibility to humans and the environment compatible with the type of Christianity espoused by KFTC and CFA members, and also expressed a desire for more equal social relations within the regulatory milieu and in localities across the globe.

In its alliance with neoliberal economics, KFB’s religious imaginary is similar to the Protestantism discussed by Weber (1976) and Hunt (1990)—it is interwoven with the group’s notions of capitalism and it is supportive of capitalism as a system. It is also, as KFB asserted during the group’s previously referenced campaign to ensure that priests and ministers restricted their sermons solely to the ‘spiritual’, an imaginary that is dissociated from the social and physical world. This separation is consistent with Latour’s (1999: 22) description of the geography of modernism: “To sum it up in one simple formula: ‘out there’ nature, ‘in there’ psychology, ‘down there’ politics, ‘up there’ theology.” This formulation of ‘up there’ locates the ‘spiritual’ in the domain of the private.

Although KFB asserts this compartmentalization, it only does so when convenient. For example, the group monitored the boundary between ‘up there’ and ‘down there’ during its surveillance of sermons delivered in pulpits during the Vietnam era to ensure that the pulpit was the site of spiritual advice only. Yet, the group’s previously referenced campaign for Bible education and prayer in the public schools breached this divide. The Bible and prayer campaign was conducted simultaneously with another that called for the schools to teach “basic economics and responsibilities of living in a democratic society” also. The insistence upon the teaching of both Bible and prayer along with economics and citizenship tied the group’s version of Christianity, capitalism, and democracy into one neat package that brought the ‘spiritual’ ‘down’ into the worldly (male) public sphere from the private space ‘up there’.

The group’s religious imaginary also plays a crucial role in the maintenance of patriarchal social relations. Despite its insistence upon compartmentalization, the group asserted the ‘spiritual’ to buttress both its anti-abortion position and its campaign to make public the names of welfare recipients in order to limit the right of unmarried women to reproduce. Apparently, KFB is asserting that ‘spirituality’ cannot move from the private into the public when it might be deployed to challenge dominant discourses; it may be moved, however, when it can be mobilized to support dominant discourses, that is, when it can be used to valorize capitalism or to control women and other spectral beings. It is noteworthy that the group implicitly represented female desire—to choose the right to reproduce or not—as a

threat to the social order. In the group’s formulation, female desires to control reproduction are
doubly irrational because they are expressed outside of the channel of economic exchange and
they are the desires of women who are, by nature, irrational and chaotic.

The group’s relationship with its Christian God is also important. Irigaray (Whitford
1991: 142) charges that the creation of a male God allows men to deny their own limits and
relegate women to spheres that are the source of fear:

Men have refused to confront their limits. By creating a male God
(Father/Son/Holy Spirit) they have given infinite extension to the male
principle, while assigning women the role of guardians of death (sex and death
are then fused in a deathly equation). They incorporate the feminine rather than
recognizing women. If they had confronted Woman as another kind/genre, they
would have been obliged to confront their own finitude and their own limits; the
fact that Mankind is not universal.

In this way, in this mainstream form of Christianity that Irigaray describes and KFB
practices, the female, which is a figment of the male imaginary, becomes “the other of the
same” (Irigaray 1985). She exists only as the repository of traits from which men wish to
disassociate themselves; she does not exist as an entity of her own. As such, she is sacrificed to
enable the creation of the male subject whose dominion has been extended by his association
with a male God. Through his belief in and obedience to his God, the male subject may gain
immortal life. He is the active godlike rational fount of ideas; she is the passive irrational
material sphere, which is associated with flows of blood and other fluids. The deified-by-
association male subject then controls female sexuality by justifying his actions as compliance
with his God’s wishes.

Such thoughts on divine truth are available to many only when he has left
behind everything that still linked him to this sensible world that the earth, the
mother, represents. Are these thoughts also to be understood from behind? This
backside duplicity is resolved only in God, it would seem, who sees all and is
thus also at the beginning of all. As for the mother, let there be no mistake about
it, she has not eyes, or so they say, she has no gaze, no soul. No consciousness,

**Imaginaries of ‘wife and mother’**

KFB locates ‘woman’ as wife and mother in the home where she is responsible for
reproduction, bearing and raising children who are socialized to the norms of the dominant
order. In her role as mother, she becomes an appendage of the father/producer.

Property, ownership, and self-definition are the attributes of the father’s production.
They define the work of the father ‘as such.’ To be. To own. To be one’s own (Irigaray
1985: 300).

‘Woman’, in this formulation, however, is not “simply a piece of property” (Theweleit
1987: 331). Rather, she is
a part of the masculine self that has been placed outside of him and now needs to be reincorporated. She is at once the medium for the desires of the male self and the name of the desired object. Soul-flesh-blood/wealth-estate-treasure-goods: coupled not for production, but joined together under the sign of antiproduction (lack as the guarantee of attachment) (Theweleit 1997: 331).

But this incorporated ‘she’ is a phantom (Irigaray 1985). Within Western family relationships, the production of the ego requires the sacrifice of the mother, the erasure of the daughter, and the production of sons who are both haunted by the specters of their fathers and who, as future supplanters, haunt their fathers (Derrida 1994, Irigaray 1985, Theweleit 1997). This homosocial lineage first enacted in the nuclear family guarantees “that the ‘ego’ it engendered would view the world as a place of ends and purposes, an arena for the realization of predetermined interests” (Theweleit 1997: 312). With the channeling of desire into economic streams, economics becomes the privileged calculus for determining ends, purposes and interests. It also establishes an arena in which fathers and sons must struggle: the father to hold on to his supremacy against the son who will ultimately succeed him. So this homosociality is produced by and fraught with struggle, and the specters of economics (both neoliberal and Marxian) are also the specters of the Father (God) and fathers and sons (Derrida 1994). These specters are themselves produced by “the forgetting of the maternal” (Lewis 1999: 183).

Many feminists have written about the patriarchal geography in which women are located in the private and men in the valorized spheres of “defense, politics, religion and economics” (Van Buren 1989: 47). As previously noted, within the organization, KFB has assigned women to social reproduction—ensuring the valorization of normative heterosexual relations, maintaining standards of physical attractiveness as caretakers of the annual King and Queen contest, and working within the parameters established for women’s participation in the organization as members of the Women’s Committee.

Conversely, leaders of both KFTC and CFA have always included women: in both groups, women are as likely as men to create and run statewide campaigns and liaison with other state and regional groups. Because women have been accepted as equal campaigners and because men, as well as women, have been represented as victims of unequal social arrangements, within the group more equal gender relations are the norm. This in no way, however, should be read as an assertion that the women in both groups are not thought within or relegated to the domain of the maternal or that they do not experience sexism. Because patriarchal relations are produced within a multitude of sites, men who are content to work as equals with women in both groups may well participate in patriarchal relations in other sites, including their own homes and workplaces, just as women in both groups may return to homes where their maternal roles take precedence and they may experience sexism at the hands of family members and friends. Further, women in both groups experience sexism regularly in their dealings with people outside of the groups and family-friend networks. What is important, however, is that women in KFTC and CFA are seen by group members as leaders and are not spatially constrained.

The sexism that women in KFTC and CFA experienced during the debate, was also experienced by male activists because, as activists, they were also feminized by KFB and the
Cabinet. Cixous (1981: 93) argues that gender systems are inextricably embedded within relationships of power, production, and reproduction:

The (political) economy of the masculine and of the feminine is organized by different requirements and constraints, which, when socialized and metaphorized, produce signs, relationships of power, relationships of production and of reproduction, an entire immense system of cultural inscription readable as masculine or feminine.

Thus, the feminization that (male and female) activists experienced was the manifestation of power imbalances that were compounded by KFB’s and the Cabinet’s feminization of the environment and hogs: the feminine was speaking for the equally feminized environment and hogs. This doubling of the domains of the denigrated feminine blocked activists from the realm of the symbolic which in turn created further discursive constraints.

Because ‘woman’ as a construct is a phantom, ‘woman’ has no place in the symbolic (Cixous 1981, Irigaray 1985). The Cabinet understood KFB’s use of ‘the market’ as the site of production, as metaphor for the economic relations upon which it relies, and as the appropriate (male-in-a-capitalist system) channel for desire. Similarly, the Cabinet understood KFB’s production of the environment as inert controllable matter and shared KFB’s assumptions that technology would provide methods of control. As these discourses met and flowed within each other, KFB’s and the Cabinet’s beliefs in the rectitude of their discourses gathered strength. This is not a simple question of ideology or ‘false consciousness’. Instead, Deleuze and Guattari (1983: 104) argue

[t]here is an unconscious libidinal investment of the social field that coexists, but does not necessarily coincide, with the preconscious investments, or with what the preconscious investments ‘ought to be’. That is why, when subjects, individuals, or groups act manifestly counter to their class interests—when they rally to the interests and ideals of a class that their own objective situation should lead them to combat—it is not enough to say: they were fooled, the masses have been fooled. It is not an ideological problem, a problem of failing to recognize, or of being subject to, an illusion. It is a problem of desire, and desire is part of the infrastructure. Preconscious investments are made, or should be made, according to the interests of the opposing classes. But unconscious investments are made according to positions of desire and uses of synthesis, very different from the interests of the subject, individual or collective, who desires.

Conversely, the activists articulated unrecognizable desires, desires that flowed dangerously outside of the channels of the economic stream. Because this economy of desire does not stay within the bounds of properly bounded male desire, within the binary formulation of the Western Enlightenment cognitive grid, it must be feminine. It is, however, the feminine desire of the other of the same because “[w]omen’s desire has, like women’s sexuality been theorized within masculine parameters” (Irigaray 1981: 99). Thus, within the realm of the symbolic, the activists had reached the “limits of the sayable” (Foucault 1991a: 60) on two fronts because: 1) they and that for which they spoke were feminized; and 2) there is no feminine symbolic.
Desire

Deleuze and Guattari (1983: 38) note the linkage between signs, signifying chains and desire: “The one vocation of the sign is to produce desire, engineering it in every direction.” KFB’s strategy of fixing signs through deployment of the signifying chains discussed in a previous chapter, channel desire into the domain of capitalist economics. KFTC’s and CFA’s signs and signifying chains assert establish radically divergent economies of desire that flow across a multitude of sites.

Liberation movements contain, in a more or less ambiguous state, what belongs to all requirements of liberation: the force of the unconscious itself, the investment by desire of the social field, the disinvestments of repressive structures (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 61).

Because, following Theweleit, my search for context was conducted across genres to locate desires that may not have been consciously articulated, KFTC and CFA (as well as KFB and the Cabinet) may well not even recognize their desires in my analysis. Analysis of desire, however, is crucial because it is the gendering of desires embedded within signs and signifying chains that render them so potent. Further, analysis of the ways in which expression of KFTC’s and CFA’s (feminized) desires has been constrained by discursive boundaries, illustrates the need for the development of a female symbolic, for an imaginary of the sort for which feminists such as Cixous (1981) and Irigaray (1981, 1985) have argued. Whatever the form of this imaginary—whether it is developed through female writing (Cixous 1981) or opposes fertility and abundance to the impoverished male imaginary (Irigaray 1985)—it must confront the production of ‘woman’, ‘nature’ and animals as entities that lack that which has been allocated to men.

Maintaining relations of dominance—the ‘divide’ half of the motto—was assured through the establishment of the experience of lack as the basic component of real male-female relations of production; for the image of women and her living reality can never be made even approximately to coincide with each other. Relations of production have thus become relations of antiproduction, within which and out of which inequality and oppression are engendered, creating a reality that constricts and reterritorializes.

The fictive body of woman has become an imaginary arena for fantasies of deterritorializations, while actual male-female relationships have continued to serve, and have been actively maintained, as focal points for the implementation of massive reterritorializations (Theweleit 1987: 298-99).

I want to argue both that activists (who have not indicated awareness of the roles of gendering and sexualizing in the debate) are seeking to deterritorialize and that the gendering and sexualizing of the fictive others in the debate that is used to maintain the dominance of KFB’s and the Cabinet’s positions constitutes a reterritorialization. In the following sections, I will discuss the strategies—especially those related to time and space—used for deterritorialization and reterritorialization.
Territorial strategies

Deterritorialization. Throughout the debate (and throughout both KFTC’s and CFA’s histories), activists have challenged the established socio-spatial order. Much like Whatmore (1999: 31), they have consistently pointed out that spatial parameters: “[i]nhere in a host of socio-technical practices—such as property, sovereignty, and identities—that are always in the making, not in some a priori order of things.” Their insistence upon natural processes “challenges spatial, as well as, social (pre) dispositions” (Whatmore 1999: 31). Further, through their networks that include an active natural world and activists in both ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ sites across the globe, their

... geographies alert us to a world of commotion in which the sites, tracks, and contours of social life are constantly in the making through networks of actants-in-relation that are at once local and global, natural and cultural, and always more than human (Whatmore 1999: 33).

In the activist imaginary, much as in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1983) notion of the body without organs, flows are (in contrast to KFB and the Cabinet) unimpeded, and desires stream across a multiplicity of sites where they mingle, sometimes gathering strength (for a time), and sometimes being diverted to other sites. So, during their lives as organizations, although both groups’ desires have been articulated as challenges to the social inequalities produced by gender, race, economic, sexual, and political arrangements, their tactics and campaigns have varied over time: sometimes they work together, other times alone; sometimes they work with ‘rural’ people, other times with ‘urban’ or with both simultaneously. In this sense, the groups, much like guerillas, are moving targets whose range of desire extends across the networks they traverse.

KFB and the Cabinet are also advocating a deterritorialization but of a very different sort than that proposed by activists. The highly secured closed-off landscape of industrial livestock farming that they propose as successor to what most of us think of as ‘traditional’ farm layouts reconfigures territories. The barns, silo, pastures and farmhouses that represent ‘farming’ to many, are replaced by large enclosed buildings and vast lagoons to store waste. Beyond this change in the architecture of farm operations, even if potential contaminants are contained, the immediate and surrounding territory is altered. The pastoral endures in the American imaginary in part because it evokes a sense of emotional security: because of the close relationships assumed to exist in rural areas, the pastoral is a ‘safe’ emotional place. Those relationships, however, are linked to a particular geography: farmhouses with welcoming porches, where family members can sit and enjoy the evening breezes with other neighbors; fences which farmers of abutting properties can lean on while they chat; and feed stores where gossip is swapped. Of course, this is an idyll but large numbers of people in rural areas experience some elements of the myth—enough to make them fight to protect what is left of it (if it ever existed). There is empirical evidence of porches, fences and feed stores, however, and, even if they are less than ideal, the social relationships that these spatial arrangements are produce are altered dramatically when buildings (without porches) are not open to visitors, when workers are on the land surrounding the industrial operation only during the spreading of wastes, a process sufficiently odiferous to discourage folks from stopping by.
to chat, and when feed stores close because the contractor stipulates that feed be purchased elsewhere. Often long-standing relationships are also changed by the influx of newcomers who work on industrial farms. And, of course, when odors and biological matter is not contained, relationships between neighbors within the territory tend to become contentious. Further, although the human-animal relationship did not play an important part in the debate, that change must also be noted here.

Because, at the same time, KFB and the Cabinet are attempting to reterritorialize, the openings for alternative flows of desire that Deleuze and Guattari (1983) associate with deterritorialization are blocked. Desire still flows along economic streams in their reterritorialization. Deleuze and Guattari (1983: 35) relate this double movement to the search for profits.

...the more the capitalist machine deterritorializes, decoding and axiomatizing flows in order to extract surplus value from the, the more its ancillary apparatuses, such as government bureaucracies and the forces of law and order, do their utmost to reterritorialize, absorbing in the process a larger and larger share of surplus value.

**Reterritorialization.** Both KFB and the Cabinet are trying to reterritorialize, to secure their territory against activist incursions. To do so, they are mobilizing “dominant forces to prevent the new productive possibilities from becoming new human freedoms” (Theweleit 1987: 264). Both are generating “‘hard’ facts” to extend their “networks spatially” (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 34). Thus, KFB has mobilized knowledge-producing networks to produce data to support its stance against stringent regulation and to prove that regulation will unnecessarily impede the accumulation of profits from the creation of new markets for agricultural products from Kentucky across the globe. Similarly, the Cabinet has generated scientific data to defend increasing its regulatory area while simultaneously limiting that regulation from unduly impeding the accumulation of profits that produce the tax revenues upon which its operating budget relies. Both groups deploy their ‘hard facts’ through discourses that “incorporate the propensity to legitimize invasiveness” (Slater 1999: 68).

KFB’s discourses of economics and biotechnology are invasive. The group’s constant quest for ‘free trade’ agreements to facilitate the creation of new export markets allows for the penetration of new states and spatially extends the group’s economic networks. The discourse of biotechnology legitimates the penetration of plants and animals to accomplish the genetic transformations that make them more ‘productive’ and profitable. Similarly, the Cabinet’s and activists’ discourse of geotechnological investigations opens up natural processes to scrutiny and surveillance. It is important, however, to note that the Cabinet and activists deploy this discourse to different ends: the Cabinet’s discourse legitimates the engineering of natural processes in such a way that industrial farms can be deemed ‘safe’ for the environment and humans; the activists’ discourse aims to prove that the contingencies created by active physical processes defy technological control and thus preclude industrial farming in much of Kentucky. KFB also deploys time to legitimate its re/deterritorialization.
Time and progress

KFB uses the notion of time-as-progress both to erase the social effects of deterritorialization and to reterritorialize. Thus time takes precedence over space. ‘Progress’ is an ever-recurring trope across all of KFB’s genres. It is used to justify socio-spatial displacements. Even when disruptions are noted, they are excused. For example, when the group’s leadership explains concentration and/or decreases in prices paid to farmers, it does so by framing these events as temporary aberrations or ‘corrections’ which, when completed, will produce better conditions. ‘Progress’ is also deployed to reterritorialize.

As the territory becomes secured, so the refrain is ‘picked up’ or reiterated by others who come to occupy the same space, much like bird-songs, or . . . cultural myths. Each time the refrain is picked up, it is articulated anew, yet it still remains recognizably the same repetitive series (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 36-37).

‘Progress’ is a KFB refrain: “an element of repetition, a recalling of something old that makes a territory” (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 46). The use of the refrain is a form of ordering that territorializes “both the past and the future . . . in a very specific way” (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 46). Although a refrain does not necessarily impose a specific chronological order, KFB’s discourse of ‘progress’ is used to organize time into a coherent linearity which is represented through the movement from ‘before’ to after’. In this way, Brown and Capdevila (1999) report, networks territorialize. Through repetitions with differing refrains, “[t]ime is folded so that the past becomes in-tensionally relevant and repeatedly so” (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 47). The refrain also folds time into the future by establishing discourses and practices that set parameters within which the future will be conceptualized. For example, through its representation of the historic importance of agriculture to Kentucky, KFB has effectively projected this importance into the future thus enabling it (and agricultural experts) to argue that state agencies must meet its present needs so it can accrue future profits.

The group’s discourse of ‘progress’ is frequently articulated through the tropes of ‘efficiency’ and ‘growth’, which establishes the link between ‘progress’, neoliberal economics, and capitalism. In this way, the group can both distance itself from former farming methods and disparage those who use them as ‘backward’ while simultaneously justifying present actions on the basis of the re-presented past. KFB’s notion of time-as-progress both subsumes other narratives into a universal linearity and erases the role of power. In this way, KFB’s representation of its agricultural network resembles the perpetuum mobile:

Networks are assemblages of forces, they emerge from and dissolve into the play of power. Power is what makes them what they are, and what—eventually—is responsible for their collapse. If power is left out of the approach then networks come fully to resemble the perpetuum mobile, curious structures which function endlessly without apparent reference to the world around them (Brown and Capdevila 1999: 38).

Importantly, KFB’s erasure of power from its re-presentation of its network across time, locates power in the network much as its representation of economics locates power in the ‘market’. In this way, KFB erases both individual (human) agency and power differentials.
between group members much as the modernist constitution obscures the existence and autonomy of hybrids. Time-as-progress works for KFB much like the Rolling Stones’ refrain: “Time is on my side.” Because the group represents time-as-progress as having a life of its own, it can be used as the justification for actions while simultaneously providing the group’s logic.

Where KFB’s conflation of time, progress, and capitalism screens out all social context (“the world around them”), KFTC and CFA deploy time to highlight the social inequalities that the groups have challenged. In KFTC’s discourse, time becomes a question of endurance, of residents’ struggle against out-of-state corporations and the state’s collusion with the same firms. Time becomes the measure of the group’s ability to endure to resist hegemonic relations and, through successes, to attract more members. The group evokes past struggles and successes regularly to frame the present struggle. KFTC and CFA represent industrial farming as out-of-state corporations invading Kentucky, turning Kentucky farmers into the equivalent of ‘sharecroppers’ who, because the contractor establishes conditions and practices of work, survive only if they can do so within corporate-established parameters. The reference to sharecropping evokes a history of struggle of small farmers (white and black) in the south and establishes an equivalency between that history and contract farming. Farmers who have contracted with corporate integrators are, in both groups’ representations landed labor only.

In addition, CFA folds time to bring the social relations associated with the less intensive agricultural practices of the past into the present, and to use former, less chemically intensive practices as a basis upon which to build more sustainable agricultural practices. Through this refrain, the group has produced a critique of KFB’s (and agricultural experts’) representations of industrial farming as ‘real’ farming and ‘progress’.

The strategies of participants that have been deployed to assert divergent visions of future agriculture attest to the validity of Derrida’s argument that “there is no symmetry between what is past and what is to come” (Hamacher 1999: 197). The changes in American agriculture since WWII have been oriented toward increasing productivity and efficiency through the development and application of progressively more sophisticated technologies (Cochrane 1993). Because agricultural experts have failed to account for the hybrids that were produced in this process and, especially, failed to recognize the contingency of natural processes, the experts saw the future as more of the same. They did not foresee the effects of these changes upon humans and the environment (Buttel et al. 1990, MacConnell 1998, Reichelderfer-Smith 1994, Ward et al. 1998). Those effects, however, raised the possibility of alternative futures—the regulation of agricultural practices and/or sustainable agriculture—that are endorsed by KFTC and CFA.

As previously noted, KFB has argued for weak regulation at the hearings and, in its newspaper, resisted environmental regulation across all possible sites of application. Although the group has grudgingly acceded space (in the form of a niche market) to sustainable agriculture and cynically resisted the Cabinet’s regulations by arguing that it would jeopardize sustainable agricultural practices, it (with agricultural experts) has consistently maintained that industrial agriculture and biotechnology is the real agriculture, the future of agriculture called into life by the present. In this reading, sustainable practices, especially when couched in the discourse of more ‘traditional’ practices appear then as a specter of the (less productive and less efficient) past. KFB and agricultural experts failed to realize that “specters of the past can only appear when conjured by the promise of another future” (Hamacher 1999: 197).

The ‘other future’ that KFTC and CFA and, to a lesser extent, the Cabinet saw emerging from KFB’s future was environmental contamination that potentially threatened human health. KFTC and CFA also saw the social effects that both KFB and the Cabinet erased. So, the future
of regulation and/or sustainable agriculture emerged as a the ghost of another future which, because KFB associates the discourse of sustainability with the past, it sees as a specter that threatens its re-ordering of space.

**Space and spatiality**

*Space.* In KFB’s formulation, space is, like the environment, passive and inert, waiting to be used productively and efficiently. In this debate, space matters to KFB only to the extent that farmers have sufficient land to comply with the regulations’ requirements of buffer strips and distances from stipulated physical and human features. Beyond abutting spaces and a reified ‘global market’, the group sees no spatial relations. Further, it subsumes space into time by rearranging spatial differences into a progression of time-as-progress so that spaces can be read: farmers and locales across the globe who have not adopted ‘modern’ agricultural practices are ‘backward’. In the group’s reading, space is coded as ‘modern’ or ‘backward’, ‘rural’ or ‘urban’, ‘developed’ or ‘undeveloped’. KFB’s notion of space is also implicitly transparent and uniform.

The conceiving of spatial difference by occluding it is typical of many of the great modernist understandings of the world. The stories of progress, of development, of modernization, of the evolution through revolution from pre-capitalist through capitalist to socialist/communist, share a geographical imagination which rearranges spatial differences into temporal sequence (Massey 1999: 280).

Massey (1999: 281) argues that this reordering “closes down multiplicity and the possibility of alternative voices.” This is precisely KFB’s strategy, not only during the hearings but also throughout its history. Since its inception, the group has fought to exclude oppositional voices. At the hearings, its strategies included its insistence that the Cabinet privilege the voices of KFB and agricultural ‘experts’, attempts to weaken the regulation’s proposed public notification requirements, efforts to introduce a bill that would have made criticism of agricultural practices libelous, and its struggle to fix the definition of farming to privilege its practices over those of CFA. Similarly, the group’s erasure of social inequalities and thus difference facilitated its representation of homogenous and transparent space. From the beginning, when the group differentiated itself from other farming groups by categorizing them as ‘radical’ or ‘ineffectual’, it represented itself as the only rational voice of farmers and farm families. Massey (1999: 281) associates the modernist understanding of space and denial of heterogeneity to “a kind of temporo-spatial version of that understanding of difference which sees others as really only a variation on oneself, where the ‘oneself’ is the one constructing the imagination.” Massey’s description is strikingly similar to Irigaray’s (1985) other of the same.

The Cabinet also represents space as passive, inert, uniform, and transparent. Through the boundaries stipulated in the regulations, space is only a medium that, through buffer strips, can be gridded so that the Cabinet can argue that contaminants can be contained. The social changes that result from this reconfigured space are denied in the Cabinet’s formulation. Further, through its use of universal models, such as that of karst landscapes, the Cabinet is implicitly asserting the uniformity and transparency of space. These assumptions are essential to the Cabinet’s argument that it can predict movement of matter through media and thus control flows.
Spatiality. Through their arguments for recognition of ways in which changes in spatial arrangements of farming will result in changes in social relations in place, KFTC and CFA implicitly recognize that space can be both “disruptive and . . . a source of disruption” (Massey 1999: 280). Although both groups understand space as relational, interrelated and permeable, it is not possible, from the genres analyzed here, to determine if either group is assuming a spatial coherency or transparency.

Both groups’ critique of KFB’s notion of ‘progress’ and their folding of the past into the present and future challenges KFB’s linear progression of time-as-progress. Again, however, from genres analyzed, I cannot ascertain if members of both groups are trying to fix agricultural spaces. For example, it is not clear if KFTC and/or CFA would oppose industrial livestock farming if it were regulated to their satisfaction. Nor can I say if either group is attempting to fix a definition of farming as sustainable and, further, if they would attempt to fix a meaning of sustainability by sanctioning some practices and disavowing others.

It is, however, possible to say that both groups’ recognition of and desires to create space for multiplicity is consistent with an understanding (at least to some extent) of spatiality (Massey 1999). Although both groups have consistently struggled to reduce economic differences, they have simultaneously fought to create spaces for alternative agricultural, gender and racial practices and, in the case of KFTC, sexual practices also. The struggle about the spaces of regulation, and the others in which KFTC and CFA have engaged, demonstrate that space is always already political.

Spatializing politics

Like Massey, I think of ‘progressive’ politics as those that provide more inclusive and heterogenous spaces for participation. I understand subjectivities as “plural, working in many discursive registers, many spaces, many times” and I locate resistance, which “is inherent in the constitution of power,” within “variation in regimes of subjectification” (Thrift 1997: 135). Because “power emerges out of what is done, . . . different discourses, different arrangements and representations may emerge tangentially from supposedly dominant groups,” (Pryke 1999: 172). The gaps between those discourses, arrangements and representations, provide the spaces in which to challenge socio-spatial arrangements. Because identities are constituted in place and practices of power “are constructed within the context of certain geographies—both imagined and material” (Radcliffe 1999: 227), power relations are always embodied. These embodiments are “the outcome and the effect of . . . a disciplining which results from the coordination of space, place, and society by groups invested with power” (Radcliffe 1999: 227). It is important, however, to extend our notions of embodiment beyond the human body, to incorporate such things as the biophysical world and hogs.

KFTC’s and CFA’s political agenda is grounded in a social history that has deeply influenced members’ political practices. Although their tactics are inclusionary, neither group assumes consistency among members because both recognize that people occupy different subject positions, especially those related to gender and race. Through their campaigns, both groups have recognized an understanding of the ways in which practices in one domain are articulated on other practices (e.g., the ways in which economic practices influence the development of regulation). Across all genres, both groups recognize that economics is a domain of social arrangements involving power relationships, rather than reflective of a set of universal laws. In their arguments about the effect of an altered agricultural landscape on existing social
arrangements, both groups are implicitly acknowledging that space is productive. In their focus upon biophysical processes, they have activated the environment. In short, both groups have created fewer specters than KFB and the Cabinet.

In contrast, although across all genres KFB and the Cabinet assert that their actions are apolitical, both groups’ politics are also grounded in a particular set of historic conditions. KFB’s politics have always been oriented toward the attainment of policies that maintain the organization within a capitalist political economy. Its political goals have been developed to facilitate individual farmers to respond to conditions established by a reified market. Similarly, in its history of facilitating corporate activity in Kentucky, the Cabinet’s regulatory policies have been similarly disciplined by economic concerns.

Both KFB and the Cabinet posit “a uniform abstraction of change” (Foucault 1991a: 70). In KFB’s formulation, change occurs as a result of market conditions and technological advancements that are assumed to operate outside of the realm of social relations. Although the group understands that all farmers do not necessarily benefit from the ongoing concentration of livestock markets or may not have the capital to invest in new technologies, it represents the difficulties of individual farmers as ‘market corrections’ or as attributable to the shortcoming of individual farmers who are short-sighted or poor planners.

The Cabinet also valorizes both economics through draft analyses that determine how much environmental and public health protection is cost-effective and technology through its insistence upon its efficacy to prevent the release of contaminants from industrial hog farms. Throughout its history, the Cabinet has consistently erased social relations and has adamantly refused to consider the political and economic effects of its policies.

Additionally, KFB represents a unitary conscious rational male as the subject of all operations. Although the Cabinet has not addressed man as subject directly, its responses to comments indicate that it also takes a similar stance. Across KFB’s genres, there is no indication of either an understanding of subject positions or of the possibility of rational thought or activity from an other source, such as women or feminized men, biophysical processes or animals. Given the Cabinet’s insistence that its policies are objective and rational and its feminization of activists, the environment and hogs, it is likely that the Cabinet also assumes a unitary male subject. Likewise, and closely related to their insistence upon space vis-à-vis spatiality and erasure of social relations, neither KFB nor the Cabinet acknowledge that discourses form practices that are articulated upon other practices. Although both groups valorize two discourses—economics and technology—because they conflate them, they fail to understand how one discourse deeply influences the other.

A very important caveat. My analysis of the politics of the groups involved in this debate should not be extended to individuals within the groups. Although the politics of KFB and the Cabinet are less than progressive, especially in their strategies of gendering and sexualizing, it does not necessarily follow that individuals within the groups uniformly subscribe to these politics in all domains of their lives, or, beyond a search for survival as farmers, to the politics analyzed here.

Human beings are not the unified subjects of some coherent regime of domination that produces persons in the form in which it dreams. On the contrary, they live their lives in a constant movement across different practices that address them in different ways. Within these different practices, persons are
addressed as different sorts of human beings, acted upon as if they were different sorts of human beings. Techniques of relating to oneself as a subject demand that one decipher oneself in terms of the authenticity of one’s actions run up against the political demand that one abides by the collective responsibility of organization decision-making even when one is personally opposed to it (Thrift 1997: 136).

Given that some CFA members also belong to KFB, clearly, not all KFB members espouse all of KFB’s politics or endorse its strategies. Additionally, given that KFB’s policies are adopted by elected representatives at annual meetings and strategies are determined by elected directors, it is possible that there are members who do not also belong to CFA who are not in complete agreement with all of its strategies and politics. Finally, because subject positions are produced within a multitude of power relationships, there is no reason to assume uniformity across and within subjectivities. Although the same arguments also apply to Cabinet employees, they may face additional constraints: employees may disagree with policies yet, because they need their paychecks, be hesitant to express dissent. I understand Foucault’s description of a “doubly involuntary world of dependence and productivity” (Burchell 1991: 120) to be saying something similar.

Similarly, as Lamar Keys indicated when he expressed concern that not all KFTC members would be comfortable with the group’s campaign against racism, it is possible that not all KFTC and CFA members are comfortable with the group’s stances against sexism and racism or its political economy critique. People who are strongly invested in one campaign may not be similarly invested in all campaigns.

**Conclusion**

Although both the social constructionist and political economy methodologies of risk and hazards perception literature are helpful to developing a content analysis of risks asserted in this debate, neither methodology addresses the fact that risk debates are about far more than divergent assertions of risk. As indicated in this analysis, such disputes, like capitalism itself (Delueze and Guattari 1983), encompass everything that has come before and will come again in often-oppositional shifting configurations that are produced from elements (physical and discursive) at hand. Because these disputes are embedded within and draw from domains other than the physical world, they are always ultimately disagreements about power relations, space and identity. Yet, the majority of the literature that addresses the social construction of risk, fails to consider the socio-spatial context in which peoples’ risk perceptions are constructed, the power relations between participants in risk debates, and the ways in which socio-spatial context and networks of power relations are manifested in strategies and tactics of participants in such debates.

Political economy-based, especially Marxist, analyses address power relations within the domain of political economy but they too have a number of shortcomings. Of particular importance to this debate, these analyses tend to overlook important elements by privileging the ‘global’ over the ‘local’, approaching the rural as ‘backward’, and valorizing economic over other power networks. All too often, in Marxist analyses, the ‘local’ is represented as a medium that is noteworthy only to the extent that it is a laboratory in which to study changes caused by the ‘global’ (Massey 1984). As previously discussed, modernist thought has constructed
‘rurality’ as the site of the ‘backward’, the polar opposite of ‘urbanity’ and ‘progress’. This construction erases urban dependence on the rural. I argue that this dependence is more than one of simple reliance upon ‘rurality’ for food but that the ‘rural’ is the constitutive outside that allowed for the construction of the ‘urban’. Quite simply, any notion of urbanity would not be conceivable without one of rurality much in the same way that the ‘global’ could not exist without the idea of the ‘local’. In the modernist formulation, the ability of existing socio-spatial relationships in localities to alter the ‘global’ and the hybridity of both the global and local (Massey 1999), is erased.

The assumption of the rural as backward is troubling because it implicitly reinscribes a Western notion of ‘progress’—in this case, because the ‘rural’ is associated with a pre-proletarian labor force which has no revolutionary potential, rural labor relations and the social networks that support them must be eliminated to allow for the progression to a proletariat which will bring about a transformation to socialism and communism. I argue that it is not a coincidence that animals low on the hierarchy—those slated for consumption rather than those that represent freedom (wild animals) or affection (pets)—have been placed into rural spaces. In this debate, the politics of the predominantly ‘rural’ CFA and members of KFTC who live in rural areas challenge these representations of rurality.

Both social constructionist and political economy analyses share other shortcomings. With few exceptions (e.g., McAvoy 1998, Schnaiberg and Gould 1994, Wisner 1995), analyses of risk disputes fail to question the ‘expert’ notion of risk. This is noteworthy because the lack of a genealogical investigation into risk assertions tends to (at least implicitly) indicate that there is an ‘expert’ construction of risk that is superior to others. Because risk ‘experts’ base their analyses upon the technocratic assumptions indicated in the previous chapter, the failure to interrogate expert notions of risk is also tacit support of technocratic assumptions that are at best questionable and at worst (unfortunately often the case) deployed to legitimate power inequities. I have argued that a Foucauldian power-knowledge analysis provides the tools to investigate the processes through which notions of risk are constructed. It allows for analysis of the epistemologies that underlie asserted risks, identification of sites of knowledge production and differences in knowledges produced, the role of power in knowledge production, and the identification of excluded knowledges. This form of analysis also challenges notions of a unitary state by focusing attention on the types of knowledges produced by different state agencies.

Additionally, neither the social constructionist or Marxist accounts of risk address the relationship between environmental regulation and the production of subjectivities. In their study of British farmers and their attitudes toward environmental regulation, Ward et al. (1998) have indicated the importance of regulation in creating self-regulated subjects, a form of regulation that allows regulatory agencies to govern at a distance. A Foucauldian approach to governmentality that examines subject positions provides the means to identify sources of
conflict that are overlooked in social constructionist and risk analyses. This examination is important because I see risk disputes as political and, like Mouffe (1993), I maintain that an accounting of subject positions is necessary for the reimagining of the political. I am arguing that, in debates such as this one, consensus is not possible because of the antagonism that is directly attributable to the fact that the social cannot be fixed, and, because such disputes always entail identities, they are ultimately personal to participants. In Mouffe’s (1993) reading, identities are an effect of politics—they are relationally constructed through processes that are themselves political. Further, space plays a crucial role in the interrelations between subjects and objects.

For there to be interrelations (so that political subjects, for instance, can be constructed) there must be multiplicities (a multiplicity of potential subjects) and for there to be a multiplicity there must be space. Objects (with their internal space-times), relations and space, then, are co-constitutive. Non-essentialist identities require spatiality (Massey 1999: 288).

Because spatiality is crucial to the creation of subjectivities, I argue that social constructionist and Marxist analyses of risk disputes are also flawed by their failures to attend the imaginative geographies of participants in disputes. These geographies, combined with identification of the networks participants in such debates can mobilize, affords a more nuanced interrogation of “the ways in which space affects the operation and realization of power” (Pryke 1999: 171) than do current methodologies.

Equally troublesome is the failure of much geographical risk and hazards literature to adequately interrogate the role of gender in these debates. Although some sociological literature on risk pays closer attention to gender (e.g., Brown and Ferguson 1998), too often, when gender is considered at all, it is approached as a variable, which has the effect of asserting a male-female binary. Beyond the problematic maintenance of an untenable binary, this method fails to account for the fact that gender is only one of multiplicity of subject positions created within other domains, such as class, ethnicity, religion, age, and sexuality, which often operate to oppress. As important, the lack of gender analysis results in a failure to theorize the ways in which gender and sexuality are used as strategies to maintain hegemonic relations.

Both social constructionist and political economy analyses of risk share other significant omissions. First, both implicitly assume that the ‘environment’/’nature’ can be known, that there can be a correspondence between knowledges produced and the physical world. In this way, both overlook the production of the environment/nature for distinct ends. This omission is important for a number of reasons. First, it precludes interrogation of the role of an inert and commodified environment/nature in the constitution of the essentialized (male) modern liberal political subject. Second, it results in the reinscription of the feminized environment/nature and animals as a resource for human activities. Third, it maintains a troublesome divide between physical and human geography. Finally, by failing to interrogate the conflicts between state agencies involved in developing environmental regulation, it implicitly and erroneously asserts a unitary state, which has the effect of supporting an impoverished top-down notion of power that accedes too much authority to the state and erases the power-knowledge negotiations between state agencies and participants.

Related to the role of the environment/nature in the constitution of the modern liberal political subject, social constructionist and political economy analytic methods fail to interrogate
the binary formulations that underlie the modern constitution that both separates and valorizes the ‘human’ over the ‘non-human’. This omission continues a modernist epistemology that has greatly contributed to development of technocratic rationality as a means of control of both the physical/social world and its occupants. Equally importantly, it also precludes recognition of the hybrids that challenge the human-nonhuman binary of Latour’s modern constitution which Latour maintains is essential in order to effect social change. Whatmore (1999: 31) makes a similar argument when she writes: “Re-cognizing nature not as ‘a physical place to which one can go’ . . . but as an active, changeable presence that is always already in our midst challenges spatial, as well as, social (pre) dispositions.” The erasure of hybrids also masks actual and possible transgressions (of both ‘human’ and ‘non-human’ agents) of the socio-spatial order. It has also erased the possibility of chaos, the unpredictability and contingency of ‘natural’ systems and animals, including ‘humans’. This is crucial politically because contingency, rather than a universalized rationality, is necessary for the operation of democratic politics (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, Massey 1999). Chaos is also an important component of the spatiality that Massey (1996) argues is essential to multiplicity and democracy. It is the chaos that results from “happenstance juxtapositions, those accidental separations, the often paradoxical character of geographical configurations,” that produces the “inherently disrupted” quality of space (Massey 1999: 284).

Additionally, the social constructionist and political economy analyses of risk disputes theorizes the role of desire as either an attempt to avoid risk or to accrue profits. This impoverished notion of desire results is due in part to an implicit acceptance of a unitary subject and to the geography of the modernist constitution which locates desire “in there,” inside the unitary subject where desire is produced autonomously by the subject or, in a more Marxist account, has been produced by marketing moguls. Since Marx recognized that desire for commodities could be produced, the economic domain has been valorized by Marxist accounts with analyses that rely upon the notion of ‘false consciousness’ that Deleuze and Guattari (1983) dispute through their discussion of desire.

Finally, both the social constructionist or political economy accounts of risk assume transparency—of the subject, of the environment, of risks and other social relations. They operate as exorcisms. Yet, the ghosts that I have written of here deny the possibility of such transparencies.

The addition of Foucault’s theories of power-knowledge and governmentality, actor network and feminist theories and Deleuze and Guattari’s work on desire produce a more complex and nuanced understanding of the debate than do social constructionist and political economy analyses. My analysis indicates that, although the politics of KFTC and CFA hold more promise for democratic politics than do those of KFB and the Cabinet, at this writing and from the genres analyzed, neither group has challenged the modern constitution. Although both groups have analyzed power relations and oppressions across a number of sites and mounted a campaign that incorporates a Foucauldian power-knowledge critique, neither has come to grips with the importance of hybridity, gendering and sexualizing in the debate. I argue that these are important for two reasons: 1) recognition could enable the development of new tactics; and 2) such recognition of the organizing principles of modernity is necessary to change the conditions of modernity.

My research indicates a need for further investigation into the deployment of scientific discourses in risk disputes. Although, as Buckingham-Hatfield (2000), Haraway (1978), Harding (1991 1993), Hartsock (1987), Rose (1993) and others have indicated, the practice of ‘modern’
Western science is gendered masculine, ‘science’ consists of numerous sometimes competing disciplines, as indicated by the conflict over the types of ‘science’ that would be admitted into the regulatory debate. Additionally, ‘science’ and related practices within any given scientific discipline is contested terrain as evidenced by the debate about what types of geologic and hydrogeologic data to include in the design of the regulations. I suggest that it may be useful to investigate such disputes to identify the types of science that are deployed to maintain hegemonic relations and those that are excluded to determine if there are indeed forms of science amenable to challenge existing power imbalances.

Another important caveat. My account of the debate, ghosts and all, is partial and situated. Until this project, I had never visited a farm. Nor had I given much thought to hogs or, beyond my own garden, to food production. Although I understood the importance of gender when I undertook this research project, I had no notion of the importance of sexualization and desire in the debate. I had not begun to think about the relevance of Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of desire and flows, nor had I connected their discussion to KFB’s and the Cabinet’s strategies of gendering and sexualization in the debate. I cannot identify a point in my thinking where I suddenly ‘saw the light’, although increasingly I found myself thinking about Theweleit’s analysis of the Freikorps. After rereading the two volumes, the shape of my analysis took form.

I have struggled with the telling of this story. Still, I feel constrained by the need to produce a coherent account that, too often, feels linear. I am perplexed by my need for words such as ‘before’ and ‘after’, by the need to create chapters that create artificial boundaries in my narrative. My interpolations, which I first thought of as a solution to my human-centered account, now also feel forced and arbitrary. This seems to me, to be a struggle to write spatiality within a disciplinary form that privileges time in the requirements for coherency.

Quite simply, my subject position as author wants to resist the governmentality of academic writing conventions while my subject position as student advises conformity to academic authority. I am uncomfortable with this dissonance of desire. Yet, at the same time, I berate myself for my discomfort, which is after all decidedly modernist in its attempts to banish dissonance in favor of comfortable subject positions that can at least present themselves as somewhat coherent. I wonder what literary devices would produce a form of narrative that could capture adequately the complexities and contingencies in this debate. How would James Joyce tell this story? What would Cixous do with it? How do we, as Doel (1999) advises, find, and write, within the fold? How can we evoke ghosts in ordinary language?

I understood the politics of my research going into this project. It was clear from the beginning that my affinity for KFTC and CFA would place me at loggerheads with the majority of faculty members in the university’s College of Agriculture. I also understand that my project will likely preclude USDA grants and, very likely, employment at land grant institutions. Given what I see as the need for this type of research and the fact that I would not be comfortable in environments that were opposed to my research, this is not unduly problematic. I had not, however, understood that this three-year association with hogs might affect my eating habits. It has—I rarely desire meat.

810 Like Cixous (1981), I think of Joyce as a model for the type of writing that unleashes the feminine.
Future research

It is possible that some participants in the debate recognize the existence of hybrids and the importance of gendering and sexualizing in this debate but have not expressed these thoughts. The parameters established by the Cabinet (and attempted by KFB) have imposed limits on the sayable. Additionally, because such thinking flies in the face of ‘common sense’ notions, people might not express them even outside of the context of hearings. More ethnographic research offers a way to fill in the gaps in this research project. In-depth interviews with participants could excavate these thoughts (if they are present). Interviews could also provide important information about diversity within the groups and subjectivities of members, as well as information about their families. Also, it would be helpful to compare the debate in Kentucky to similar debates in other locales. I am especially interested in whether the techniques of gendering and sexualizing exercised by KFB and the Cabinet occur in other cultural contexts.
AFTERWORD: SUBSEQUENT HEARINGS

Since the Cadiz hearing, which was the last hearing discussed here, the Cabinet altered the regulations so that they apply also to chicken CAFOs and cattle feedlots. The addition of chicken CAFOs is important because Kentucky is now the 13th largest broiler producer in the US, producing over 200,000,000 birds in 2000. Again, as indicated by the map of CAFOs in Kentucky, most chicken CAFOs are also located in the western portion of the state.

In the regulatory analysis for these altered regulations (401 KAR 5: 074), the Cabinet estimated that Kentucky hosts six beef cattle operations with more than 1000 animal units (two of which have more than 1500 animal units), four dairy operations with more than 1000 animal units (one with more than 1500 animal units, 176 poultry operations with more than 1000 animal units (54 with more than 1500 animal units), and 250 hog operations (98 which have more than 1500 animal units). The total of operations that fall under the regulations is 250, of which 98 have more than 1500 animal units. As a result of expanding the number of operations regulated, the Cabinet estimated it would need to hire an additional three persons at a cost of $253,364 annually.

Three hundred and sixty-six people submitted comments on the revised regulations at the three hearings that the Cabinet held. Of those who submitted comments, 245 were men, 112 women and I could not determine the gender of nine participants from their names. Comments made at the additional hearings that the Cabinet held about these changes to the regulations were similar to those made at the hearings I have reported on, with the exception that more comments addressed the poultry industry specifically. Also, more representatives from the poultry, dairy and beef and livestock industries attended these hearings. In addition to groups that attended the five hearings I have written about, the later hearings were attended by members of the McClean County Citizens Against Factory Farms, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Kentucky Milk Producers, Kentucky Poultry Federation, Ohio County Property Valuation, and the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet.

Again, members of KFB, Kentucky Pork Producers, and a USDA employee argued there is no emergency to justify regulation. Representatives from the state Department of Agriculture, Kentucky Milk Producers’ Association and attorneys for Tyson Foods insisted that Kentucky should not take action until 2002 when the EPA is expected to finalize its proposed regulatory regime. Members of activist groups argued again for the necessity of strengthening the regulations, citing the same concerns recounted earlier. Again, the Cabinet did not significantly alter the proposed regulations as a result of these three hearings.

The Cabinet-stipulated setbacks for the swine, beef and dairy setbacks are the same. Setbacks for chicken CAFOs are less stringent than for other CAFOs. The Cabinet requirements are less for land application of chicken manure.

The EPA’s proposed regulations do not include setback requirements, however, states may develop their own regulatory requirements which can be more, but not less, stringent than
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federal regulations. The EPA is considering tiering the regulations, establishing different provisions for operations by size, and the agency has included a joint liability provision.

Despite complaints that the Cabinet should delay establishment of a regulatory regime until legal issues have been resolved and/or the EPA acts, the Cabinet is currently issuing permits and KFB, KFTC, and CFA have not discussed CAFO regulation as a 2002 legislative issue in their publications or on their websites.
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APPENDIX 1. CODES

SEX: 1=F, 2=M

POSITION ON REGULATIONS: 1=pro-regs; 2=weaken regs; 3=strengthen regs; 4=anti-regs

TESTIMONY: 1=written; 2=written and oral; 3=oral

AFFILIATION:
1=CFA
2=KFTC
3=DRC
4=CRAPP
5=Sierra Club
6=agribusiness
7=county official
8=state official
9=swine expert
10=UK and other state schools
11=swine and UK
12=Coalition for Family Farms
13=KFTC and Coalition for Family Farms
14=KIPDA
15=Kentucky Pork Producers
16=Corn Growers and Farm Bureau
17=Kentucky Hog Marketing Association
18=Kentucky Resources Council
19=Kentucky Cattlemen’s Association
20=United We Stand
21=Kentucky New Era
23=environmental firm
25=KFTC, CFA, and FFA
26=Kentucky Waterways Alliance
27=KFTC and CFA
28=Kentucky Pork Producers and F-A
29=Science in the Public Interest
30=federal official
31=insurance business
32=Coalition for Health Concern
33=out of state agricultural economist
34=banker
35=Free the Planet
36=Kentucky Corn Growers’ Association
37=CRAPP and county official
38=Kentucky Soybean Association
AG AGRICULTURE
AG1 Treatment of animals
AG2 Time, linear thought
AG3 Consumer disassociation from agricultural processes
AG4 Industrialization
AG5 Globalization
AG6 Agribusiness
AG7 Environmental impact of agriculture
AG8 Employment
AG9 Agriculture as discursive practice
AG10 Structure
AG11 Gendering of
AG12 Commodity prices
AG14 Values
AG15 Agricultural policy
AG16 Family farming
AG17 Hog farming
AG18 Sustainability
AG19 It is an agricultural, not an environmental, issue
AG20 Regulations will put hog producers out of business
AG21 Contradictory agency definitions and practices
AG22 Regulations constrain innovation
AG23 Regulations will eliminate corporate farms in Kentucky
AG24 Regulations will constrain expansion
AG25 Compliance time is too short
AG26 Regulations have negative effect on family ownership
AG27 Regulations impede contractual relationships and cooperation between farmers
AG28 State freedom to farm laws passed to pave way for megahog farms to move to Kentucky
AG29 Industrial hog farms are not agriculture; are industry and should be regulated as such
AG30 Permit, engineering and noncompliance fees will cause bankruptcies
AG31 Farmers are conservationists
AG32 Fees constrain interstate competition
AG33 Regulations are an unfair economic surcharge
AG34 Regulations stifle growth
AG35 Regulations are technological fixes
AG36 Compliance should be voluntary
AG37 Agriculture must be profitable to be environmentally responsible

BIN BINARIES DEPLOYED
BIN1 Nature/culture
BIN2 Subject/object
BIN3 Male/Female
BIN4 Order/disorder
BIN5 Positivism/relativism
BIN6 Certainty/ambiguity
BIN7 Verbal/nonverbal
BIN8 Humans/animals
BIN9 Public/private
BIN10 Sustainability/unsustainability
BIN11 Urban/rural
BIN12 Rational/irrational
BIN13 Expert/lay
BN14 Mind/body
BIN15 Subjectivity/objectivity
BIN16 Episteme/techne
BIN17 Productive/unproductive
BIN18 Active/passive

BOUND BOUNDARIES
BOUND1 The body
BOUND2 Categorical
BOUND3 Postivist/relativist
BOUND4 Geographical
BOUND5 Property lines

CAT CATEGORIES
CAT1 Pollution as that which cannot be contained within categorical boundaries
CAT2 Categorization as power

COM COMMODIFICATION
COM1 of nature
COM2 of women

CONF CONFLICT
CONF1 Grassroots opposition
CONF2 Environmental holism (systems)/technocratic control

CON CONSUMPTION
CON1 Consumer demand
CON1.1 Consumer demand for pork

DEM DEMOCRATIC PROCESS
DEM1.1 More public participation is needed
DEM1.2 Less public participation is needed

DEV DEVELOPMENT
DEV1 Development theory
DEV2 Development and environment
DEV3 Development and gender
DEV4 Development and locality
DEV5 Impact of CAFOs on tourism
DEV6 Need for alternative crops
DEV7 CAFOs reduce possibilities of other development forms
DEV8 Regulations have negative effect on development

DIS DISCOURSE
DIS1.1 Economic discourse
DIS1.2 Critique of economic discourse
DIS2 Agriculture/environment
  DIS2.1 Farmers are environmental stewards
  DIS2.2 Agriculture needs to be more sustainable
DIS3.1 Scientific discourse
DIS3.2 Critique of scientific discourse
DIS4.1 Patriarchal religious discourse
DIS4.2 Liberation theology discourse

EC ECONOMICS
EC1.1 Economic rationality, anti-regulation
EC1.2 Economic rationality, pro-regulation
EC2 Economies of scale
EC3 Global economy
EC4 Agricultural economics
EC5 Environmental economics
EC6 Negative effect of regulations on property
EC7.1 Need for fees in regulations
EC7.2 Fees are excessive
EC8 Economic and environmental goals are incommensurable
EC9 Tax structure favors large operations
EC10 Economy as agent, reified market
EC11 Privileging of competition

ENV ENVIRONMENT
ENV1 Impacts of industrial hog farming
  ENV1.1 Manure spills
  ENV1.2 Surface water degradation
  ENV1.3 Groundwater contamination
  ENV1.4 Air pollution
  ENV1.5 Problems with lagoons
  ENV1.6 Nutrient overloading
ENV1.7 Fly and vector populations
ENV1.8 Soil contamination
ENV1.9 Insoluble problems
ENV1.10 Wildlife concerns
ENV1.11 Volatization of gases
ENV1.12 Heavy water use of CAFOs
ENV1.13 Impact of traffic increase on local roads
ENV1.14 Water’s already contaminated
ENV1.15 Fish kills
ENV1.16 Impact on native plants
ENV1.17 Runoff
ENV1.18 Metals buildup from feed passed in manure
ENV2 Lack of data
ENV3 Complexity of natural systems
ENV4 American environmental thought
ENV5 General degradation
ENV7 Environmental justice
ENV8 Environment and globalization
ENV9 Scale
ENV10 Rainfall and floods
ENV11 Monitoring is insufficient
ENV12 Regulations are an overreaction
ENV13 State has not complied with federal environmental regulations
ENV14 Lack of scientific data
ENV15 Mining has changed some bedrock foundations
ENV16 Regulations will impede organic food production because organic farmers use natural fertilizers

GEN GENDER
GEN1 Gender differences
GEN1.1 Women
   GEN1.1.1 Women opposed to regulations
   GEN1.1.2 Women for regulations
GEN1.2 Men
   GEN1.2.1 Men opposed to regulations
   GEN1.2.2 Men for regulations
GEN2 Gender and environment, feminizing of environment
GEN3 Gender and space, closely related to public/private boundaries
GEN4 Gender and rurality

LAB LABOR
LAB1 Migrant workers
LAB2 Occupational safety

POW POWER
POW1 Concentration in production and distribution of hogs and pork
POW2 Corporate control of technical data
POW3 Corporate influence over Cabinet
POW4 Networks of power
POW5 Role of agricultural experts
  POW5.1 Use land grant and ag agency information only
  POW5.2 Critique of information produced by agricultural ‘experts’
POW6 Power of the state
POW7 Power of scientists
POW8 Farm Bureau has too much influence on the Division of Water

PROC PROCEDURE
  PROC1 Who and what did the Cabinet use for information in designing regulations
  PROC2 Cabinet’s underestimated risks from CAFOs
  PROC3 Governmental agencies don’t do their jobs properly

PH PUBLIC HEALTH
  PH1 Gastrointestinal illnesses
  PH2 Antibiotic resistance
  PH3 Odors and moods
  PH4 Immune system
  PH5 Hepatitis
  PH6 Pesticides
  PH7 Cancers
  PH8 Blue baby syndrome
  PH9 Spontaneous abortions
  PH10 Respiratory illnesses
  PH11 Headaches, dizziness, nausea, vomiting
  PH12 Non-Hodgkins lymphoma
  PH13 Occupational hazards
  PH14 Eye, nose, throat irritation
  PH15 Pfiesteria

RECOMMENDATIONS
  REC1 Financial stability
  REC2 Owner/operator certification
  REC3 Bonds for closure
  REC4 Bonds for spills
  REC5 Liability insurance
  REC6 Past performance review
  REC7 County tax for remediation and prevention
  REC8 Establish odor standard
  REC9 Best Management Practices for odors
  REC10 Odor control plans
  REC11 Require vector abatement plan
  REC12 Require unannounced inspections
  REC13 Give citizens access to CAFOs
REC14 Let local governments set their own regulations
REC15 Form public task force to ensure compliance
REC16 Work with agricultural organizations to develop regulations
REC17 Establish nutrient standard
REC18 Require water analysis
REC19 Joint liability
  REC19.1 For joint liability
  REC19.2 Opposed to joint liability
REC20 Put burden on integrators
REC21 Develop strong siting and setback requirements
REC22 Construction and design requirements
REC23 Review site-specific geology
REC24 Consider long-term impacts
REC25 Consider feasibility of alternative waste systems
REC26 Develop lagoon design standards
REC27 Require waste management plans
REC28 Lagoon monitoring is insufficient
REC29 Map groundwater
REC30 Do periodic soil tests
REC31 Evaluate nutrient partitioning
REC32 Require separate management of liquids and solids
REC33 Require covers on manure storage lagoons
REC34 Require berms around fields accepting wastes
REC35 Don’t allow land application to frozen soil
REC36 Prohibit aerial spraying
REC37 Existing water quality regulations are sufficient
REC38 Uphold right-to-farm laws
REC39 Define terms in regulations
REC40 Questioning accuracy of definition
REC41 Create threshold levels
REC42 Raise numbers of swine at which regulations set in
REC43 Decrease numbers of swine at which regulations set in
REC44 Put CAFOs in an industrial park
REC45 Establish joint permitting to prevent transmedia pollution
REC46 Use watershed approach for siting
REC47 Assess cumulative effects of several CAFOs in an area
REC48 Stage permits – site selection, construction, operation
REC49 Don’t issue permit to company with outstanding violation
REC50 Require baseline water quality analysis
REC51 Require geological borings
REC52 Renew permits every two years and require full sampling data, etc.
REC53 Reduce permit processing fees
REC54 Insufficient technical assistance
REC55 Permit process too open-ended
REC56 Delete public notification on changing land application areas
REC57 Delete public notification for permit renewals
REC58 Grandfather existing livestock producers unless operation sold to non-family member
REC59 Address siting density of related facilities
REC60 Don’t allow public to be involved in siting
REC61 Only notify abutters of siting, no public notification
REC62 Public must be given opportunity to comment on permits and draft permits
REC64 Give the public the right to request hearings on permits
REC65 Improve public notification requirements
REC66 Develop county libraries with copies of laws, permit applications, waste management plans
REC67 No swine operations over 1000 in earthquake hazard areas of VII or greater
REC68 Insufficient attention to karst features
REC69 Exclude 1000 or more swine operations from areas where underground aquifer’s 150 feet from surface
REC70 Insufficient attention to earthquake zones
REC71 Increase setbacks
REC72 Increase setbacks as numbers of hogs increase
REC73 Require aerobic treatment
REC74 Increase setbacks from state and national parks, wildlife management & other sensitive areas
REC75 Increase setbacks for private drinking water wells
REC76 Reduce setbacks
REC77 Require holding tank liners
REC78 Require more sophisticated wastewater treatment
REC79 Require state-of-the-art treatment for animal waste
REC80 Develop construction and maintenance standards to avoid individual monitoring, anti-reg
REC81 Require more stringent groundwater monitoring systems
REC82 Require baseline groundwater sampling
REC83 Faster response time to correct problems is needed
REC84 Set more protective standards
REC85 More frequent sampling is needed
REC86 More stringent waste analysis is needed
REC87 Farmers shouldn’t have to keep records for waste spreading
REC88 Monitoring requirements are too stringent
REC89 Waste application record requirements are too stringent
REC90 Require baseline soil sampling
REC91 Require surface water baseline tests
REC92 Require in-stream monitoring
REC93 Develop civil and criminal penalties
REC94 Institute a three strikes and you’re out policy
REC95 Mandate immediate reporting of releases and lakes or groundwater contamination
REC96 Fines should be determined per head
REC97 Shorter permit timeframe for review
REC98 Longer permit timeframe for review
REC99 Hold public hearing on permit issuance
REC100 Pay for regulations through taxes
REC101 Put costs onto livestock producers
REC102 Appoint panel to study all environmental and economic factors of swine industry
REC103 Include poultry CAFOs in regulations
REC104 Work with environmental groups to develop the regulations
REC105 Tier the regulations
REC106 Require bonds for cleanup
REC107 Reinstate filing fees and 180-day permitting process
REC108 Tier permit costs
REC109 Build in reevaluation of regulations to incorporate proven evidence and latest technology
REC110 Prohibit nuisance odors
REC111 Consider cumulative loading on streams within watersheds
REC112 Establish a Family Farm Commission to help family farmers stay in business
REC113 Give small firms and farms the same grants and loans given to large corporations
REC114 Don’t develop regulations more stringent than those planned by the EPA
REC115 Limit the number of animals allowed on the basis of county water supply
REC116 Limit the number of hogs allowed
REC117 Require waste treatment
REC118 Consider each site on its own merit
REC119 State should give financial help for compliance to medium-sized farms
REC120 Monitor chemicals used in lagoons
REC121 Add specified sensitive areas to permitting process
REC122 Decrease the scale of permit maps
REC123 Require geotechnical investigations
REC124 Eliminate requirement for reapplication when permits expire
REC125 Aggregate all corporations contracting with one corporation for review and liability
REC126 Require notification of abuttors and media of spills
REC127 Require aerobic lagoons
REC128 Retain monitoring wells
REC129 Require hydrogeologic studies
REC130 Change groundwater contamination boundary to lagoon rather than property line
REC131 Prohibit lagoons in subsidence areas
REC132 Require site-specific plans
REC133 Land application restrictions are excessive
REC134 Require reporting of disease outbreaks
REC135 Eliminate written reports
REC136 Remove agricultural exemptions from industrial-scale operations to require more comprehensive waste disposal plan for spreading of wastes and wastewaters
REC137 Require emissions permits
REC138 Require ground injection systems for liquid wastes
REC139 Develop closure standards
REC140 Establish permit application fees
REC141 Require KPDES permit
REC142 Monitor for odors
REC143 Assess operations for deterioration of roads from heavy truck traffic
REC144 Study other states’ regulations
REC145 Appropriate more money for people to implement water conservation on farms
REC146 Reverse setbacks so they apply to people who move next to farms
REC147 Regulations must be more flexible, especially regarding numbers of animals
REC148 Increase public comment period
REC149 Decrease public comment period
REC150 Notify public of permit renewals
REC151 Corps of Engineers or US Fish and Wildlife Dept., rather than National Resource Conservation Service, should determine wetlands
REC152 Require covers on lagoons
REC153 Require berms around lagoons
REC154 Require a secondary containment structure that holds as much as the lagoon
REC155 Require lagoon liners
REC156 Strengthen closure standards
REC157 Groundwater monitoring is inadequate
REC158 All water quality data should be sent to the state more often
REC159 All water quality data should be available to the public
REC160 Notify public immediately of groundwater contamination
REC161 Groundwater monitoring should be done by someone other than owner or employee
REC162 Eliminate testing for chlorides in groundwater
REC163 Require less frequent groundwater testing
REC164 Point of compliance should be facility boundary rather than property line
REC165 Land application regulations should be more stringent
REC166 Don’t allow land application of waste in floodplains
REC167 Land application of waste must not exceed soil infiltration rate
REC168 Return lease application requirement to ten, rather than five, years
REC169 Unnecessary to require permit modification when new land application area’s added
REC170 More soil testing is needed
REC171 Records for land application should be submitted quarterly and public should have access to them
REC172 Nutrient management plan should be updated regularly
REC173 Baseline air testing is needed
REC174 Prohibit application of animal waste on crops grown for human consumption
REC175 Require filter strips to protect streams
REC176 Require chemical analysis of manure before application
REC177 Require report of disease outbreak, monitor waste for pathogens, develop plan to destroy pathogens prior to land application
REC178 Require disclosure of past compliance history of all owners and controllers, including out-of-state violations
REC179 Require advance notice, public comment, and compliance review if facility proposes to change ownership or control
REC180 Change number of days an animal can be confined from 45 to 20
REC181 Limit the number of livestock raised in an area or the number that can tap into one water supply area
REC182 Analyze all water classifications and existing uses of water to determine watershed’s ability to handle agricultural nutrient runoff
REC183 Regulations should kick in at less than 1000 swine units
REC184 Allowable expansion for operators without violations should be 500 rather than 250 swine units
REC185 Add tiered approach for animal mortalities
REC186 Allow public comment period and hearing after decisions
REC187 Strengthen lagoon design and liner standards
REC188 Less stringent lagoon criteria
REC189 Groundwater standards are inadequate
REC190 Groundwater should be sampled quarterly
REC191 Monitoring wells are too expensive
REC192 Prohibit aerial spraying of waste
REC193 Require maintenance of proper pH
REC194 Nutrient management plan should include phosphorous, potassium and other metals
REC195 Leases must include right to re-entry to perform corrective action
REC196 Persons with EPA violations should be ordered to cease operating within 10 days of violations

RISK
   RISK1 Social construction
   RISK2 Economic
   RISK3 Health
   RISK4 Rationality arguments
   RISK5 Media constructions
   RISK6 Specific to industrial hog farms

RURAL RURALITY
   RURAL1 Protect rural quality of life
   RURAL2 Regulations discriminate against rural residents

SOCIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS
   SOCIAL1 Discounting of individual and human values
   SOCIAL2 Reductions in local spending
   SOCIAL3 Outmigration
   SOCIAL4 Decreased property values
   SOCIAL5 Church and school consolidation
   SOCIAL6 Health
   SOCIAL7 Crime
   SOCIAL8 Company towns
   SOCIAL9 Protect children
   SOCIAL10 Protect family farm, pro-reg
SOCIAL11 Protect family farm, anti-reg
SOCIAL12 Local job loss
SOCIAL13 Protect independent and small farmers, pro-reg
SOCIAL13.1 Protect independent and small farmers, anti-reg
SOCIAL14 CAFO water use
SOCIAL15 Need for constant road repairs

SPAC SPACE
  SPAC1 Discursive space
  SPAC2 Production of space
  SPAC3 Space as protection from contaminants
  SPAC4 Participatory space
  SPAC5 Gendered space
  SPAC6 Local space
  SPAC7 Global/local nexus
  SPAC8 Geography of hogs

STAT STATE
  STAT1 Kentucky regulations
  STAT2 State as part of infrastructure
  STAT3 Policies that facilitate industrial farming
  STAT4 Protector of public health and environment
  STAT5 Burden of proof
  STAT6 Evidentiary requirements not fulfilled for regs
  STAT7 Standards of proof
  STAT8 Recreancy
  STAT9 Land grants
  STAT10 Boosterism

TECH TECHNOLOGY
  TECH1 Conflict between ecological holism and technocratic rationality
  TECH2 Technology as solution to sustainability
  TECH3 Limitations of technology
  TECH4 Biotechnology
  TECH5 Technocratic control
APPENDIX 2. DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO SETTLEMENT FUNDS

Table A2.1. Funds to be allocated to the top 20 tobacco-dependent counties (*CFA News*, May 2000, p.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Barren</td>
<td>$1,112,750</td>
<td>2. Bourbon</td>
<td>$992,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shelby</td>
<td>$990,301</td>
<td>4. Owen</td>
<td>$987,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Scott</td>
<td>$876,149</td>
<td>12. Breckinridge</td>
<td>$837,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Green</td>
<td>$798,488</td>
<td>18. Fayette</td>
<td>$798,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Pulaski</td>
<td>$772,053</td>
<td>22. Metcalfe</td>
<td>$760,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lincoln</td>
<td>$748,719</td>
<td>24. Nicholas</td>
<td>$745,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Jessamine</td>
<td>$633,522</td>
<td>30. Grant</td>
<td>$629,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Adair</td>
<td>$626,090</td>
<td>32. Warren</td>
<td>$620,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Lewis</td>
<td>$625,757</td>
<td>34. Montgomery</td>
<td>$614,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Christian</td>
<td>$612,948</td>
<td>36. Pendleton</td>
<td>$605,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Marion</td>
<td>$599,778</td>
<td>38. Morgan</td>
<td>$570,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Trimble</td>
<td>$557,134</td>
<td>40. Taylor</td>
<td>$534,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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