

Cultural Modeling in Two Eras of U.S. Food Protest: Grahamites (1830s) and Organic Advocates (1960s–70s)

Jeffrey Haydu, *University of California, San Diego*

This article extends theories of social movement diffusion to encompass other kinds of cultural modeling. Using a comparison of two cases of food protest in the United States—the health food movement of William Sylvester Graham (1830s) and the early organic movement (1960s–1970s)—I emphasize similarities in underlying grievances and in the general advocacy of natural food alternatives. The two movements differed dramatically, however, in framing and tactics. I focus on contrasts in the religious significance they assigned to diet, in their democratic commitments, in the relationship they constructed between personal transformation and social change, and in their use of state-centered strategies. These frames and tactics transposed to food reform more general scripts associated with cultural institutions and movements of the time, particularly evangelical churches and temperance (Grahamites), and environmentalism, the New Left, and the wider counterculture (organic advocates). Keywords: social movements; framing; culture; food; comparative historical sociology.

Social movement scholars have long been aware of the influence that movements have on one another. Many have added that diffusion from one movement to another is particularly common during upswings in cycles of protest (McAdam 1995; Minkoff 1997; Soule 2004; Strang and Soule 1998; Whittier 2004). These scholars have identified various processes of diffusion, and the shared aim of their studies is to explain similarities across movements. This article extends accounts of social movement diffusion and puts those accounts to a different purpose. The extension comes from borrowing ideas about cultural modeling from institutionalists. Doing so expands our checklist for assessing how—from what sources, through what mechanisms, and under what conditions—other institutions and movements shape collective identities, goals, and repertoires of action. This expanded treatment of diffusion may also be put to a different purpose. Rather than explaining the spread of or commonalities among movements, we may use the tools of diffusion research to understand contrasts between otherwise similar movements in different times and places. Expanding the scope and use of diffusion in these ways can be seen as a call to pay more attention to the historical context of social movements—a call that contrasts with the strategy of disaggregating cases into mechanisms of contentious politics (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001). The latter perspective allows for history by showing how generalizable mechanisms get combined in different configurations to produce distinct cases. The approach taken here depicts wide-ranging cultural modeling as channeling protest in historically specific directions, highlighting a different dynamic of contention.

I will develop these arguments through a comparison of two U.S. movements for natural food, the Grahamites of the 1830s and the champions of organic food in the 1960s and 1970s. Followers of William Sylvester Graham subscribed to a simple diet of minimally processed

The author thanks Kathy Mooney, Amy Binder, Mary Blair-Loy, John Evans, April Linton, Isaac Martin, Tad Skotnicki, and this journal's reviewers for their comments and suggestions. Direct correspondence to: Jeffrey Haydu, University of California, San Diego, Department of Sociology, 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093-0533. E-mail: jhaydu@ucsd.edu.

Social Problems, Vol. 58, Issue 3, pp. 461–487, ISSN 0037-7791, electronic ISSN 1533-8533. © 2011 by Society for the Study of Social Problems, Inc. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website at www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo/asp. DOI: 10.1525/sp.2011.58.3.461.

foods as an antidote to social, spiritual, and physical corruption. Their counterparts 130 years later emphasized the advantages of natural foods over artificial ones, and for them too, changing the way we produce and consume food was part of a larger project of social reform. Each of the two cases is of interest in its own right. The early organic movement is a direct predecessor of today's activism around alternative and sustainable agriculture, as well as a cautionary tale about how such activism can be blunted by government regulation and co-opted by corporate interests. The movement's consumer wing (as distinct from the small producers and hobbyists who dominated the organic movement from the 1940s into the 1960s) is also a leading example of the political consumerism (i.e., a reliance on market choices to pursue social change goals) that has become a common form of contemporary protest (Micheletti 2003; Micheletti, Follesdal, and Stolle 2004). The Grahamites, for their part, are of interest both in the way they anticipated this contemporary style of protest and for their direct influence on later generations of food reformers. Together, the two cases also remind us that concerns over the safety and quality of food supplies, and popular mobilization to act on those concerns, are of very long standing.

For the main purposes of this article, these cases have two, more analytical, virtues. First, these are movements that developed in response to similar problems and had much in common in their general recommendations. But beneath these similarities are striking differences in the connections they made between food and other social problems, in the standards they used to evaluate dietary vice and virtue, in the ways they tied together personal transformation and social change, and in the tactics they used to advance their goals. These similarities and differences provide opportunities to see cultural modeling at work. It is one thing to show the biographical and organizational overlaps between evangelical churches and Grahamites or between the New Left and organic advocacy. Doing so makes it more plausible that similarities in framing reflect a common cultural script. To show that comparable movements in response to similar challenges also took contrasting cultural turns brings home the additional point that this sort of modeling has important consequences. A second virtue of the case selection is that for both movements, the most common form of participation was the individual and private consumption choice. With movements of this kind, the cultural modeling described here may be particularly important, providing shared meanings and common guidelines for action. The cases thus point to more generalizable organizing mechanisms in political consumerism.

The article has five main sections. The first section provides a fuller summary of the literature on social movement diffusion and spillover. It then imports institutionalist ideas about cultural transposition, showing how these ideas point to additional sources, mechanisms, and conditions of diffusion. The next two sections look more closely at similarities in the causes and general thrust of the two movements. My aim in these sections is to preempt the objection that the cases are too different to allow sufficient comparative leverage for assessing cultural modeling. The last two sections turn to these differences. The fourth examines the biographical careers, overlapping networks, and organizational bridges that tie Grahamites and organic activists to institutions and movements present in their respective historical periods. The fifth shows how cultural scripts characteristic of these institutions and movements appear in reformers' approach to food. I make no claim to cover *all* the differences between Grahamites and organic advocates or *all* the causes of those differences. My goals are more modest. I seek to demonstrate that amending our approach to diffusion can yield a more richly contextualized comparative account of social movements. Through that comparative account, I also make explicit a point suggested by students of alternative health movements and home schooling (Schneirov and Geczik 1996; Stevens 2001), namely that very different cultural infrastructures can support mobilization around like issues and send those movements down distinct ideological paths.

My primary sources for the ideological paths of the Grahamites and organic advocates are the main journals published by the movements' leaders. The *Graham Journal of Health and Longevity*, edited by Graham ally David Campbell, offers accounts of public speeches, responses

to critics, and letters from supporters. *Organic Gardening and Farming* was produced by the most important early U.S. champions of organic food (J. I. Rodale, his son Robert, and the Rodale Institute). It, too, includes letters from organic enthusiasts as well as news and views from the leadership. By the end of the 1960s, *Organic Gardening and Farming* had moved from catering to producers to also covering the consumer side of the movement. I supplement these primary sources with other writings by key figures in the movements, as well as with secondary treatments by historians.

Diffusion and Cultural Modeling

Among the many forces shaping social movements, one that has received relatively modest attention is diffusion and spillover from *other* movements. Most features of social movements studied by sociologists are subject to this influence. *Mobilization* itself may be inspired by protest events elsewhere. Doug McAdam and Dieter Rucht (1993) attribute the timing of student protest in Germany, in part, to the long reach of U.S. campus radicals, Kenneth Andrews and Michael Biggs (2006) show that the spread of lunch counter sit-ins in 1960 was strongly influenced by news coverage of prior sit-ins elsewhere. Scholars have also traced the diffusion of innovative *tactics* from one protest site or movement to another, as with the construction of shanties in the anti-apartheid movement (Soule 2004) or the spread of online petitions to new areas of contestation (Earl 2010). The participatory *organization* practiced by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the early civil rights movement was widely adopted by campus protesters and feminists later in the 1960s (Polletta 2002). Activists challenging social inequalities affecting Chicanos, women, white ethnics, and the disabled *framed* their struggles as a quest for “civil rights” (Skrentny 2006), while union leaders picked up the language of social justice from anti-globalization movements (della Porta and Tarrow 2005). Even *collective identities* can travel: David Meyer and Nancy Whittier (1994) document how feminist identities constructed in the women’s movement helped motivate and justify participation in the peace movement.

Through what mechanisms do these components of social movements travel? In some studies, the transmission belts lie largely outside the field of activism, as in Andrews and Biggs’s (2006) emphasis on the mass media and the spread of sit-ins. More often the focus is on relations among activists, whether direct or indirect. Individuals move from one movement to another. Many of the early sparkplugs in the student and women’s movements, for example, were civil rights veterans, carrying with them both lessons from that struggle and status from having participated in it (McAdam 1988). Even without such personal experience, organizers might be influenced by another movement through direct ties to fellow activists, forged through travel and correspondence, or they might be affected through the “nonrelational mechanisms” of defining themselves as occupying similar positions in their own social setting (McAdam and Rucht 1993). Organizational practices create additional channels for cross-movement influence. More or less ad hoc campaigns focused on pressing issues bring together activists with primary loyalties to different causes, as when representatives from environmental, consumer rights, and organic food movements work together to resist the introduction of genetically modified food (Reisner 2001). Those ties among participants in different causes, in turn, may be institutionalized by social movement organizations structured to serve as peak associations for *other* organizations as well as for individual members (della Porta and Mosca 2007). In such settings, activists can learn from their counterparts in other places and in other movements. The World Social Forums emphasize and encourage this mutual learning on a global scale (Smith 2008).

What conditions foster diffusion among social movements? Some favorable circumstances can be inferred from the mechanisms of diffusion just summarized. Where networks among activists are more dense (either by virtue of the multiple movement affiliations of individual

activists or the overlapping campaigns of organizations), cross-movement diffusion is more likely (della Porta and Mosca 2007; Meyer and Whittier 1994). Major upswings in cycles of protest also provide fruitful conditions for spillover. In part, this is because such concentrated bursts of social protest foster self-conscious communities of activists (della Porta and Rucht 1995) who move rapidly from one cause to another, trading lessons about successful and unsuccessful tactics. In part, it is because these upsurges in protest are associated with the development of “master frames” (Snow and Benford 1992; Tarrow 1998). Activists adopt from another movement a common language for diagnosing grievances and defining goals, and they come to see themselves as engaged in comparable struggles. The practices of other movements then may be embraced as suitable points of reference for their own cause. The prospects for one movement drawing and applying lessons from another one, finally, may turn on the creative skills of organizers. In Marshall Ganz’s (2000) account of farm worker organizing, for example, it was a matter of imaginative leadership for United Farmworkers’ officials to redefine a labor struggle as also “like” a civil rights struggle and to press into service framing devices, tactics, and allies from that field (see also Nepstad and Bob 2006; Swart 1995).

Both the features of social movements subject to diffusion and the vehicles that carry this influence appear in the case studies that follow. But it is useful to make some friendly amendments. To the mechanisms of diffusion one may add the transposition of schemas discussed by institutionalists and cultural sociologists. That amendment helps expand the treatment of diffusion in other ways. In addition to the usual contents of diffusion—tactics, frames, organizational practices—transposable schemas include standards of evaluation and forms of boundary work that are particularly important in movements that center on consumption choices. In addition to the usual sources of diffusion—other social movements—schemas may be transposed from other social institutions. And by treating the movement of schemas from one social field to another as problematic, studies of transposition remind us that there may be distinctive conditions under which diffusion occurs. I elaborate below on these friendly amendments to the mechanisms, content, sources, and conditions of diffusion.

Transposition across Social Fields

In explaining institutional change, scholars often invoke the concept of transposition—the application of cultural scripts across social settings. The scripts themselves are templates, often specific to particular institutions, which define legitimate practices, institutional identities, and standards for evaluating worth. For historical sociologist William Sewell (1992), these schemas combine with material resources to make up social structure. For institutionalists, who cut their teeth accounting for persistence when transformation might have been expected, the transposition of scripts from one setting to another reintroduces a source of change (Clemens and Cook 1999; Friedland and Alford 1991). The application of family schemas to work, for example, may bring with it new employment practices (Hochschild 1997); cultural norms defining the natural capacities and appropriate roles of women as mothers and wives may be used to justify political reforms like voting rights and protective legislation (Clemens 1997; Skocpol 1992).

Social movement scholars have made some use of the concept of transposition. Marc Schneiberg and Michael Lounsbury (2008) do so in cataloging how social movements may alter institutional logics or diffuse innovations more widely in society. Heather Haveman, Hayagreeva Rao, and Srikanth Paruchuri (2007) see transposition as one mechanism through which social movements affect other institutions. But the concept may be used in a different way: to show how institutional schemas shape social movements and (partly for that reason) how cultural logics may be reproduced in new social movement fields. Transposition thus expands the checklist of possible mechanisms of diffusion.

The concept also expands our sense of what might get diffused as schemas transpose. “Schemas” and “scripts” are capacious terms; they can easily encompass the characteristics

of social movements most commonly seen as traveling from one site to another. In Elisabeth Clemens's (1997) study of interest group politics, women's identities as wives and mothers, rooted in family life, were transposed to political reform efforts, along with distinctive ways of framing the issues: expanding city parks or improving sanitation became instances of "municipal housekeeping" (see also Szczygiel 2003). Theda Skocpol (1992) puts more emphasis on the spread of federal organization and lobbying tactics. For institutionalists, however, "schemas" usually have a normative component (DiMaggio 1997; Powell and DiMaggio 1991; Scott 2001). They dictate what are appropriate practices and orientations in a given institution,¹ such as exchanging money for services in the economy but not generally within the family, or running rival candidates for office in a democratic polity but not in the military. Cultural sociologists like Michèle Lamont (2009; Lamont and Molnár 2002; Lamont and Thévenot 2000) emphasize that schemas also include standards of evaluation. Members of particular communities (a social class, an academic discipline) often deploy shared metrics for making distinctions of worth and for drawing boundaries between the more and the less valued (types of people, competing grant proposals) (see also DiMaggio 1992). This evaluative dimension of schemas is not the focus of diffusion studies, but it may be particularly relevant for the case studies that follow. Both Grahamites and organic advocacy are examples of movements in which individuals participate by deliberately choosing some consumption items and shunning others. We know, as well, that consumption choices are shaped by cultural capital and involve displays of social status (Bourdieu 1984; Slater 1997). Where social movements take the form of political consumerism (Micheletti 2003; Shah et al. 2007), then, it is particularly important to see how underlying boundary work and standards of worth guide activism. This is perhaps all the more true for movements centered on food: a long line of scholars have shown how foodways reveal and act out social hierarchies and distinctions (Goody 1982; Johnston and Baumann 2010).

Adding transposition to our analysis of diffusion also calls attention to other sources of modeling. The titles of key articles on diffusion illustrate their tight focus on *other* movements: "Diffusion Processes Within and Across Movements" (Soule 2004); "The Consequences of Social Movements for Each Other" (Whittier 2004); "The Sequencing of Social Movements" (Minkoff 1997). But activists may apply institutional and organizational scripts from outside the field of social movements, thereby drawing from "co-optable institutions" (McAdam 1982) more than just resources and protection. Clemens (1997) highlights the maternalist framing that female reformers imported from family life; Francesca Polletta (2002) examines models of participatory organization that 1960s activists drew from religious fellowship and personal friendship; and Ann Mische (2008) tracks the movement of leadership styles from professional associations and church groups into Brazilian student protest. In each case, a script for "how we do things here"—in families, churches, professions—was transposed into the field of social movements. Institutionalists remind us, however, that diffusion of this kind may face high hurdles. More than is the case in movement-to-movement diffusion, cultural transposition across fields may violate "logics of appropriateness" (Clemens 1997; Friedland and Alford 1991) that normally segregate institutional scripts. Norms and standards generally accepted as appropriate for family life are usually not deemed applicable to commercial relations; the model of buying and selling commodities, in turn, should not govern relations between students and professors.² Most people honor and reinforce these separate spheres by learning to switch hats, taking on or setting aside different rules of the game as they move from one setting to another (Stryker, Owens, and White 2000). This insulation of scripts from one another may inhibit diffusion. It might seem natural for activists in one movement to look to their counterparts in other

1. "Appropriateness" may be less a matter of what norms dictate than what possibilities can be imagined.

2. As this last example illustrates, these logics of appropriateness are subject to change, for better or worse. For an excellent study of abrasion between separate cultural schemas—parents' relations with children and hospital staff members' relations with patients—see Heimer and Staffen (1998).

movements for useful models. Those same activists may be less likely to see the relevance of church rituals or family roles for organizing protest. And even among social movements, leaders in one field may not ordinarily see the applicability of tactics and framing used in another area. AFL-CIO officials trying to organize farm workers in the 1960s were adamant that this was *not* a civil rights struggle (Ganz 2000). These potential obstacles to transposition have implications for the conditions under which diffusion is likely to occur.

Many of the conditions that facilitate diffusion—the varied careers and multiple affiliations of individual activists, social networks among them, upswings in protest, the development of master frames—may play a role as well in transposition across fields. But given potential barriers of appropriateness, transposition is more likely when these predisposing conditions take particular forms. It is one thing for a student activist to have ties to other student activists, such that protest events and strategies diffuse from one campus to another. If that student activist has been involved in different *types* of movement, or belongs to organizations that bring her together with activists in other causes, logics of appropriateness distinguishing movements are more likely to be breached. If that same individual protests side by side with individuals who also belong to the same circle of friends, the same religious community, or the same professional association, they are more apt to use a common script than to switch hats, such as by “bearing witness” with fellow believers in a secular struggle. And if, for whatever reason, an individual’s institutional identity—as a person of faith or as an educator—comes to include a commitment to activism, that individual is a particularly good carrier of scripts across the two settings. To use an old-fashioned example, the ideal-typical class-conscious proletarian not only makes his role as a wage laborer the basis for activism; he also applies the same schema of class inequality and exploitation to interpret and contest inequalities in other arenas, from electoral politics and religious conventions to leisure activities. Students of diffusion sometime make the point that ideas are more likely to pass between actors in the same social category (Haveman et al. 2007; Strang and Meyer 1993). By contrast, transposition is more likely when actors or their networks cross social categories. Our research focus, accordingly, should not be just on transmission belts but also on bridging mechanisms.

Explaining Differences

Thus far I have borrowed from discussions of cultural transposition to expand how we approach the mechanisms, content, sources, and conditions of social movement diffusion. A final recommendation is that we use these concepts in a different comparative design, for a different explanatory purpose. With the exception of Whittier’s (2004) discussion of anti-spillover (in which activists define their identities in opposition to discredited predecessors), the literature uses the concept of diffusion to explain similarities rather than differences among movements. This is reasonable enough: that is usually what students of diffusion *want* to explain. Changing the comparative perspective highlights another possibility, however. By juxtaposing movements that have similar starting points but are shaped by different cultural templates, we can apply the tools of diffusion studies to explain why these movements developed along contrasting lines. Methodologically, this approach is not unfamiliar in social movement studies. A typical use of “political opportunities,” for example, is to explain why protest in response to similar grievances develops to different degrees or takes different forms (examples include Ferree et al. 2002; Kitschelt 1986; Slater 2009). But research designed to show how cultural models lead comparable social actors in different directions is more common in other sociological specialties. In order to demonstrate the existence and potency of schemas, cultural sociologists have compared divergent interpretations of the same objects—novels (Griswold 1987), religious traditions (Geertz 1968), “local” food (DeSoucey and Téhoueyres 2009)—in different settings. A similar logic underlies historical studies of working class formation that use cases similar in economic conditions and grievances but different in political outcomes (for example, in ideological critiques of employers [Steinberg 1999], in

racial inclusiveness [Johnson 2009], or in sustained insurgency [Billings 1990]). Explanations for these differences may then be sought in the contrasting cultural traditions and institutions of local working class communities.

An expanded conception of diffusion can be used in similar fashion to help account for variations among comparable social movements, including divergent responses to common grievances over food. The comparison that follows concentrates on two tasks. First, for each case it documents the kinds of biographical, network, and organizational ties that (in theory) favor transposition. Second, and more substantially, it presents evidence for cultural templates rooted in other institutions and movements being applied to food problems. In so doing, it offers a partial explanation for how comparable problems gave rise to movements strikingly different in their interpretation of grievances, their framing and boundary work, and their tactics for pursuing change. First, however, it is necessary to show that the two cases did indeed have similar starting points.

Grahamites and Organic Advocates: Similarities in Grievances

William Sylvester Graham was the most prominent leader of an 1830s' movement for dietary reform (the best general sources are Nissenbaum 1980; Whorton 1982; Cole 1975). Graham and his followers believed that eating a strictly vegetarian diet of minimally processed or spiced foods, in modest quantities and accompanied only by cold water, was the key to good health—but also to moral reform. Advocates of organic food in the 1960s and 1970s (Belasco 2007; Conford 2001; Guthman 2004; Fromartz 2006) were generally not opposed to meat or alcohol, but their recommendations were otherwise similar. Food grown without chemical fertilizers or pesticides and consumed (as far as possible) in its natural state was good for the body, the environment, and social life. It is particularly the link drawn in both cases between changes in personal consumption practices and larger projects of social change that warrants applying the label “social movements” to Grahamites and early organic consumers. And while it is impossible to quantify their size, by indirect measures—attendance at Graham's lectures, subscriptions to the leading journal of organic gardening, anxious dismissal of their ideas as fads by mainstream newspapers and scientific authorities—both qualify as significant and well-known movements of their times.

The movements developed in response to very similar grievances. At issue, most broadly, were commercialization and technological change as they affected food. On different scales, these were eras in which lengthening commodity chains and the application of new methods of food production created crises of confidence in what people were eating. That mistrust reflected deeper anxieties over larger social changes like urbanization and bureaucratization. In the 1830s, the rapid growth of cities and spread of market relations distanced consumers from the sources of their food. The distance was in part physical, separating homes from farms and, for key commodities like wheat, western production from eastern consumption. The distance was also social, as the addition of more business intermediaries along the commodity chain gave economic relations a newly impersonal character (Danhof 1969; Hurt 1994; Sellers 1991). By the 1960s, few consumers had any memories of farms or pastures, but commodity chains in this period were increasingly national and even global in scale (Guthman 2004; Levenstein 2003). Longer food chains mediated by anonymous markets were in each era particularly problematic when combined with innovations in food processing. In the 1830s, shipping flour over longer distances required refining to reduce spoilage, and the size of urban markets both made possible and required the application of industrial techniques to producing milk and baking bread (Larkin 1988; Nissenbaum 1980). The 1960s saw a similar shift—again on a larger scale—towards a regime of chemical fertilizers and pesticides applied to “factories in the fields” and towards the application of modern science to the construction of processed foods (Flandrin and Montanari 1999; Pollan 2006).

Distant food, food as a commodity sold by impersonal businesses for a profit, and food produced using new techniques all created for many consumers a crisis of confidence: could you trust the food you were eating? Small numbers of critics in both eras answered “no,” and periodic tainted-food scares—what social movement scholars would classify as “moral shocks” (Jasper 1997)—made that answer plausible to wider audiences. Health reformers in the 1830s warned of the use of animal manure to replenish soil fertility in the intensive agriculture of the day (Egan 2005). Urban bakers were another source of concern. “Most people in cities and large towns” depended on them, the *Graham Journal of Health and Longevity* (hereafter *GJHL*) complained, and yet they acted for “their own emolument rather than for the public good.” Even if they did not add chalk or other adulterants to their bread (a common practice), “their mode of manufacturing bread destroys much of the virtue of the flour” (*GJHL* May 2, 1837). The specifics are different in the 1960s, but the themes are the same: our health is at risk from the pesticides sprayed on crops and the synthetic chemicals added to processed food. From time to time in each era, well-publicized exposés—of the “swill milk” produced by cows fed residues from neighboring distilleries, of alar on apples, of DDT everywhere—gave credence to these critiques (Ferrières 2006; Nowacek 1997).

Who was most likely to take up the fight for healthier food? Here too, the answer is roughly the same for both movements: an urban, relatively young, middle class. Those who joined Graham’s American Physiological Society or who wrote letters to the *GJHL* were largely artisans and tradesmen, part of a new (and precarious) middle class based in rapidly growing cities (Haber 2002; Nissenbaum 1980). The 300,000 subscribers to *Organic Gardening and Farming* (hereafter *OGF*) in 1962 were less urbanized, a mix of small producers and home gardeners. But the movement exploded in the late 1960s—subscriptions reached 850,000 by late 1972—and *OGF* writers saw the new recruits as younger, more urban, and college educated. At least one Los Angeles organic retailer agreed, describing the boom in his business as fueled by “the upper class hippie group” (*OGF* June 1962:17, September 1972:42, November 1970:39).

In both cases, finally, alarm over the quality of food supplies and demands for alternatives came amidst much broader upsurges in social movement activity. These were eras of reform and, as previously noted, such major upswings in cycles of protest are usually favorable to diffusion. At the time of Graham’s early public lectures on diet, in 1832, the evangelical Second Great Awakening and its auxiliary temperance movement were in full swing; the abolitionist movement was getting underway; and the election of Andrew Jackson marked a democratic upheaval in electoral politics (Johnson 1978; Walters 1997; Young 2006). Although organic farmers predate the 1960s (*OGF* began publication in 1942), the rapid expansion of its consumer base came during a much more familiar set of insurgences: the New Left was just beginning to implode, the counterculture had yet to fade, and newer movements around consumer rights, the environment, and farmworker organizing were gathering steam (for surveys and reviews of the historiography, see John McMillian 2006 and Roberta Lexier 2008 on the New Left; Doug Rossinow 1997 and Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle 2002 on the counterculture; and Adam Rome 2003 and Keith Woodhouse 2008 on environmentalism). These political movements and cultural shifts would supply the language and set the direction for food protest in the two periods.

Similarities in Framing: Celebrating Nature, Criticizing Science

In part because they were responding to similar threats from developing food systems, the basic diagnoses and recommendations voiced by Grahamites and organic advocates had much in common.³ Both celebrated natural food as against artificial and modern edible goods,

3. Gusfield (1992), comparing Graham with a wider range of natural food advocates in the 1950s and 1960s, emphasizes shared cultural traditions (individualism and populism) as another source of similarities in framing, particularly the emphasis on self control and the invidious contrast between elite and popular medicine.

both stressed the advantages of natural food for personal health and community well-being, and both regarded mainstream medical and scientific authorities with skepticism—even while claiming scientific support for their own views. I will describe these similarities more fully before turning, in the next two sections to contrasts in the cultural base and ideological character of the two movements.

Natural versus Artificial

The Grahamites have been described as America's first "anti-industrial food movement" (Fromartz 2006:147), and Graham himself relentlessly contrasted natural foods to the artificial versions offered by commercial interests. "The simpler, plainer, and more natural the food of man is," the better. "By simple food I mean that which is not compounded and complicated by culinary processes; by plain food I mean that which is not dressed with pungent stimulants, seasonings or condiments; by natural food I mean that which the Creator has designed for men" (Graham 1839:14, 18). The Creator's design, moreover, called for food "raised on a pure, unadulterated soil . . . without the aid of any unnatural or artificial process" (*GJHL* May 9, 1837:48). If one insists on eating meat, wild animals are preferable because they "live after nature's intention," unlike "stall-fattened" cattle stimulated to have "artificial appetites" and to accumulate "artificial fat" (*GJHL* May 16, 1837:52). Robert Rodale, son of J. I. Rodale, the founder of America's organic movement and editor of *OGF*, agreed. His journal celebrated foods and growing methods that established "a direct link between us and the natural, even primitive, realities of life" (*OGF* December 1974:38). Consumers of organic food constructed the same contrast between natural food and the "plastic" products of the modern food industry (Belasco 2007). This opposition between artificial and natural, machine and garden, is of course a staple of American cultural history and the romantic tradition (a classic survey is Marx 1964; see also Edgington 2008). The point is that both Grahamites and organic advocates drew on that tradition in similar ways to frame their critiques of the prevailing food system. In both cases, too, reformers explicitly linked the perils of artificial food to wider social ills.⁴ For Grahamites, the large cities and impersonal markets responsible for unhealthy food were also to blame for rising crime, urban blight, and the swelling ranks of foreigners and the poor (Van Buren 1977). For organic advocates, the widespread use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides could be traced to the same industrial civilization that had given us overcrowded and dangerous cities (*OGF* September 1975:44).⁵

Extolling the Virtues of Natural Food

Why was natural food so devoutly to be preferred? The starting point in both cases was the claim that natural food was biologically healthier. Graham developed an elaborate theory of the inflammatory effects of meat, spices, and overly refined flour on the digestive system. By contrast, whole-grain, homemade bread and a spartan vegetarian diet were well suited to human beings' own nature, and Graham's followers filled his journal with stories of their newfound vitality and resistance to disease (*GJHL* 1837–39 passim; Graham 1837; Sokolow 1983). The *OGF* regularly featured similar warnings about the poisonous properties of conventionally grown foods and testimonials about the superior nutritional qualities of organic produce. "A basic tenet of the organic method is our claim that the American people are not

4. On this point see Gusfield's (1992) extended discussion of nature, civilization, and social control in the ideology of Grahamites and natural food advocates.

5. This is also a regular theme in the early 1970s issues of *Mother Earth News*. I rely on *OGF* rather than *Mother Earth News* as the main source of evidence because the *OGF*'s continuous publication from before the late 1960s and its roots in an older organic movement make it possible to see the independent influence of the counterculture on the thinking of organic advocates as it occurs. *Mother Earth News*, by contrast, begins publication in 1970 and, from the start, mixes together countercultural and organic advocacy.

eating enough of the right foods to maintain good health" (*OGF* August 1961:2). These themes are even more prominent in *OGF's* sister magazine, *Prevention*, in which the Rodales trumpeted the health advantages of natural food. But the benefits of alternative diets went well beyond individual health. According to Graham, following his regimen would also bring *moral* health. Of particular concern was that meat and spices inflamed sexual appetites at the same time that they injured the digestive system. Proper diet carried an additional meaning for the middling artisans and tradesmen who were most likely to join Graham's crusade. This was a newly expanding stratum of uncertain social status in Jacksonian America. Their testimonials suggest that they saw in Graham's ascetic diet a means to achieve a much-sought social identity as members of the respectable middle class—pious, disciplined, and self-improving (Haber 2002; Nissenbaum 1980). For Rodale, organic production and consumption also served social goods, protecting the community not from sexual license but from technological domination. "While today being organic is a comfort—an added plus that gives texture and meaning to life—tomorrow being organic could be the only alternative to a technological concentration-camp style of life," a concentration camp that Rodale associated with cities (*OGF* September 1971:33; September 1975:45). Here too, Graham and Rodale are representatives of a larger tradition linking dietary health to social reform (DuPuis 2007; Schwartz 1986).

Challenging Scientific Authority

The claims for the benefits of natural food were unorthodox for their times and became the target of derisive commentary by nutritional experts of each era. Critics dubbed Grahamites' American Physiological Society "the bran bread and sawdust pathological society," and they dismissed Graham's dietary recommendations as finding "long life in starvation [and] 'moral reform' in bran and cabbage" (quoted in Whorton 1982:58 and Walker 1955:122–23, respectively). Scientists and officials allied with the food industry heaped the same scorn on organic agriculture. Organic farming methods, they charged, were nothing but an ignorant fad that could never meet the needs of modern society. "Before we go back to organic agriculture," Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz warned, "somebody is going to have to decide what 50 million people we are going to let starve" (quoted in a *New York Times* obituary [Goldstein 2008]).

Not surprisingly, Grahamites and organic advocates replied in kind, combining their critiques of artificial food with attacks on scientific and medical authorities. Educator and health advocate William Alcott, a leading ally of Graham's, invoked comparative evidence for the limited value of doctors. "In those countries . . . where no physicians have ever been in vogue, and very little medicine beyond a few herbs . . . the health of the people is quite as good . . . as in those countries where physicians . . . have obtained a strong foothold" (Alcott 1859:378). The rank and file frequently made the same point in their testimonials. The standard narrative begins with a litany of afflictions, physical and mental, and reports that physicians only made matters worse through their prescribed treatments. "None of them seemed to have correct notions concerning diet," and a full return to health came only after becoming "convinced of the folly of depending on medicine" (Graham 1834:89, 71; William Walker 1955 and Jayme Sokolow 1983 review the more general backlash against medical practitioners in the 1830s). Going organic, similarly, meant that "you must reject the opinions of the expert and the professor and stand up to occasional charges that you are a crackpot or faddist" (*OGF* April 1962:23). Yet, Graham and Rodale *also* presented their own dietary injunctions as based on genuine science, not religious faith. Graham's recommendations, he claimed, had been "ascertained by rigorous scientific investigation."⁶ His organic successors took the same line in *OGF*, parading the academic credentials of any author who backed their views and calling for "adversary scientists" to rebut the corrupt establishment (*OGF* April 1971:77–80). Rodale tried

6. From a letter to the editor of *Zion's Herald*, February 24, 1836.

to reconcile these seemingly contradictory views by distinguishing “basic” from “applied” science. The former focuses on how the natural world works, and the organic approach to agriculture does the same. Applied science, by contrast, is largely tainted by corporate sponsorship (*OGF* October 1960:16–18; May 1972:41–42).

Constructing Alternatives

The 1830s health food and 1960s–70s organic movements went beyond calls for dietary reform. To support alternatives to artificial food and establishment medicine, they also fostered alternative institutions, and even here there are similarities in approach. Both published popular journals to spread the word and to counter criticisms from mainstream science. Grahamites anticipated organic food co-ops by organizing health food stores featuring edibles grown according to proper “physiological principles” (*GJHL* May 9, 1937:48). Graham’s followers added boarding houses in major cities where travelers could find proper meals; organic pioneers strove to build regional networks of producers, retailers, and consumers, backed by certification programs to ensure compliance with organic standards—what we would now call alternative local food systems (*OGF* April 1973:91, 97).

The two movements thus have much in common in their underlying grievances, the general way they framed their critiques and their alternatives, and even some of the steps they took to set things right. But each also was tied to other institutions and movements in ways that favored cultural transposition. That helps us understand the different paths they took, particularly in the relative importance each attached to democratic alternatives, the divergent ideals each championed for personal transformation and social change, and the connections each made between these ideals.

Networks and Organizations Favoring Cultural Modeling

Diffusion through cultural transposition should be more likely when individual biographies, social networks, and organizational settings cross social fields. In this section, I focus on these bridging mechanisms among Grahamites and organic advocates. Did key actors in these movements have roots in other institutions and movements? Did they belong to the same social networks or move in the same circles as members of the “source” movement or community? Were there organizations that brought actors from different fields together? For each question, the answer is “yes,” with the caveat that evidence for the Grahamites is fragmentary. There are no good records identifying the multiple affiliations of men who attended Graham’s lectures, for example, or documenting who stayed at Graham’s boarding houses. The fragments, however, all point in the same direction, towards networks and organizations that bridged distinctions between institutions and social movements and among different types of movement. The same pattern is clear for organic advocates.

Grahamites

The main cultural infrastructure for Graham’s health food movement consisted of a pervasive evangelical revival and a specific movement—temperance—that emerged from that revival. Graham’s dietary reform was linked to these two cultural phenomena through individual careers, social networks, and shared organizations.

The evangelical revival of the 1810s–30s is known as the Second Great Awakening (the following discussion draws on Hatch 1989; Noll 2002; Walters 1997; Young 2006). One of its most important features was a populist repudiation of established church hierarchies and intellectualized theology. Evangelical leaders embraced, instead, more popular and emotional religious enthusiasms; a more personal relationship between believer and God; and the

capacity of all to grasp God's work through their own reading of the Bible. In rejecting church clerics' exalted role in interpreting God's will and dispensing His blessings, evangelical preachers necessarily had to construct alternative channels for seeking converts. They did so in part through popular sermons and mass meetings, often under tents to accommodate the crowds and to distance themselves from established church structures. They did so, too, in an explosion of religious newspapers and pamphlets, putting improved printing technology and postal facilities to work for spreading God's word. To these preachers' audiences, evangelical Protestantism offered hope and imposed responsibilities. The hope, in contrast to grim predestination, was that salvation could be chosen through a direct relationship to Jesus Christ. There were corresponding responsibilities: salvation demanded exacting moral self-discipline as the faithful monitored their impulses and resisted temptations.

These beliefs, techniques, and emotional investments fueled an unbounded faith in the possibility of moral reform in America as a whole. More, they provided the energy to pursue a more perfect society. The Second Great Awakening spawned a range of national social movements (Young 2006), from Sabbatarianism to abolitionism to temperance. The last was the movement on which Grahamites depended most heavily in their quest for dietary reform.

The first phase of organized efforts to wean Americans from alcohol began in the mid-1820s and extended to the Civil War. According to reformers, sobriety was one key to a disciplined Christian life, and drinking spirits all too often led to other sins. Historians have generally interpreted the movement as a middle class response to the threats of urban disorder and lower class unrest. On one hand, abstinence would help discipline a rowdy and sometimes rebellious urban rabble of immigrants, Catholics, and dependent laborers. And if sobriety produced a more tractable workforce for a rising class of manufacturers and tradesmen, so much the better. Popular lectures, workingmen's libraries, and adult education were among the more constructive alternatives offered to win the hearts and minds of former drinkers (Gilkeson 1986; Johnson 1978; Wallace 1972). But historians have also noted that temperance involved a project of *self*-discipline. Conspicuous displays of sobriety, industry, and domesticity enabled the middle class—or those who aspired to it—to both get ahead and establish their superior social status (Boyer 1978; Faler 1981; Gusfield 1963). And whatever the advantages of abstinence for mobility and status distinction, temperance crusaders deployed the evangelical language of personal choice and redemption to make their case, along with the evangelical tools of popular sermons and mass meetings to popularize it.

Grahamites' connections to the temperance movement and to the larger evangelical revival were in part situational: these were inescapable components of the ambient culture of the time. But the connections were also more direct, involving biographical careers, network ties, and organizational bridges. Graham was himself a former minister. He made his name as an organizer for the Pennsylvania Society for Discouraging the Use of Ardent Spirits in the late 1820s (Nissenbaum 1980), before turning to dietary reform. And Graham kept up these connections. As he made his way around the northeastern lecture circuit in 1836 and 1837, he continued to mix "scientific" presentations on physiology and diet with Sabbath talks on biblical attitudes towards meat and alcohol (Sokolow 1983). In his voluminous public writing, he continued to contribute to temperance newspapers.⁷ David Campbell, secretary of Graham's American Physiological Society and publisher of the *GJHL*, was also active in the temperance movement (Alcott 1837–1842:v. 1). William Alcott's involvement in dietary reform closely followed his own evangelical conversion (Van Buren 1977). Ronald Walters (1997) notes that this pattern of reformers being active in two or more of the period's major causes was a common one.

Even if health reformers were not themselves engaged in temperance or evangelism, they moved in these circles. The hosts and organizers of Graham's public lectures were often the local clergymen or temperance advocates. They saw Graham's reform campaign as

7. Letter to the editor, *Zion's Herald*, February 24, March 2, 1836.

a continuation of their own causes. "While we rejoice . . . at the progress of Temperance," resolved the committee welcoming Graham to Providence, "it is the opinion of this meeting that the work of reformation should be prosecuted with equal zeal as to the quantity and quality of food" (Graham 1834:xi). The organizational settings through which Grahamites pursued dietary reform also permitted mingling with evangelical and temperance reformers and campaigns. While Graham himself spread his message mainly through lectures and writing, local associations provided forums for on-going participation and networking. Alcott promoted moral reform societies in numerous cities, societies where all manner of sin, from intemperance to unsavory books to corsetting, could be discussed and discouraged. Local health societies, in some cases acting as auxiliaries to the American Physiological Society, had a similarly multipurpose agenda (Alcott 1837–1842:v. 3 [1839], p. 72, v. 4 [1840], p. 40). In this they echoed Alcott's own newspaper, *The Moral Reformer and Teacher on the Human Condition*, which addressed food, temperance, labor reform, and immodest fashion side by side. The Graham boarding houses in major cities were themselves modeled after temperance houses and provided more than proper meals. They were also temporary homes for traveling crusaders against alcohol and slavery (Sokolow 1983; Young 2006). One visitor to the New York City Graham boarding house reported sharing spartan meals and ample conversation with the editor of a leading temperance newspaper and several abolitionists before going on to hear the prominent evangelical preacher Charles Finney at a nearby church (William S. Tyler to Edward Tyler, October 10, 1833, reprinted in Le Duc 1839:190–91). Graham's followers appear to have been well aware of the overlap between his dietary advice and prevailing religious beliefs. One merchant, after recounting the usual tale of prior ill health, described his determination "to make a thorough trial of what is now called Grahamism, but . . . is in fact Bibleism" (*GJHL* April 4, 1837:4).

Organic Advocates

Individual careers, social networks, and bridging organizations also tied organic proponents to wider movements of the time. By the mid 1960s, organic gardeners in the United States had been championing the benefits of composting and pesticide-free produce for twenty years. In doing so, they drew on intellectual traditions of alternative agriculture with an even longer history (Conford 2001). But the movement, and particularly its consumer wing, gained much wider support and visibility from the late 1960s as it crossed paths with the New Left and the counterculture, and as it converged with the environmental movement (for an excellent summary, see Guthman 2004).

Readers will likely be familiar with the general character and historical arc of social movements and the counterculture of the 1960s. To briefly summarize: The New Left is generally seen as emerging from the civil rights movement, as students turned their attention from the struggle for racial equality to other social problems, including undemocratic universities, urban poverty, irresponsible corporations, and especially the Vietnam War (Breines 1982; McAdam 1988). The counterculture, by contrast, is often treated as a separate, even antithetical phenomenon more focused on lifestyle than on "serious" politics, more a cultural trend than a social movement, and more a form of withdrawal than a quest for social change. By the late 1960s, however, the New Left and the counterculture overlapped significantly. Nixon's 1968 election marked a conservative turn in the nation, reinforcing among young progressives a growing sense of political impotence. As the New Left fragmented, some constituents turned to lifestyle activism: rather than abandoning their goals, they embraced deliberate changes in personal lifestyle and in consumption choices as alternative means to effect change. In doing so, they often joined "hippies" in countercultural institutions like housing collectives, food co-ops, and communes. In places like these, the New Left critique of hierarchy and corporate capitalism merged with the counterculture's rejection of possessive individualism and social conformity (Miller 2002; Rossinow 1997). One particular point of convergence was the

ecology movement. Environmentalism had its own roots within establishment liberalism and in popular reactions to well-publicized risks posed by pollution and pesticides (Rome 2003). In the late 1960s, however, the movement rapidly gained strength as a home for New Left critics of industrial capitalism and for countercultural celebrants of nature (Dow Chemical, after all, manufactured both Agent Orange for Vietnam and pesticides for U.S. farms) (Mertig, Dunlap, and Morrison 2000; Rome 2003). This convergence was symbolized and galvanized by the 1969 confrontation over Berkeley's People's Park. That battle joined student critics of the university and its military allies, countercultural champions of communal gardens, and environmentalist defenders of the earth from encroaching parking lots. For the present purposes, it is also notable that People's Park was to be a place for growing *organic* food (Pollan 2006; Woodhouse 2008).

As with the Grahamites, organic advocates' ties to the counterculture and to other major movements of the 1960s were in part biographical. Three of the major writers for *OGF* were also involved with campus activism, and among influential founders of organic food cooperatives, several were veterans of the SDS or maintained membership in antiwar organizations (Cox 1994). Robert Rodale, for his part, had ties to the consumer rights movement (testifying before Congress on food safety issues) and championed the Environmental Defense Fund (Goldstein 1992; *OGF* May 1970:67; March 1968:33–34). Beyond such personal multitasking, committed organic consumers clearly moved in the same networks as student activists, hippies, and environmentalists. Major universities that were centers for New Left movements also had active organic clubs ("The Organic Revolution Goes to College," trumpeted the *OGF*'s M.C. Goldman, writing of the Student Garden Project at the University of California - Santa Cruz [January 1970:56]). And as the counterculture began to turn upscale, its members discovered the virtues of artisanal organic food. As one Bay Area gardener reported, "*OGF* has become required reading for much of the Berkeley 'hip' community" (*OGF* August 1971:21). In the widely circulated *Whole Earth Catalog* (1968–) and in *The Mother Earth News* (1970–), similarly, the causes (and tools) of environmentalism and organic agriculture appeared side by side. Rodale returned the favor. By 1970, his journal was offering "The Organic Gardener's Guide to Complaining in the Name of the Environment" and lumping together, under the heading of "environmental groups," organic gardening clubs, ecology action groups, and community organizations formed to observe Earth Day (*OGF* July 1970:61). This spillover from the environmental movement also included a new generation of organic enthusiasts. Speakers at a 1970 symposium on organic food attributed the tremendous expansion of interest in the field to "the thundering herd of young people" committed to natural food and to living "in harmony with the world's ecology" (*OGF* August 1970:39).

A variety of grassroots organizations institutionalized this blending of organic advocacy, a wider counterculture, and environmentalism. Best known, perhaps, were food co-ops. They were the easiest place for urbanites to find organic food for purchase. But their governing boards were often peppered with veterans of youth radicalism of other kinds. Moreover, they deliberately served as nodes for local activist communities—a function best illustrated by the co-op bulletin board and the co-op newsletter, with their postings for political meetings, feminist carpenters, spiritual consultants, and health food remedies (Cox 1994; Hartman 2003; McGrath 2004). Local ecology centers played a similar role for organic and environmental advocates, bringing together organic growers and environmentalists to plant gardens, run recycling programs, and listen to invited speakers (*OGF* February 1972:2–3). Organic gardening clubs, in turn, had by the early 1970s taken up environmental activism. According to one *OGF* observer, "social action aimed at tackling environmental problems on the community level has become 'standard operating procedure' for O. G. Clubs everywhere." The *OGF* claimed nearly 150 such clubs across the country in 1972 (*OGF* April 1972:139–140). These networks and organizational ties were particularly dense in Northern California, a geographical center for the student left, the counterculture, and an emerging web of organic farms, restaurants, and co-ops (Guthman 2004; McGrath 2006). But at the national level, the Rodale Institute

played its own bridging role, active as it was in organizing conferences to debate organic standards, lobbying against pesticide use, and sending reporters to meet with campus ecology and organic activists. These close relationships with the New Left, the counterculture, and environmentalism were clearly visible to organic advocates at the time. Rodale referred to “the ecologists” as natural allies and applauded “the hippies [and] the student rebels” for growing and eating food “naturally”—even if he had some reservations about their “living communally and going around nude” (*OGF* October 1968:20; September 1969:22–24). Organic proponents made deliberate use of these affinities, such as by spicing up practical guides to composting with indictments of the Vietnam War and traditional schooling (Belasco 2007).

Two Cultural Turns

The previous section examined conditions favorable to cultural transposition from other fields—churches, temperance reform, the New Left, environmentalism—to protest focused on food. It remains to look for signs that such transposition occurred. Did Grahamites and organic advocates frame their critiques and recommend solutions in terms mirroring those in other fields? Did they apply similar standards of evaluation and construct similar social boundaries? Did they adopt the same tactical repertoires? As a further test, was the sequencing right? Can we see the purported ideological effects of transposed schemas occurring in a timely fashion after the development of cross-field biographical, network, and organizational ties? If the evidence on all these points is clear, there is a strong case for cultural modeling. In principle, the argument might be even stronger if we find that key actors deliberately adopted frames and boundary work rooted in one sphere to advance their goals in another. Transposition may occur, however, without such strategic and self-conscious borrowing of cultural models (Sewell 1992; Clemens and Cook 1999; Haydu 2002; Polletta 2002). Particularly for historically distant cases like the Grahamites, direct evidence on this point is in any event not likely to be available.

Building on contrasting cultural infrastructures led Grahamites and organic advocates in different directions in their critiques of conventional food, in their recommendations, and in their strategies. Two caveats are needed at the outset. First, this account is meant to highlight only the role of cultural modeling in steering the two movements, not to provide an exhaustive causal account of differences between them. Second, there are some ways in which the different settings for these movements led the two sets of activists in similar ideological directions. Evangelical reformers’ challenge to traditional clerical authority carried over into a broader questioning of professional expertise: doctors and lawyers, too, faced populist assertions of the value of lay knowledge (Hatch 1989). That broader delegitimation of the professions shows up in Graham’s views of established medical science. The New Left’s critique of science and technology as handmaidens of corporate capital—quite different grounds for questioning professional expertise—is also the common wisdom of critics of modern agricultural science in *OGF*.

Religiosity

Other applications of broader scripts to food reform pointed the movements in different directions. The most obvious is that Grahamites justified their program in significant part on religious grounds. Graham and Alcott claimed a scientific base for their dietary injunctions. Both men, however, were caught up in a larger wave of evangelical reform, and they paired scientific authority with explicitly biblical warrants. Why was natural food better? Characteristically, Graham first offered up theological arguments. God must surely have made us to be adapted to conditions at the time of creation. Only after such assertions did he advance further proofs on the basis of “comparative anatomy” and dietary experiments (Graham 1839:v. 2, p. 14). There

was no contradiction here: nature's laws were God's laws, according to Graham. His followers similarly transposed to food a religious script, in particular the evangelical model of conversion and salvation. In letters to the *GJHL* and other publications, they recounted past dietary sins (eating meat, drinking "stimulants," taking nostrums prescribed by incompetent doctors), and suffering (ill health, low energy, depression). It took many trials and much pain before they finally saw the light. Narratives concluded (sometimes after brief reviews of dietary backsliding and relapse) with the writers' ultimate redemption, as proper eating led to restored health and self-control. "The change in my body was as great as it was in my soul when I was converted to the Lord," reported one of the saved (Graham 1834:45). The influence of religious scripts—and particularly evangelicals' demands for bodily self-discipline—is apparent, too, in Graham's insistence on sexual restraint. Meat eating, he argued, inflamed sexual passions along with the digestive system. His diet would calm both.

OGF writers, by contrast, offer only secular arguments in favor of organic food (although some readers' letters to the editor carry a whiff of New Age spirituality). These organic advocates valued natural food not for its conformity to God's plan but as an alternative to "plastic" food and (as we will see in more detail below) social conventions. And far from recommending natural food for its libido-depressing effects, some advocates hinted that it would have a salutary effect on sexual potency (Brissett and Lewis 1978; Gusfield 1992).⁸ There was nothing inevitable in this secularism. As Philip Conford (2001) shows, the early British organic movement had important and influential Christian roots. U.S. organic advocates of the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, viewed the problems of unhealthy food and unsustainable agriculture through quite different cultural lenses. Among them was an ecological worldview, derived in part from environmentalism, that is missing entirely from the Grahamites. Writers on organic methods had long stressed the interdependence of natural elements in agricultural processes. Amid the wider environmental movement, however, one sees this ecological thinking extended beyond the garden. By 1974, *OGF* is calling for "organic living"—"eating for health, cooperating with nature, recycling wastes" (*OGF* November 1974:77).

Other contrasts between the Grahamites and organic advocates are less obvious and deserve more attention. The two movements diverged in the value they assigned to democratic participation; in the standards they used for evaluating and connecting personal transformation and social change; and in the tactics they favored for pursuing reform.

Democratic Organization and Control

Both movements, we saw, questioned professional authority and expertise. Beyond this general populist impulse, however, there is a striking contrast in movement ideology. Organic activists, but not Grahamites, attacked concentrated economic and political power and called for democratic alternatives. The most common target for this critique was Big Agriculture, both for its sheer size and its unaccountable power. "Company farms threaten America," the *OGF's* Jerome Goldstein warned, and "smallness is becoming as significant a quality of the organic method as no-pesticides and no-artificial fertilizers" (*OGF* May 1972:97–98). Among organic producers' objections to Earl Butz's appointment as Secretary of Agriculture in 1972 was the (fully warranted) belief that, as a representative of agribusiness, he was unresponsive to small farmers. This perspective appears as well in critiques of government bureaucracies. Even the prospect of federal organic certification in 1972, promising relief from fraudulent competition, raised suspicions among some *OGF* readers. It would mean "bigness, centralization,

8. Sex aside, cookbooks advocating alternatives to industrial food in this period are not as consistent as Graham in their attitudes towards sensual pleasure. The tone and recipes in Frances Moore Lappé's *Diet for a Small Planet* (1975) are as sober as Graham's book on bread-making: this is food we should eat because it is good for the earth and for our bodies. As the title suggests, Anna Thomas' *Vegetarian Epicure* (1972) puts more emphasis on the culinary pleasures that ecologically sound and physically healthful ingredients could serve up. The latter approach has become the norm among contemporary locavores. For a more fine-grained discussion of this stylistic range, see McGrath (2006).

specialization, etc . . . These are the way of corporate monoculture" (September 1972:10–11). And it appears in a still more general lament about the iron cage of modern technology—except using the more organic metaphor of "the technological cobweb" that ensnares people. It is imperative, Rodale argued, that we take back control (*OGF* May 1967:27). Graham and Alcott and the men and women who wrote to them frequently criticized particular business practices and, occasionally, state policies related to food. They never voiced a democratic critique of economic or political governance, however.

Both movements' internal practices appear to be consistent with their democratic principles, or lack thereof. Little is known of how Graham boarding houses or health food stores were run, but given the standardized regimen of the boarding houses (small vegetarian meals with cold drinking water, served at fixed times; curfews) the norm seems to have been that management knew what was good for you. The clearest, if still anecdotal, evidence comes from David Campbell's stint as steward for Oberlin College's dining hall. There he eliminated the "elective meat" table and helped censure a faculty member for excessive use of pepper. "Democratic participation" at Oberlin took the form of a revolt *against* Campbell's stewardship (Walker 1955). By contrast, organic advocates made a virtue of democratic procedures. Proponents of organic certification programs, sought by farmers largely to improve consumer confidence, emphasized that standards should be developed on "a grass roots, regional basis" (*OGF* April 1973:89). Consumers associated with organic co-ops took democratic commitment even further. *OGF* writer Jeff Cox likened them to "a food conspiracy" in which "you regain some control in this most important area of your life" (*OGF* October 1971:64). "Regaining some control" often involved radically participatory approaches to food co-ops' work and management, from shared responsibility for sweeping the floors to consensus decision making in choosing what products to stock (Cox 1994; Haedicke 2008).

These contrasting valuations of democratic procedure fit neatly with the respective cultural parents of the two movements. Evangelical reform had its populist tilt, and in matters of religious discipline—observing the Sabbath, eschewing strong spirits, behaving modestly—voluntary compliance was certainly the first line of defense against Satan. Salvation, after all, was a personal responsibility (Johnson 1978). But evangelicals also had their moral certitude, and many were willing to resort to more coercive measures to deal with sin, whether by requiring Sunday closures of businesses or by proscribing alcohol (Gilkeson 1986). Graham never advocated a ban on meat, but he certainly did not consider that his own nutritional advice, based equally on God's design and modern science, left room for dissenting views. The contrasting stance of organic advocates had both long-standing and more proximate roots. Organic farmers were heirs to America's agrarian tradition (Goodman and Goodman 2007; Guthman 2004). That tradition honors the political virtues and good character of small producers, and it suspects the worst of large corporations and big government. But the themes of democratic control and participatory organization became much more pronounced in *OGF* articles and letters towards the late 1960s, with increasing spillover from the New Left. It was within the major constituents of the 1960s New Left—the student movement, the antiwar movement, the feminist movement—that there was a thorough-going critique of power hierarchies, whether in universities, foreign policy, or gender relations (Breines 1982; Hodgson 1976). It was among these activists, too, that there was the most explicit insistence that participatory democracy be both goal and practice of the movement (Melucci 1989; Polletta 2002). And it was *OGF* writers like Jeff Cox, M.C. Goldman, and Jerome Goldstein, responsible for covering the organic scene at college campuses and city co-ops, who most often transposed these themes in their critique of the food system.

Personal Transformation and Social Change

Grahamites and organic advocates alike emphasized the possibilities and the importance of personal change. For Grahamites, consistent with the wider evangelical ethos, this was a

matter of individual redemption, freely chosen. Giving up meat, spices, and spirits might be hard, but it was within the power of each person to do so and to reap the benefits of robust health and improved morals. Replacing conventional with organic foods, similarly, was a personal choice and involved a measure of self-reliance. By doing your own organic gardening, or at least by more careful selection of purchased produce, you could protect yourself from poisons and free yourself from a dysfunctional industrial food system. In both cases, too, individual change was tightly linked to social reform. "A vegetable diet," Alcott proclaimed, "lies at the basis of all Reform, whether Civil, Social, Moral, or Religious" (quoted in Sokolow 1983:101). Improving personal health and morals (notably by tempering sexual passions) would make for a more industrious and responsible citizenry in early nineteenth-century cities. Buying organic produce was conceived as making no less of a contribution: it would foster a food system that was both economically and socially sustainable. Grahamites and organic advocates, then, explicitly connected individual transformation to social change. They sharply diverged, however, in their standards for evaluating both sides of that equation.

To begin with social change, in balancing progressive goals against the restoration of idealized virtues from the past, Grahamites and organic proponents tilted in opposite directions. Graham's ideal was clearly pre-capitalist. His vision of the loving mother nurturing her family with handmade bread from minimally processed flour endorsed a rural, patriarchal order (Nissenbaum 1980). Alcott agreed. "So important an article should never be made by hirelings . . . That wife or mother . . . who does not make her own bread, fails to fulfil [sic] a most important part of her mission" (Alcott 1835–1837:v. 1:173). The invidious contrast was to the commercial, urban society that was rapidly developing around them, with no call to construct a better future on that foundation. Leading figures in the organic movement shared some of this nostalgia for handcrafted food. And their critique of corporate agriculture clearly harkened back to the yeoman farmer of America's agrarian past. But Rodale and his colleagues also sought to build a new society that was more sustainable (unlike a food system based on monoculture and petroleum) and more participatory (unlike the "technological cobweb" of modern society).

That difference in emphasis is still more prominent on the personal side of change. For Grahamites, personal transformation in one's diet transposes the more general evangelical call for rigorous self-discipline. For their organic successors, it echoes the counterculture's quest for personal liberation. The contrast can be seen in the way organic advocates (but not Grahamites) extend the meaning of "natural." The word is first used to describe chemical-free fruits and vegetables and, more generally, food produced in harmony with natural biological processes. Gradually, *OGF* writers come to use it in an additional way, to describe a lifestyle relatively free of conventional social restraints. M. C. Goldman, recounting a gardening project at a private school in New York, explicitly connects the two meanings. "The idea is to let the children develop freely, with a minimum of restriction, interference, or roles . . . And what's good for the scholar is good for the gardener . . . The school believes in freedom and natural harmony—and that applies to the garden as well. And so there are no pesticides . . . and no chemical fertilizers" (*OGF* January 1970:60). The meaning of "organic" undergoes a similar expansion to include an alternative lifestyle. "What is Organic Living?" *OGF* asks in 1974. It is "a style of being, a way of coping, a learning process. It's eating for health, cooperating with nature, recycling wastes. It's making [do] with less and *enjoying* it" (November 1974:77, emphasis in original). Warren Belasco (2007) adds that organic food consumption became a way to repudiate middle class standards, governing where to shop (choosing more communal, less sterile co-ops), what to eat (natural and raw foods), and even how to eat it (using fingers, sharing food, and defying the canonical format of middle class dinners, with their meat centerpieces and separate side dishes) (see also Kamp 2006). Following Graham's diet was unconventional, but it was a way to achieve (and display) middle class respectability and self-control. The invidious comparison was not only to the urban rabble, but also to the frivolous affluent. Alcott confirms the latter point in his indictment of "the needless expense

and petty vexations" imposed by "the tyranny of fashion." The fashionable upper class might look down on simpler dress, but such dress was "less inconsistent with purity, or at variance with the gospel" (Alcott 1835–1837:v. 1, pp. 65–66, quoting a resolution of the Utica Maternal Association). Here the boundary work runs along quite different lines from those drawn by organic advocates. Instead of distinguishing virtuous eaters from a square middle class, Grahamites asserted prim middle class status against the undisciplined rich and poor alike.

These differing measures of virtue and ways of constructing social boundaries in matters of food draw on broader evangelical and countercultural scripts. Michael Young (2006) makes a similar claim for the temperance and abolitionist movements. In these movements, a general evangelical schema enabled reformers to connect personal transformation and social change. That schema linked personal sin to the problems of the nation, with the links most visible in rituals of public confession. The Grahamites provide a further illustration of Young's argument, tying dietary sin to problems of community morality. But when juxtaposed to the organic movement, the Grahamites also show how schemas connecting personal and political come with other cultural elements. The evangelical insistence on human perfectibility that helped fuel reform efforts entailed clear standards for the perfect human. He or she lived in accordance with biblical injunctions, as interpreted by evangelical preachers; the perfected society made possible by the moral integrity of the reformed allowed no room for backsliding (Walters 1997). And while evangelicals accepted relatively unfettered displays of enthusiasm in religious settings, they insisted on rigorous self-discipline elsewhere. Individual virtue was the bourgeois requirement of an emerging middle class anxious about rowdy challenges from below and about their own claims to social status (Sisson 1985; Wallace 1972). Demands for temperance, similarly, linked personal and social improvement. On the personal side, addiction to alcohol was likened to "enslavement," a sign that the addict was not master of his self (Walters 1997). Sobriety reclaimed self-mastery. Abstinence, in turn, would improve the community by creating "economic growth, industrial success, happy homes, and quiet streets." It would also do so, however, because the "distinctly middle class way of life" that was required of individuals stood in beneficent contrast to the "mores of working people and immigrants" (Gusfield 1963; Johnson 1986:522).

The New Left's discovery that "the personal is the political" provided an equally effective, multipurpose script for linking individual and social change. Organic advocates clearly applied this script in their claims for the importance of personal choices—of how to farm and what to eat—in bringing about broader social change. But that link between the personal and political was embedded in a critique of the many means by which domination was exercised, from large-scale social institutions down to the conventions governing everyday, private life. The corresponding injunction was to resist such institutions and conventions. By the early 1970s, that injunction filters into the pages of *OGF*, right next to the composting tips. Politically, growing and consuming organic food subverts big agriculture and big government; personally, it frees individuals from "unnatural" constraints. And the counterculture strongly reinforced this bohemian, as against Graham's bourgeois, rendition of how dietary reform contributes to personal change (Belasco 1999; Gusfield 1992; Lavin 2009; McGrath 2006). The timing of *OGF's* reframing of natural is consistent with the influence of a countercultural script. It is in 1969 that we see a decisive move in the journal to address organic consumers, with announcements of a new project to improve the marketing of organic food, the appearance of a new section for "The Organic Food Shopper," and the launching of a separate "Organic Shopping and Living Guide" to help readers find sources for meeting their food needs. This turn to consumers is accompanied by sharp increases in outreach to college campuses and in *OGF* circulation. These expanded ties to youthful and politicized consumers coincide with the *OGF's* growing tendency to portray "organic" as a lifestyle, one involving both personal and social change. This shift may have been a sign of things to come: demonstrating personal virtue while pursuing social change through individual consumption choices helped set the stage for the evolution of organic food into safely commercialized "yuppie chow" (Guthman

2007). But even at a time when organic was still more movement than market, the *OGF*'s 1969 shift points to a form of collective protest in which the most important act of participation is to make deliberate, politically informed decisions about one's individual purchases. For movements that combine the personal and political in this way, it is particularly important to understand the character and sources of the standards of evaluation that guide those purchasing decisions. For the consumers who swelled the ranks of *OGF* readers from 1969 into the early 1970s, these standards came above all from the counterculture and New Left.

Tactics

One final area where we can see the effects of cultural modeling in these two food movements concerns their tactical repertoires. The key difference is simply that the organic movement, particularly its producer wing, included state-centered strategies to bring about change. The main goals were to win government (state or federal) certification of "organic" and tighter regulation of agricultural chemicals (Guthman 2004; Nowacek 1997). Organizers like Rodale were clear that the state was, or should be, a resource for the movement. He complained as early as 1963 about the USDA's limited power to block the use of harmful pesticides (*OGF* August 1963:19). By contrast, neither the writings of Graham and Alcott nor letters from their followers suggest that government was seen as a useful ally in dietary reform.

The contrast surely owes something to economic conditions. By the late 1960s, problems in the U.S. food supply were national in scope and thoroughly bound up with federal agricultural policy. In this setting, local and voluntary measures to change eating habits were not enough. But in advocating for new agencies, new laws, and new policies to promote alternative agriculture, organic producers were also influenced by the environmental and consumer rights movements. The former was establishing a track record for taking legal action against environmental harms; the latter supplied a similar model for political strategy but also a language of rights that organic advocates put to use (including the "right to know" and corresponding calls for improved labeling of food). And while state-centered tactics may have been over-determined in the organic movement, it is not as obvious why Grahamites would have eschewed such tactics. Other kinds of food reformers at this time, notably opponents of "swill milk," were beginning to demand protective laws at the municipal level (Egan 2005). Here again, the larger evangelical revival modeled a different approach: it put salvation squarely in the hands of each individual, a matter of free choice. And what was true for one's eternal soul was no less true for one's digestion: purging harmful foods from one's diet and continuing to follow Graham's advice required an act of personal will, not a change in government policy. If enough dietary sinners converted, no more would be needed to improve community morals (Walters 1997; Whorton 1982). This contrast and the other main differences between Grahamites and organic advocates are summarized in Table I.

Conclusion

Grahamites and organic advocates were responding to similar kinds of problems in the food system. In both eras, newly extended food commodity chains and new methods of manufacturing food created problems of trust: what you were eating might not be as it appeared, and it might even harm you. In both eras, critics identified these problems and offered natural alternatives—ones that would benefit the individual consumer and the wider community. Moreover, in their rhetoric and in the institutions they constructed, the two sets of reformers offered some similar alternatives to the food system and the scientific establishments that backed it.

For the most part, then, the character of "grievances" does not explain the differences we find between the two cases. I have argued that a better starting point combines accounts

Table 1 • Summary of Major Differences between Grahamites (1830s) and Organic Advocates (1960s–70s)

	<i>Grahamites</i>	<i>Organic Advocates</i>
Meaning of “natural”	Conforming to God’s law	Uncorrupted by technology and social conventions
Evaluation of personal and social change		
personal ideals	Redemption through personal self-discipline	Liberation through alternative production and consumption
social ideals	Pre-capitalist patriarchy vs. commercial city; middle-class respectability vs. improvident poor and frivolous rich	Democratic participation vs. corporate and technocratic control; yeoman independence vs. middle-class conformism
connecting personal and social	Public confession and conversion	The personal is the political
Tactics	Personal responsibility in dietary choices	Mix of state-centered strategies and consumption-based strategies

of social movement diffusion and of cultural transposition to consider how institutions and movements in other fields may provide models for activists’ framing of issues, identification of goals, and choice of tactics. This theoretical combination calls attention to mechanisms, sources, and conditions of diffusion that have been understudied in the social movement literature. In most studies of social movement diffusion, activists are seen to directly imitate or learn from the tactics, organizational devices, and framing strategies of their counterparts in other protest sites or other movements. Transposition involves, instead, the borrowing of more general cultural scripts and the application of these scripts to specific problems at hand. It is a process that requires, first of all, recognition of a problem or problems as like others that might normally be considered incommensurable. The sources of transposition, accordingly, may be more wide-ranging than we see in the diffusion literature. They may include movements in more remote fields of action or institutions that are not movements at all, and which would not ordinarily be regarded as appropriate models for collective identities, frames, and the like. What is drawn from these culturally more distant movements and institutions, furthermore, may be not specific tactics or frames but standards for evaluating worth and criteria for constructing social boundaries. Thinking in terms of transposition also calls attention to conditions of diffusion that might otherwise be missed. In studies of social movement diffusion, scholars typically look for networks that tie together activists in similar social categories (fraternities that link black students across campuses, for example, or churches that link Polish workers across factories). Adding transposition to our analyses draws attention to career paths, networks, and organizations that help activists bridge movements and institutions of different types, crossing logics of appropriateness.

Applying this expanded framework to Grahamites and organic advocates, I have argued that the former drew mainly from evangelical churches and temperance reform, and the latter mainly from environmentalism, the New Left, and the counterculture. All manner of ties, including overlapping activist careers, common social networks, and bridging organizations linked food reformers to these institutions and movements. The cultural scripts carried over from these institutions and movements, in turn, can account for many of the differences between Grahamites and organic advocates—in their religious framing of dietary choices, their democratizing impulse, their conception of the relationship between personal change and social reform, their boundary work, and their tactical choices. There is no reason to assume that key actors in either case were self-conscious and instrumental in applying generally familiar tropes to the specific issues of food and diet. Deliberate or not, cultural modeling helps explain the divergent paths taken by these two movements.

This line of argument might be seen as applying a fresh theoretical gloss on an old-fashioned plea: social movement scholars should take historical context more seriously, rather than disaggregating movements into ahistorical constituent mechanisms. That latter approach has its value for developing tentative generalizations about “the dynamics of contention” (McAdam et al. 2001). We can identify in my two cases, as in many others, generic mechanisms of grievance construction, identity formation, etc. But owing to their generic character, these mechanisms provide little leverage for causal analysis of historical differences. For that purpose, it makes more sense to explore how historically specific cultural models can steer comparable movements in different directions. There is an additional payoff from taking this approach when the movements at hand are cases of what scholars dub political consumerism (Micheletti 2003; Micheletti et al. 2004). Where the movement is composed of individual consumption choices and there is little in the way of formal organization or leadership to coordinate activism, how do we account for the apparent coherence with which participants make their decisions and endow them with some common political meaning? For devotees of Graham’s dietary regime and early supporters of organic agriculture, at least part of the answer may be found in a consistent application to the dilemmas of safe and healthy eating of standards of evaluation and cultural models rooted in other fields.

References

- Alcott, William A., ed. 1835–1836. *The Moral Reformer and Teacher on the Human Condition*. Boston: Light and Horton.
- , ed. 1837–1842. *The Library of Health and Teacher on the Human Constitution*. Boston: George W. Light.
- . 1859. *Forty Years in the Wilderness of Pills and Powders; or, The Cogitations and Confessions of an Aged Physician*. Boston: J.P. Jewett.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. and Michael Biggs. 2006. “The Dynamics of Protest Diffusion: Movement Organizations, Social Networks, and News Media in the 1960 Sit-Ins.” *American Sociological Review* 71:752–77.
- Belasco, Warren J. 1999. “Food and the Counterculture: A Story of Bread and Politics.” Pp. 273–92 in *Food in Global History*, edited by R. Grew. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- . 2007. *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry, 1966–1988*. 2d ed. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Billings, Dwight. 1990. “Religion as Opposition: A Gramscian Analysis.” *American Journal of Sociology* 96:1–31.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boyer, Paul. 1978. *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820–1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Braunstein, Peter and Michael William Doyle, eds. 2002. *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ’70s*. New York: Routledge.
- Breines, Wini. 1982. *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal*. New York: Praeger.
- Brissett, Dennis and Lionel S. Lewis. 1978. “The Natural Health Food Movement: A Study of Revitalization and Conversion.” *Journal of American Culture* 1:61–76.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1997. *The People’s Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. and James M. Cook. 1999. “Politics and Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:441–66.
- Cole, Edith Walters. 1975. “Sylvester Graham, Lecturer on the Science of Human Life: The Rhetoric of a Dietary Reformer.” Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Conford, Philip. 2001. *The Origins of the Organic Movement*. Edinburgh: Floris Books.
- Cox, Craig. 1994. *Storefront Revolution: Food Co-Ops and the Counterculture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Danhof, Clarence H. 1969. *Change in Agriculture; The Northern United States, 1820–1870*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- della Porta, Donatella and Dieter Rucht. 1995. “Left-Libertarian Movements in Context: A Comparison of Italy and West Germany, 1965–1990.” Pp. 229–72 in *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*, edited by C. Jenkins and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- della Porta, Donatella and Lorenzo Mosca. 2007. “In Movimento: ‘Contamination’ in Action and the Italian Global Justice Movement.” *Global Networks* 7(1):1–27.
- della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow. 2005. “Transnational Processes and Social Activism: An Introduction.” Pp. 1–20 in *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, edited by D. della Porta and S. Tarrow. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- DeSoucey, Michaela and Isabelle Téhoueyres. 2009. “Virtue and Valorization: ‘Local Food’ in the United States and France.” Pp. 81–95 in *The Globalization of Food*, edited by D. Inglis and D. Gimlin. Oxford: Berg.
- DiMaggio, Paul. 1992. “Cultural Boundaries and Structural Change: The Extension of the High Culture Model to Theater, Opera, and the Dance, 1900–1940.” Pp. 21–57 in *Cultivated Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1997. “Culture and Cognition.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:263–87.
- DuPuis, E. Melanie. 2007. “Angels and Vegetables: A Brief History of Food Advice in America.” *Gastronomica* 7:34–44.
- Earl, Jennifer. 2010. “The Dynamics of Protest-Related Diffusion on the Web.” *Information, Communication and Society* 13:209–25.
- Edgington, Ryan H. 2008. “‘Be Receptive to the Good Earth’: Health, Nature, and Labor in Countercultural Back-to-the-Land Settlements.” *Agricultural History* 82:279–308.
- Egan, Michael. 2005. “Organizing Protest in the Changing City: Swill Milk and Social Activism in New York City, 1842–1864.” *New York History* 86(3):205–25.
- Faler, Paul G. 1981. *Mechanics and Manufacturers in the Early Industrial Revolution: Lynn, Massachusetts, 1780–1860*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, William Anthony Gamson, Jurgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferrières, Madeleine. 2006. *Sacred Cow, Mad Cow: A History of Food Fears*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Flandrin, Jean-Louis and Massimo Montanari. 1999. *Food: A Culinary History from Antiquity to the Present*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Friedland, Roger and Robert R. Alford. 1991. “Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions.” Pp. 232–63 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by W. Powell and P. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fromartz, Samuel. 2006. *Organic, Inc.: Natural Foods and How They Grew*. Orlando: Harcourt.
- Ganz, Marshall. 2000. “Resources and Resourcefulness: Strategic Capacity in the Unionization of California Agriculture, 1959–1966.” *American Journal of Sociology* 105:1003–62.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1968. *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gilkeson, John S., Jr. 1986. *Middle-Class Providence, 1820–1940*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Goldstein, Michael S. 1992. *The Health Movement: Promoting Fitness in America*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Goldstein, Richard. 2008. “Earl L. Butz, Agriculture Secretary Forced Out by Comments, Dies at 98.” *New York Times*, February 4, p. A21.
- Goodman, David and Michael Goodman. 2007. “Localism, Livelihoods, and the ‘Post-Organic’: Changing Perspectives on Alternative Food Networks in the United States.” Pp. 23–38 in *Constructing Alternative Food Geographies: Representation and Practice*, edited by D. Maye, L. Holloway, and M. Kneafsey. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Goody, Jack. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine, and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham Journal of Health and Longevity (GJHL)*. 1837–1839.
- Graham, Sylvester. 1834. *The Aesculapian Tablets of the Nineteenth Century*. Providence, RI: Weeden and Cory.

- . 1837. *Treatise on Bread and Bread-Making*. Boston: Light and Stearns.
- . 1839. *Lectures on the Science of Human Life*. Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon, and Webb.
- Griswold, Wendy. 1987. "The Fabrication of Meaning: Literary Interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:1077–117.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1963. *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- . 1992. "Nature's Body and the Metaphors of Food." Pp. 75–103 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guthman, Julie. 2004. *Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2007. "From the Ground Up: California Organics and the Making of 'Yuppie Chow'." Pp. 241–54 in *Alternative Food Geographies: Representation and Practice*, edited by D. Maye, L. Holloway, and M. Kneafsey. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Haber, Barbara. 2002. *From Hardtack to Home Fries: An Uncommon History of American Cooks and Meals*. New York: Free Press.
- Haedicke, Michael Anthony. 2008. "Adapting to Contradiction: Competing Models of Organization in the United States Organic Foods Industry." Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, San Diego.
- Hartman, Stephanie. 2003. "The Political Palate: Reading Commune Cookbooks." *Gastronomica* 3:29–40.
- Hatch, Nathan O. 1989. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Haveman, Heather A., Hayagreeva Rao, and Srikanth Paruchuri. 2007. "The Winds of Change: The Progressive Movement and the Bureaucratization of Thrift." *American Sociological Review* 72:117–42.
- Haydu, Jeffrey. 2002. "Business Citizenship at Work: Cultural Transposition and Class Formation in Cincinnati, 1870–1910." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:1424–67.
- Heimer, Carol A. and Lisa R. Staffen. 1998. *For the Sake of the Children: The Social Organization of Responsibility in the Hospital and the Home*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hodgson, Godfrey. 1976. *America In Our Time*. New York: Vintage.
- Hurt, R. Douglas. 1994. *American Agriculture: A Brief History*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, Paul. 1986. "Drinking, Temperance, and the Construction of Identity in Nineteenth-Century America." *Social Science Information* 25(2):521–30.
- Johnson, Paul E. 1978. *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815–1837*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Johnson, Victoria. 2009. "The Status of Identities: Racial Inclusion and Exclusion at West Coast Ports." *Social Movement Studies* 8:167–83.
- Johnston, Josée and Shyon Baumann. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Kamp, David. 2006. *The United States of Arugula: The Sun-Dried, Cold-Pressed, Dark-Roasted, Extra Virgin Story of the American Food Revolution*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 16:57–85.
- Lamont, Michèle. 2009. *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle and Laurent Thévenot. 2000. "Introduction: Toward a Renewed Comparative Cultural Sociology." Pp. 1–24 in *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*, edited by M. Lamont and L. Thévenot. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167–95.
- Lappé, Frances Moore. 1975. *Diet for a Small Planet*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Larkin, Jack. 1988. *The Reshaping of Everyday Life, 1790–1840*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lavin, Chad. 2009. "The Year of Eating Politically." *Theory and Event* 12(2). Retrieved April 14, 2011 (http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v012/12.2.lavin.html).
- Le Duc, Thomas H. 1839. "Grahamites and Garrisonites." *New York History* 37:190–91.

- Levenstein, Harvey. 2003. *Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lexier, Roberta. 2008. "The New Left: Legacy and Continuity." *Labour/Le Travail* 62 (Fall):256–58.
- Marx, Leo. 1964. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. London: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1995. "'Initiator' and 'Spin-Off' Movements: Diffusion Processes in Protest Cycles." Pp. 217–39 in *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*, edited by M. Traugott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McAdam, Doug and Dieter Rucht. 1993. "The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 528(July):56–74.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McGrath, Maria. 2004. "'That's Capitalism, Not a Co-Op': Countercultural Idealism and Business Realism in 1970s U.S. Food Co-Ops." *Business and Economic History On-Line* 2:1–14.
- . 2006. "Recipes for a New World: Utopianism and Alternative Eating in Vegetarian Natural-Foods Cookbooks, 1970–84." Pp. 162–83 in *Eating in Eden: Food and American Utopias*, edited by E. M. Mad-den and M. L. Finch. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- McMillian, John. 2006. "Locating the New Left." *Reviews in American History* 34(4):551–56.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mertig, Angela G., Riley E. Dunlap, and Denton E. Morrison. 2000. "The Environmental Movement in the United States." Pp. 448–81 in *Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, edited by R. E. Dunlap and W. Michelson. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Meyer, David S. and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41:277–98.
- Micheletti, Michele. 2003. *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Micheletti, Michele, Adreas Follesdal, and Dietlind Stolle, eds. 2004. *Politics, Products, and Markets: Exploring Political Consumerism Past and Present*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Miller, Timothy. 2002. "The Sixties-Era Communes." Pp. 327–51 in *Imagine Nation: The American Counter-culture of the 1960s and '70s*, edited by P. Braunstein and M. W. Doyle. New York: Routledge.
- Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. "The Sequencing of Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 62:779–99.
- Mische, Ann. 2008. *Partisan Publics: Communication and Contention across Brazilian Youth Activist Networks*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mother Earth News, The*. 1970–1975.
- Nepstad, Sharon Erickson and Clifford Bob. 2006. "When Do Leaders Matter? Hypotheses on Leadership Dynamics in Social Movements." *Mobilization* 11(1):1–22.
- Nissenbaum, Stephen. 1980. *Sex, Diet, and Debility in Jacksonian America: Sylvester Graham and Health Reform*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Noll, Mark A. 2002. *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nowacek, David. 1997. "The Organic Foods System from 1969–1996: A Defense of Associative Order and Democratic Control Over a Market." M.A. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Organic Gardening and Farming (OGF)*. 1960–1975.
- Pollan, Michael. 2006. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2002. *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Powell, Walter and Paul DiMaggio. 1991. "Introduction." Pp. 1–38 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by W. Powell and P. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reisner, Ann Elizabeth. 2001. "Social Movement Organizations' Reactions to Genetic Engineering in Agriculture." *American Behavioral Scientist* 44:1389–404.
- Rome, Adam. 2003. "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties." *Journal of American History* 90:525–54.
- Rossinow, Doug. 1997. "The New Left in the Counterculture: Hypotheses and Evidence." *Radical History Review* 67 (Winter):79–120.

- Schneiberg, Marc and Michael Lounsbury. 2008. "Social Movements and Institutional Analysis." Pp. 648–70 in *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, edited by R. Greenwood. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Schneirov, Matthew and Jonathan David Geczik. 1996. "A Diagnosis for Our Times: Alternative Health's Submerged Networks and the Transformation of Identities." *Sociological Quarterly* 37(4):627–44.
- Schwartz, Hillel. 1986. *Never Satisfied: A Cultural History of Diets, Fantasies, and Fat*. New York: Free Press.
- Scott, W. Richard. 2001. *Institutions and Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sellers, Charles. 1991. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sewell, William H., Jr. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1–29.
- Shah, Dhavan V., Douglas M. McLeod, Lewis Friedland, and Michelle R. Nelson. 2007. "The Politics of Consumption/The Consumption of Politics." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611 (May):6–15.
- Sisson, William. 1985. *Bell Hours: Work Values and Discipline in the American Textile Industry, 1787–1880*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Delaware, Newark, DE.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Skrentny, John D. 2006. "Policy-Elite Perceptions and Social Movement Success: Understanding Variations in Group Inclusion in Affirmative Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 111:1762–815.
- Slater, Dan. 2009. "Revolutions, Crackdowns, and Quiescence: Communal Elites and Democratic Mobilization in Southeast Asia." *American Journal of Sociology* 115:203–54.
- Slater, Don. 1997. *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, Jackie. 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." Pp. 133–55 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. D. Morris and C. M. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sokolow, Jayme A. 1983. *Eros and Modernization: Sylvester Graham, Health Reform, and the Origins of Victorian Sexuality in America*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Soule, Sarah A. 2004. "Diffusion Processes Within and across Movements." Pp. 294–310 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Steinberg, Marc W. 1999. *Fighting Words: Working-Class Formation, Collective Action, and Discourse in Early Nineteenth-Century England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Stevens, Mitchell L. 2001. *Kingdom of Children: Culture and Controversy in the Homeschooling Movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Strang, David and John W. Meyer. 1993. "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion." *Theory and Society* 22:487–511.
- Strang, David and Sarah A. Soule. 1998. "Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poison Pills." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:265–90.
- Stryker, Sheldon, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White, eds. 2000. *Self, Identity, and Social Movements. Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, v. 13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Swart, William J. 1995. "The League of Nations and the Irish Question: Master Frames, Cycles of Protest, and 'Master Frame Alignment'." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36:465–81.
- Szygiel, Bonj. 2003. "'City Beautiful' Revisited: An Analysis of Nineteenth-Century Civic Improvement Efforts." *Journal of Urban History* 29:107–32.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, Anna. 1972. *The Vegetarian Epicure*. New York: Knopf.
- Van Buren, Martin Cornelius. 1977. "The Indispensable God of Health: A Study of Republican Hygiene and the Ideology of William Alcott." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Walker, William B. 1955. "The Health Reform Movement in the United States, 1830–1870." Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.
- Wallace, Anthony F. C. 1972. *Rockdale: The Growth of an American Village in the Early Industrial Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Walters, Ronald G. 1997. *American Reformers, 1815–1860*. Rev. ed. New York: Hill and Wang.

- Whittier, Nancy. 2004. "The Consequences of Social Movement for Each Other." Pp. 531–51 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Whole Earth Catalog*. 1968–present.
- Whorton, James C. 1982. *Crusaders for Fitness: The History of American Health Reformers*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Woodhouse, Keith M. 2008. "The Politics of Ecology: Environmentalism and Liberalism in the 1960s." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 2:53–84.
- Young, Michael P. 2006. *Bearing Witness Against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.