

**Cultivating Connections:
The Urban Agriculture Movement
Megan Thom**

Abstract:

The people and practices involved in urban agriculture constitute a social movement that is actively reclaiming local control over food production and consumption. They are doing this by creating connections on three fundamental levels -- between people and the environment, people and people, and people within themselves. These connections have been severed by the linked processes of urbanization, industrialization, and the globalization of trade that distance us from the consequences of our consumption choices both individually and collectively. I argue that these connections must be revitalized if we are to achieve long-term food security that is both sustainable and equitable. To see how these connections function, I examine three examples urban agriculture projects: the City of Montreal's community gardens system in Quebec, the Rooftop Gardens Project in Montreal, Quebec, and guerilla gardening by the Toronto Public Space Committee in Ontario. This paper will argue that the urban agriculture movement is part of a broader contentious politics that is reclaiming connections with the people and places that sustain us.

Introduction: A View from the Roof

Every time I open the door to the roof, the green never fails to surprise me. The garden erupts with foliage, petals and fruit -- an unexpected oasis amid a sea of grey buildings. A crowd of volunteers appears, bedecked in sun hats of varying absurdity for protection on the shadeless roof. Peals of laughter and scraps of French and English conversations float across the roof as people of all ages and backgrounds work side by side, carefully tending the garden. Another volunteer appears with a large red backpack and a bicycle to bring the harvest to the kitchen. She leaves laden with peppers, eggplants, nasturtiums and chard, dodging through the Montreal traffic with her precious cargo.

From the familiar glow of red cherry tomatoes, to the outlandish purple blossoms of amaranth, this garden defies conventional definitions of what agriculture is and what rooftops should be used for. During the summer I spent working with the Rooftop Gardens Project of Montreal, I realized that much more is being grown on this roof than food. Through this and other urban agriculture projects, we are growing connections with each other, within ourselves, and with the plants and the ecosystem of which

we are a part. In the middle of the bustling urban center of Montreal, we are growing community.

Urban Agriculture: Roots and Connections

From senior citizens in municipal community gardens, to soil-less gardening on rooftops and guerilla sunflowers in sidewalk cracks, urban agriculture is becoming increasingly recognized as a significant force of food production and activism throughout the world. The set of practices known as “urban agriculture” constitutes a social movement that is actively reclaiming control over food production and consumption by creating connections between people and the environment, people and people, and people within themselves.

These practices are also part of a broader contentious politics that is reclaiming connections with the people and places that sustain us. While an understanding of urban agriculture as a social movement is useful, it is incomplete without also transcending that category to see the connections urban agriculturalists make with other social and political movements striving for similar connections that go far beyond food. Actions as diverse as urban agriculture, the anti-globalization movement, Community-Supported Agriculture (CSA), and public pillow fights all share this common focus of connection. It seems to me that the search for connection is a growing force in both urban and rural societies around the world. This mobilization demands close attention, and it cannot be understood by dividing it into its constituent parts.

This paper is a gesture toward this broad-based search for connection that is as yet (and perhaps always will be) amorphous. I have tried to gain some insight into this movement using urban agriculture as an entry point, and a way of exploring why connection is a form of contentious politics. I will root this analysis in urban agriculture projects in the Montreal, Quebec and Toronto, Ontario, and examine how these projects create connections between people and their environments, people and

people, and people and themselves. Finally, I will consider urban agriculture as a social movement and briefly explore the links between urban agriculture in Montreal and other enactments of this contentious politics of connections.

What is urban agriculture?

The term ‘urban agriculture’ is a convenient way to talk about the infinite different forms of cultivation that might fall under that category. Like any term that encompasses a wide diversity of practices under one name, different people draw different lines of what is included and excluded. The current definition that is most widely accepted by international organizations like the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is:

Urban agriculture is an industry located within (intra-urban) or on the fringe (peri-urban) of a town, a city or a metropolis, which grows and raises, processes and distributes a diversity of food and non-food products, (re-)using largely human and material resources, products and services found in and around that urban area, and in turn supplying human and material resources, products and services largely to that urban area (Mougeot 2).

This definition is a good attempt at encompassing the wide diversity of practices known as urban agriculture. However, I would disagree with its categorization as an “industry.” For the purposes of this paper I understand urban agriculture as those practices of cultivation that take place within and on the fringes of urban areas. This could include an urban agriculture industry, but it also encompasses cultivation as subsistence farming, community service, and political resistance. I will focus primarily on urban food production, although I recognize that many other forms of urban gardening are equally valuable and can also create connections between people and their environment, their communities, and themselves.

I also recognize that the boundaries between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ are increasingly blurred through urbanization and urban sprawl. Urban agriculture itself confounds this division by bringing

traditionally 'rural' practices and scenes into the urban -- coaxing the rural out of its forgotten soil in the city. As guerrilla gardeners in Toronto said, urban agriculture transforms "both the landscape and the idea of what belongs in a city" (Toronto Public Space Committee n.p).

Urban agriculture is practiced globally by people of all economic classes, cultures, ethnicities, and situations. It is estimated to supply roughly 15% of the world's food, with an estimated 800 million people involved in the early 1990s (Mougeot 4). I would estimate this number is higher today because of the difficulty of measuring informal cultivation, and the increasing numbers of people in the global North engaging in urban agriculture. These statistics alone indicate that urban agriculture involves large enough numbers of people to constitute a social movement. But numbers alone do not make a social movement; a movement must also mobilize resources, engage in shifting public consciousness, and most importantly, engage in contentious political struggle with dominant forces. A more in-depth description of urban agriculture as a social movement will follow, but first we must examine the question of how and when practices that were simply part of daily subsistence became contentious politics.

Connection as Contention

The world is becoming increasingly urbanized, with almost half the world's population living in cities (FAO n.p.). This is a result of the linked processes of migration of rural people seeking employment in cities, and the expansion of cities into rural areas. At the same time, agriculture has become industrialized and monopolized by large 'agribusiness' corporations that rely on monoculture crops, chemical fertilizers and biocides, and the mechanization of cultivation and processing. Small farms are increasingly unable to compete in the globalized industrial trade that agriculture has become. Food produced with expensive chemical and mechanical inputs is now cheaper than organic crops, and

apples from New Zealand are easier to find and less expensive than local apples. People in both rural and urban areas are losing their control over, and connection to, the sources of their food.

With the industrialization of agriculture came the commodification of the food chain, including human beings. In the global agricultural system, the human body is reduced to a mere source of energy (labour) and profit (as consumers). As American farmer and writer Wendell Berry said, the human body has become merely “a conduit which channels the nutrients of the earth from the supermarket to the sewer” (Berry 136). Our relationships to the food we eat and the people and land that produce it are increasingly distanced. This lack of connection is enabling environmental and social exploitation on a massive scale.

Ecologically, practices such as intensive tillage, monocultures (large cultivations of a single species), chemical fertilizers and biocides, large-scale irrigation, and genetic engineering have been found to degrade soil structure and nutrients, pollute and deplete water sources, interfere with nutrient cycling, have adverse affects on the habitat requirements of native species, and reduce biodiversity (Hebda 206-207).[\[1\]](#) Industrial agriculture is also frequently socially exploitative, with low-waged, unsafe working conditions, long hours, and adverse health impacts associated with chemical use.[\[2\]](#) The social and ecological costs of how we choose to feed ourselves are distanced as “externalities,” rather than issues in which we are implicated.

I am not proposing that we go back to some nostalgic idea of rural life and self-sufficiency; we can never go back, and most people would not want to if we could. The question then becomes, how do we feed ourselves in socially and ecological sustainable ways?[\[3\]](#) I would argue that one way to pursue this goal is by reconnecting with the people and places we rely on for our everyday needs. If we reclaim interdependence and connection, we may come to experience the exploitation of others as also damaging to ourselves. The creation of connections in urban agriculture is an act of resistance against

the economic and industrial systems that divide us from the consequences of our actions. It is one way of taking responsibility for our actions and control of the processes that sustain us.

Cultivating Connections in Montreal

Urban agriculture creates connections on three main levels: between people and their environments, between people and other people, and within individuals. I will now look at two urban agriculture initiatives in Montreal, Quebec to see how these connections are being enacted. Specifically, I will examine the system of community gardens administered by the City of Montreal, and the Rooftop Gardens Project run by Alternatives and the Santropol Roulant, two Montreal-based NGOs. I will also look at urban guerilla gardening, but here I must turn to Toronto for an example. While guerilla gardening is practiced in Montreal, its generally covert nature makes information on those actions difficult to find. I will therefore limit my comments to a brief examination of guerilla gardening in general, using the Toronto Public Space Committee as an illustration.

From City Hall to City Soil: Municipal Community Gardens

The City of Montreal has one of the most well-established systems of community gardens in the world. These community gardens are primarily allotment gardens in which residents can pay \$5.00 per year for a plot of land. The city sends advertisements for garden membership in monthly hydro bills, and the waiting list is long enough to fill 12 new gardens (Cosgrove n.p.). Roughly 1.5% of Montreal's population (27 000 people) are involved with a community garden. A majority of the gardeners are 55 and over, and many gardeners are from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, with a majority of neither anglophone nor francophone members in eight gardens (Cosgrove n.p.).

The system was born out of the guerilla gardening of Portuguese and Italian immigrants

growing food in vacant lots in the early 1970s. The city began to regulate these activities, and developed a program to establish and maintain community gardens in 1985 (Cosgrove n.p.). Mountainside Community Garden provides an example of the typical municipally-supported garden in Montreal. The City's Department of Recreation and Community Development currently pays for the costs of establishing and maintaining the garden, including fencing, tool sheds, wood for plot borders, water, and electricity. The City also provides a "horticultural animator" to provide gardening advice on regular visits. Like many of the community gardens, Mountainside is zoned as parkland for full protection, and it has a long-term, five-year lease (Cosgrove n.p.).

As a result of this city support, community gardens in Montreal largely avoid the problems of land tenure and financial and personnel instability common to community gardens. Also because of this support, gardeners must follow city regulations on how to administer the gardens, allocate plots, and growing regulations such as the specification that all produce must be organic. These municipal community gardeners thus trade financial and legal constraints for the constraints of gardening in an institutional system. This is a trade that many people are happy to make, and proves that working within governmental structures is an important part of the urban agriculture movement.

The Montreal community gardens are creating connection on the three levels of environment, community, and individuals. First, the people who grow and eat the food in the gardens are finding space in one of Canada's largest cities to engage with their environment. Through the process of cultivating plants, gardeners are forced into deeper awareness of, and relationships with, the natural forces of soil conditions, wind, rain, sun, seeds, and climatic changes. They are engaging in a direct interaction with their environment to produce the most basic of human needs. In addition, humans may become more aware of the ecological benefits of urban agriculture, such as cleaner air quality, climate cooling in the summer, and run-off absorption.

Second, the community gardens are exactly that -- communities of people building relationships across age, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic lines through working together and the common interest of gardening. The gardens provide an avenue for people to connect to each other, to form communities of growers and eaters, and to combat the anomie, or social isolation, that can come with urban life. This is especially important for people migrating to cities from rural areas with smaller, more integrated social networks. However, it is equally vital to those urban dwellers who never knew their neighbours, let alone how brussel sprouts grow.

Third, community gardens help create internal connections in people's mental and physical health. On the purely physical level, the exercise of gardening and being outside is invaluable to urban residents. However, growing food also forms a deeper connection of the mind to the body, as the body may become seen not just as a consumer, but also as a valued actor in the cycle of production and reproduction. There is a deeper psychological empowerment that many people experience when they make plants grow. I believe this comes from being responsible for the growth and well-being of a living thing, the empowerment of taking control of one's food source, and the benefits of connection to people and place.

This sense of empowerment was highlighted in a brochure on urban agriculture published by the City of Montreal with Les Partenaires pour le Développement de la Sécurité Alimentaire (Partners for the Development of Food Security), a group of governmental committees, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the University of Montreal:

In becoming aware of this power, the gardeners return to their role as citizens, they become actors in the city again. What is this power? That of sharing, that of making decisions that will have an impact on the group, the power to get involved in community groups in the neighbourhood, the power to intervene in the urban landscape, to leave one's mark there, that of consuming differently, the power to help and that of seeking help... (Partenaires pour le développement de la sécurité alimentaire 4, trans. mine). [\[4\]](#)

Whether this empowerment is framed inside or outside the discourse of people as citizens, this form of individual and collective empowerment is vital to creating and strengthening the threefold connections of people and place that I see as the heart of urban agriculture and related movements of connection. I will now turn to another, non-governmental, example of how urban agriculture initiatives are creating connections in Montreal.

From Roof to Mouth: Alternatives and the Santropol Roulant

Alternatives and the Santropol Roulant are two non-governmental organizations who have come together to create the Rooftop Gardens Project (RGP). The RGP maintains gardens on six roofs and terraces in Montreal and Quebec City. The gardens provide food for two meals-on-wheels programs, sites for educational programs for children, horticultural therapy opportunities for seniors, and a place for volunteers to gain skills, make friends and celebrate the possibilities of urban agriculture.

As well as creating local connections, the RGP connects urban agriculture practitioners around the world. Alternatives, an international development organization, facilitates connections and knowledge exchanges with partner urban gardeners in Senegal, Morocco, Mexico, South Africa and Cuba (Alternatives et al. n.p.). Inspired by these international partners, the RGP experiments with new techniques of urban agriculture, including soil-less hydroponic growing and self-watering container gardening. This experimentation and exchange will help spread the manifold benefits of rooftop gardens around the world.

As well as the social benefits of food production and building connections, rooftop gardens have many ecological benefits, such as cleaner air quality through plant respiration and absorption of gases and the filtering of pollutants in rainwater. They also create wildlife habitat, decrease temperatures in the summer through absorption and respiration, and insulate the building in the winter

(Nowak 11-14).

The organic produce grown by volunteers in the main demonstration garden on the roof of a building of the Université de Québec à Montréal is prepared and distributed through the Santropol Roulant's meals-on-wheels program to Montreal residents living with loss of autonomy. This program provides up to 90 meals every day, 6 days a week, 52 weeks a year (the garden produce must be supplemented to meet that demand) (Santropol Roulant n.p.). The meals are delivered by primarily young volunteers to largely elderly recipients. The program focuses on the inter-generational, intercultural, and inter-linguistic relationships that form among the participants of the program, from the gardeners, to the cooks, to the delivery volunteers and the recipients. The RGP also established a vermicomposting system in the basement of the Santropol Roulant to transform the kitchen scraps into compost that will return the food's nutrients to the garden, creating a closed loop social and ecological cycle.

The RGP receives funding from a variety of governmental sources, including the Public Health Agency of Canada, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Environment Canada, the City of Montreal, and the International Development Research Centre (Hill pers.com.). While there are always some constraints that come with governmental funding, the project is maintained and administered independently by Alternatives and the Santropol Roulant.

This project creates the same kinds of threefold connections explored in the municipal community gardens. Relationships are formed among all the people involved in the projects, and those people reconnect to and reclaim their food sources at the same time. Even though the garden cannot produce enough food for the program all year round, the connections are made among people, and to the place and natural systems that provide their nourishment. The RGP is also actively involved in connecting to other urban agriculture initiatives in Montreal through membership in the Community

and Collective Garden Network and a newly formed food policy group, as well as supporting five other groups in their own urban agriculture projects (Hill pers.com.). Through these connections, food becomes more than a commodity grown in anonymous places by anonymous people. The act of growing food empowers, and the sharing of food, labour, and knowledge brings people together across age, linguistic, cultural, ethnic, economic, and institutional divides.

From Sidewalk to Sunflower: Guerilla Gardening

No analysis of urban agriculture as a social movement would be complete without guerilla gardening, for which I must turn to examples from other cities for the reasons discussed earlier. Guerilla gardening uses the cultivation of plants in both public and private spaces as a form of direct political action. This is a more consciously political incarnation of the informal urban gardening that people have been practicing for centuries. Guerilla gardening actions can range from informal groups planting seeds on traffic islands to mass activist plantings in Parliament Square in London or on the B.C. Legislature lawn.

The Toronto Public Space Committee is one of the best organized guerilla gardening networks in North America. Their website offers lists of native plants of Toronto, as well as the contact information of gardening coordinators for the four main areas of the city. The committee emphasizes the political nature of planting as a means of reclaiming public space, and pursues a variety of other actions against the privatization and commercialization of public spaces, such as lobbying city hall on bylaws and encouraging the removal of chain link fences. Coordinator Lindsay Kelly states, “It’s [guerilla gardening is] a subtle way of protesting public space being privatized and of demanding advertisers remove their mark from space that was meant for the people” (Cowan n.p.). Their website proclaims,

Join us as we vandalise the city with nature! ... Guerilla Gardening aims to reclaim those dismal corners and neglected breaks in concrete with sunflowers and morning glories, transforming both the landscape and the idea of what belongs in a city (Toronto Public Space Committee n.p).

This idea of urban space as the object and location of struggle between capitalist consumption and people is not unique to guerilla gardeners. Henri Lefebvre asserted that space is “an object of political struggle because space is an instrument of control by the state” (Katznelson qtd. Parker 22). In this case, it is the state and its complicity with capitalism that is reshaping urban space in ways that guerilla gardeners are quietly resisting. Lefebvre highlights capitalist production relations and the ways in which “spatial practice regulates life” (Parker 23). He examines the fragmentation of urban space and the consequent devaluing of public space:

There are two ways in which urban space tends to be sliced up, degraded and eventually destroyed by this contradictory process: the proliferation of fast roads and of places to park and garage cars, and their corollary, a reduction of tree-lined streets, green spaces, and parks, and gardens. The contradiction lies, then, in the clash between a consumption of space which produces surplus value and one which produces only enjoyment – and is therefore ‘unproductive’ ... (Lefebvre qtd. Parker 23).

As cities are fractured by narrow, capitalist definitions of productivity, urban farmers and other activists are reclaiming space for “unproductive” uses, like growing food and having fun. They are transforming “the idea of what belongs in a city” to go beyond such narrow definitions of productivity and value.

Whether through government, NGOs, or decentralized anarchist actions of civil disobedience, urban agriculture is transforming the urban landscape in physical and conceptual ways. These actions are challenging the structures and systems of capitalist exchange, consumerism, and urban ‘development’ by reclaiming the spaces in which people can connect to the environment, to each other, and to themselves. Just one calendula flower in the pavement can remind us of the soil upon which the

city is built. A whole garden can allow urban residents to form relationships with that soil and each other through collective and individual connections.

The Urban Agriculture Movement

With this understanding of how urban agriculture creates connections and why connection is contentious, acts of growing food in community gardens, on roofs, and in sidewalk cracks can come to be seen as a social movement and a movement of political contention. Millions of people around the world are part of this movement to reclaim control of their food, and recreate connections with the environment, other people, and themselves.

Urban agriculture fits into three of the main defining conditions of contemporary social movement theory: resource mobilization, consciousness raising, and sustained contention with dominant powers (Tarrow 4). First, the urban agriculture movement has millions of participants in a wide variety of geographic, economic, and social locations. Not all of these people would identify themselves as members of a social movement, but I would argue that by engaging in urban agriculture individually and in groups, these people are all implicitly enacting a contentious politics of connection.

These people mobilize substantial financial, ecological, and human resources to support these practices that provide 15% of the world's food. These resources come from everywhere from international organizations like the United Nations, to national and municipal governments, to community and guerilla gardening initiatives. Urban agriculture engages in resource mobilization both within and outside conventional governmental structures of funding and institutions. If the ultimate measure of a social movement's success is its adoption into stable institutions, then urban agriculture has already succeeded on many fronts. However, this could also be seen as cooptation and is resisted by yet other practices in the 'movement,' such as the guerilla gardeners mentioned above. This is a

testament to the diversity of the urban agriculture movement, and to the analytical inadequacy of viewing it as a unified social movement.

Second, urban agriculture engages in a significant degree of consciousness-raising. This is particularly true in North America and Europe, where urban agriculture is generally practiced less out of necessity and more out of the desire to reshape and reclaim urban space. Many urban agriculture groups explicitly focus on education in the hope of encouraging more people to grow their own food and sensitizing them to issues associated with the current food system. Urban agriculture can be an extremely effective tool for consciousness-raising because it is so tangible. The act of growing tomatoes can be more transformative than any number of speeches or pamphlets.

Third, urban agriculture engages in sustained collective contention with the dominant power structures of industrialized agriculture, globalized agricultural trade, and the capitalist commodification of food and the people that eat it. As I have already argued, the act of growing food is a radically political reclamation of the connections between individuals and communities, and communities and the land that sustains them. It is also important to note, however, that there are many ways of creating these connections; an analysis of “the urban agriculture movement” would be incomplete without an examination of other related actions working towards similar goals of resistance and connection.

Conclusion: A Politics of Global and Local Connections

Urban agriculture is part of a much broader mobilization of activities centered on the common goal of connection on at least one of the three levels examined above: humans and the environment, humans and humans, and humans and themselves.

Just a few examples of these activities and activisms include: the “anti-globalization movement,” Community-Supported Agriculture (CSA), the environmentalist movement, organic food, slow food,

slow education, alternative economic systems, dumpster diving, culture jamming, Reclaiming the Streets, participatory democracy, cooperatives and public pillow fights. “Urban agriculture” connects with established social movements like environmentalism, emerging social movements like the “anti-globalization” movement, and this plethora of other actions and initiatives around the globe.

These actions and the connections between them go far beyond the confines of “a social movement.” These actions form part of a global political mobilization of people reconnecting to their local environments, and forming connections with those people and places around the world upon whom we depend. Fundamentally, these actions are about people reclaiming control over their lives, their environments, and their communities in the face of industrialization, corporate control, urbanization, and consumerism. They are about understanding the role we play and the connections we have in this global system, and claiming the power to enact those connections differently.

I believe the relationships formed between all these different actions working for connection may be one indication of what R.B.J. Walker calls “a politics of connections” (Walker 699). Like this broad mobilization, “a politics of connections” is amorphous and undefined. It gestures towards a politics where movements are not divided or united in “the politics of inclusions and exclusions, of the reconciliation of identities and differences, expressed by the modern territorial state” (Walker 699). Rather, a politics of connections transcends ideological and geographic boundaries. These actions are largely rooted in the local, but not constrained by it. Thus the main question when looking at these actions isn’t which movement are they part of, but how can we find new ways of living together? In the case of urban agriculture the question becomes, ‘how can we find new ways of living (and eating) together in cities?’

Urban residents are finding both new and old ways of answering these questions. Urban farmers are redefining their relationships with people and places by growing their own food in community

gardens, on rooftops, and in the streets. But these actions do not stop with food. Urban agriculture blends into movements like Reclaim the Streets, where people will have temporary gardens, block parties, pillow fights, or critical mass bike rallies in order to reshape urban space for people rather than cars and consumption. This rejection of the corporate frenzy of consumerist culture is mirrored by the Slow Food Movement and the spin-off 'Slow Education Movement,' both of which are redefining conceptions of how we should eat and learn. The "Anti-globalization Movement" is similarly resisting corporate control of globalized economies and cultures, while Community-Supported Agriculture (CSA) is linking people to local farmers in both rural and urban areas.

Through this brief sketch we can begin to see some of the links in this politics of connections. These and many other initiatives are working together to create the connections between people and place, people and people, and people and themselves that could help us understand how our actions affect the people and places we depend on, for our survival. Through a wide diversity of tactics, people are finding out how they are connected to the systems of global capital and consumerism, and creating alternative ways of enacting those connections. Urban agriculture is one effective way of planting those seeds of connection, and, together with these other mobilizations, they may make them grow to transform the urban, the rural, and everywhere in between.

Epilogue: Cultivating Dreams

At the end of the gardening session everyone gathers around the beat-up wooden picnic table to share what we accomplished that day. We walk around the garden, checking how much water was collected in the rain barrels during the last storm, tasting the odd golden pear tomato, admiring the new hydroponic experiment, and noting what needs to be done at the next session. We take the time to appreciate what everyone has contributed, and to recognize the value in what each person brings to the garden. We share food, conversation, and a common vision.

We imagine a city where every roof has a garden on it and everyone can taste a fresh tomato, ripened by the sun, that they grew themselves. We imagine a world in which we can reclaim connections to our communities, to ourselves, and to the ecosystems of which we are a part. We dream as we plant, and slowly that seedling is emerging from the soil, straining towards the sun, gaining strength, and becoming a reality.

Works Cited

- Alternatives Action and Communication Network for International Development. "International Rooftop Garden Projects." *The Rooftop Garden Project*. <<http://english.rooftopgardens.ca/?q=international&PHPSESSID=098e9ca946800b52f706511ee733023c>>. Accessed 1 April, 2006.
- Andreatta, Susan L. "Bananas, Are They the Quintessential Health Food? A Global/Local Perspective." McDonald, James H. (eds.) *Applied Anthropology Reader*. 56. 4, USA: Allyn & Bacon, 1997. pp. 437-449.
- Berry, Wendell. *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture*. San Francisco: Sierra Books, 1977.
- Cosgrove, Sean. "Montreal's Community Gardening Program" *Cities Feeding People: Urban Agriculture and City Planning in North and South*. Canada: International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 1994.
- Cowan, James. "Garden Rebels Say Sod it to Neglect." *National Post*. No bibliographic info avail. <<http://www.publicspace.ca/gardeners-post.htm>>. Accessed 5 April, 2006.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). "Programme Area: Urban and Peri-Urban Horticulture." *Crop and Grassland Service*. <<http://www.fao.org/ag/AGP/AGPC/doc/hort/hcprog2.htm>>. Accessed 2 April, 2006.
- Hebda, Richard and B. Beckwith. *ES 341 Course Readings*. Unpublished, 2005.
- Hill, Alex. Coordinator, Rooftop Garden Project. Email Communication. 6 April, 2006.
- Kimbrell, Andrew. *Fatal Harvest: The Tragedy of Industrial Agriculture*. USA: Foundation for Deep Ecology, 2002.
- Mougeot, Luc J.A. (ed.) *Agropolis: The Social, Political and Environmental Dimensions of Urban Agriculture*. Canada: International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 2005.
- Nowak, Michelle. *Urban Agriculture on the Rooftop*. Master's thesis, Cornell University. May 2004.

<http://www3.telus.net/public/a6a47567/roofgarden_thesis.pdf>. Accessed 23 March, 2006.

Les Partenaires pour le développement de la sécurité alimentaire. *Cultivons la Ville : Agriculture urbaine et la jardinage social Dossier 6, juin 2001*. <<http://www.santepub-mtl.qc.ca/Publication/pdfgestes/geste6.pdf>>. Accessed 2 April, 2006.

Parker, Simon. *Urban Theory and the Urban Experience: Encountering the City*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Santropol Roulant. "Our Programs." <<http://www.santropolroulant.org/en/programs.html>>. Accessed 1 April, 2006.

Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed. USA: Cambridge, 1998.

Toronto Public Space Committee. "Guerilla Gardening: Graffiti with Nature." <<http://www.publicspace.ca/gardeners.htm>>. Accessed 5 April, 2006.

Walker, R.B.J. "Social Movements/World Politics." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 23.3, 1994. 669-700.

[1] For more in-depth analysis of the effects of industrial agriculture, see Kimbrell, Andrew. *Fatal Harvest: The Tragedy of Industrial Agriculture*. Foundation for Deep Ecology, 2002; Berry, Wendell. *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture*. San Francisco: Sierra Books, 1977.

[2] For one example, see Andreatta, Susan L. "Bananas, Are They the Quintessential Health Food? A Global/Local Perspective." In McDonald, James H. (ed.) *Applied Anthropology Reader*. Vol. 56, no. 4. Allyn & Bacon, 1997. pp. 437-449.

[3] By "sustainable" I mean the ability to live on individual, community, and ecosystem levels without inhibiting the ability of other people and places, in both the present and the future, to meet their physical, psychological, and ecological needs for a healthy life.

[4] En prenant conscience de ce pouvoir, les jardiniers réintègrent leur rôle de citoyens, ils redeviennent acteurs de la cité. De quel pouvoir parle-t-on? Celui de partager, celui de prendre des décisions qui vont avoir un impact sur le groupe, le pouvoir de s'impliquer dans des groupes communautaires du quartier, le pouvoir d'intervenir sur le paysage urbain, d'y laisser sa marque, celui de consommer différemment, le pouvoir d'aider et celui d'aller chercher de l'aide... (Partenaires pour le développement de la sécurité alimentaire 4).