

2012

The Localism Movement: Shared and Emergent Values

Nancy B. Kurland

Franklin & Marshall College, nancy.kurland@fandm.edu

Sara Jane McCaffrey

Franklin & Marshall College, sarajane.mccaffrey@fandm.edu

Douglas H. Hill

Franklin & Marshall College, douglas.hill@fandm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.rit.edu/jes>



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#), and the [Environmental Design Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kurland, Nancy B.; McCaffrey, Sara Jane; and Hill, Douglas H. (2012) "The Localism Movement: Shared and Emergent Values," *Journal of Environmental Sustainability*. Vol. 2: Iss. 2, Article 6.

DOI: 10.14448/jes.02.0006

Available at: <https://repository.rit.edu/jes/vol2/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the RIT Libraries. For more information, please contact repository@rit.edu.

The Localism Movement: Shared and Emergent Values

Nancy B. Kurland
Franklin & Marshall College
nancy.kurland@fandm.edu

Sara Jane McCaffrey
Franklin & Marshall College
sarajane.mccaffrey@fandm.edu

Douglas H. Hill
Franklin & Marshall College
douglas.hill@fandm.edu

ABSTRACT

Localism, a movement to encourage consumers and businesses to purchase from locally owned, independent businesses rather than national corporations, has grown rapidly in the past decade. With several national, federated organizations and popular “buy local” campaigns, the localism movement has the potential to affect buying patterns, marketing, and distribution in American business. Yet localism remains understudied by researchers. This article, based on data from 38 interviews with localism leaders, identifies four of the movement’s priorities: independent ownership, local buying, local sourcing, and pragmatic partnering. In addition, we analyze the movement’s emerging values, including responsibility to workers and to the natural environment, and discuss the challenges these broader values present.

KEYWORDS

Localism Movement, Buy-Local Movement, Anti-Big Box

I. THE LOCALISM MOVEMENT: MAIN STREET TAKES ON THE MULTINATIONALS

In the wake of the “big-box revolution,” which shifted commerce from Main Street to suburban malls, business owners and activists have joined together to revitalize downtowns.¹

Localism, which urges consumers and businesses to purchase from locally owned, independent businesses, has spawned at least 11 national organizations. (See Table 1.) In this study, we focus on three of the largest organizations, all of which sport a federated structure. Together, these three organizations boast a total of 229 local

networks in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and four Canadian provinces, and represent 47,000 members, most of which are businesses.²

Localism has grown rapidly in the past decade.³ It is a primarily urban movement, promoting economic justice, environmental responsibility, and social fairness.⁴ Environmental responsibility is more central to the mission of some localism organizations than others and a motivation for some, but not all, of the movement’s activists.⁵ In aiming to shift consumption from national chains and Internet retailers to local, independently-owned firms, the movement asks people to reconsider their relationships with their employers, their merchants, their neighbors, and their natural environment.

What is localism? What is the organizational structure of the localism movement, and what consensus goals exist within it? How is localism related to the larger idea of community building, and

Organization	Website	Date Founded	About
3/50 Project	http://www.the350project.net/home.html	2009	Loosely organized. Gathers supporters (i.e., independent businesses) into a national buy-local network. Not to be confused with Bill McKibben's 350.org
American Booksellers Association	http://www.bookweb.org/index.html	1900	ABA is a trade organization, that “exists to protect and promote the interests of its members: independently owned bookstores, large and small, with storefront locations in towns and cities nationwide.” Website indicates 1748 members in all fifty states, two U.S. territories (Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands), and six Canadian provinces.
American Independent Business Association	http://www.amiba.net/	2001	Founded in Boulder, Colorado, AMIBA is a national organization that presides over member networks – Independent Business Alliances or IBAs. It emphasizes a community's economic independence. Each IBA consists of member organizations. AMIBA's goal is to help communities successfully launch and operate “buy independent, buy-local” campaigns, as well as other efforts to support community enterprise. They market themselves as a “one-stop shop to help you get organized, legal, knowledgeable about issues, updated, and in touch with other IBAs to share ideas, find solutions, and build relationships.” AMIBA has 60 IBAs located in 33 states and one Canadian province.
Business Alliance for Local Living	http://www.livingeconomies.org/	2001	BALLE relies on a nested network organizational model similar to AMIBA's. Below it are member networks, and within each member network are individual members. BALLE is headquartered in Bellingham, Washington (next to the Social Venture Network which incubated BALLE's development). Its members consist of sustainable business networks (SBNs) around the country. Currently, BALLE has 75 SBNs in 26 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada, representing more than 20,000 individual organizations.)
Food Routes Network	http://www.foodroutes.org/	1999	In 1993, the Kellogg Foundation funded CISA (Community Involved in Sustaining Agriculture) in Amherst, Massachusetts. Its “Be a local hero, buy-locally grown” program was also known as the Local Hero program. In 1997, the Kellogg Foundation chose CISA to participate in its Kellogg Foundation-supported Food Routes Network Initiative (formerly Fires of Hope).

Organization	Website	Date Founded	About
Institute for Local Self Reliance	http://www.ilsr.org	1974	In 1974, the Institute for Local Self Reliance became “the first organization to systematically apply the concept of local self-reliance to urban areas.”
Local Harvest	http://www.localharvest.org	1998	Local Harvest, an organic and local foods website, claims 20,000 members and provides a “definitive and reliable ‘living’ public nationwide directory of small farms, farmers markets, and other local food sources” to connect farmers to customers.
New Economics Institute	http://www.neweconomicsinstitute.org/	1980	The New Economics Institute, formerly the E.F. Schumacher Institute, acts as a network of networks. Among its members are BALLE, 350.org, Institute for Local Self Reliance, Slow Money, Small Mart (part of BALLE), Sustainable South Bronx (BALLE SBN), and 29 other likeminded organizations. (In 1975, E. F. Schumacher published <i>Small is Beautiful</i> . Considered a landmark set of essays on humanistic economics, Schumacher’s book questioned the assumptions that “growth is good” and “bigger is better.”)
Slow Food	http://www.slowfood.com/	1989 (Italy)	Slow Food, a non-governmental organization, was founded in Italy “to counter the rise of fast food and fast life, the disappearance of local food traditions and people’s dwindling interest in the food they eat, where it comes from, how it tastes and how our food choices affect the rest of the world.”
Slow Food USA	http://www.slowfoodusa.org/	2008 (USA)	Slow Food’s US counterpart is Slow Food USA.
Slow Money	http://www.slowmoney.org/	2008	Slow Money’s “mission is to build local and national networks, and develop new financial products and services, dedicated to: investing in small food enterprises and local food systems; connecting investors to their local economies; and, building the nurture capital industry.”

how has that relationship affected the movement? To answer these questions, from November 2010 to June 2011 we interviewed 38 localism leaders from three national localism organizations, representing 20 states. We identified four broadly shared values, and another four that are common to a sizable minority of respondents. We conclude with challenges the movement faces.

II. WHAT IS THE LOCALISM MOVEMENT?

The movement advocates that consumers and firms purchase from independent businesses in their local area. It seeks to re-energize the economies of local communities, especially in traditional downtown commercial districts; to retain and develop a sense

of place; and to encourage the local area to “be a reflection of people’s personalities rather than a cookie-cutter approach where everything looks the same” (Respondent B6).⁶ When successful, these organizations increase the economic and social power of people and firms who are rooted in their communities and are more responsive to local demands and social conditions. As people “buy locally,” purchases and profits shift toward local stakeholders and away from companies (like Walmart or McDonald’s) for which decision-making authority is usually far away. Localism advocates believe that stakeholders with strong ties to the community will be fairer employers (since their employees are their neighbors) and more faithful stewards of the environment (since they and their families live, play, and likely own a home close to where they work).⁷

To date there has been little scholarly research on localism in management.⁸ Yet buy-local is becoming so well accepted that “local-washing” is a recent concern. As Mitchell writes,⁹:

HSBC, one of the biggest banks on the planet, has taken to calling itself “the world’s local bank.” Starbucks is unbranding at least three of its Seattle outlets, the first of which just reopened as “15th Avenue Coffee and Tea.” Winn Dixie, a 500-outlet supermarket chain, recently launched a new ad campaign under the tag line, “Local flavor since 1956.” The International Council of Shopping Centers, a global consortium of mall owners and developers, is pouring millions of dollars into television ads urging people to ‘Shop Local’—at their nearest mall. Even Walmart is getting in on the act, hanging bright green banners over its produce aisles that simply say ‘Local.’

What does “local” mean? In our study, movement leaders defined it in a number of ways, including in

terms of miles traveled (often between 100 and 250 miles); county and state political boundaries; and food and watersheds.¹⁰

III. LEADING LOCALISM ORGANIZATIONS

In this article, we focus on three organizations, all founded since 1999, dedicated to building local business networks in the United States and Canada: American Independent Business Alliance (AMIBA); Business for Local Living Economies (BALLE); and the Food Routes Network (FRN), which focuses on local food consumption. Each is made up of many local networks, which bring together businesses and others within a community. AMIBA’s local networks are “independent business alliances” (IBAs); BALLE’s are “sustainable business networks” (SBNs); and Food Routes has “Buy Fresh Buy Local” (BFBL) networks. Members of these networks tend to be small businesses (AMIBA and BALLE) or farmers and restaurants (Food Routes Network), but can also be individuals and non-profit organizations.

AMIBA, established in 2001 by retailers opposing new big-box stores,¹¹ focuses primarily on increasing the patronage of independent, locally owned businesses, and is sometimes viewed as anti-globalization. It has 74 local networks located in 35 states and one Canadian province, representing more than 23,000 independent businesses.¹² That same year, BALLE launched its network, expanding the focus on local commerce to include the social and environmental impacts of business.¹³ BALLE has 77 local networks in 25 states, the District of Columbia, and four Canadian provinces, representing more than 20,000 individual organizations.¹⁴ And the Food Routes Network, founded in 1999 through the Kellogg Foundation, centers its efforts on rebuilding and preserving the family farm. It now boasts approximately 78 Buy Fresh Buy Local networks in

24 states, representing nearly 2000 organizations.¹⁵

Based on its website, AMIBA's official message is to influence public policy and to encourage consumers to buy locally. BALLE leaders expand this frame to include a focus on social (e.g., fair wages) and environmental justice. And Food Routes Network's BFBL chapters emphasize economic gains (to farmers) and health benefits (to consumers) of buying local, and increasingly talk about food justice.

IV. ABOUT THE RESEARCH

From November 2010 to May 2011, we identified and interviewed leaders from both the regional and national organizations. First, we identified leaders of our local BALLE, AMIBA, and FRN affiliated networks. Second, we compiled a spreadsheet of the contact information found on BALLE, AMIBA, and Food Routes Network websites.¹⁶ This list resulted in 215 contacts (70 BALLE SBNs, 71 AMIBA IBAs, and 74 Food Routes BFBLs).

We emailed requests to the 215 contacts for interviews. Fifteen addresses came back as invalid. Thirty-seven leaders replied that they would consider talking with us. From this number, we interviewed 25, for a 12% response rate to our original email blast. We also identified several other key informants in the movement whom we contacted directly. The result was 38 interviews with leaders from 20 states: 17 from BALLE, 14 from AMIBA, and 9 from Food Routes or related food organizations.¹⁷ The respondents fell into five categories:

1. National (work in the national headquarters, co-founded the national organization but affiliate with a regional network, or sit on the board of the national organization)
2. Regional (co-founders, executive directors, or board members of regional networks) of large (more than 300 members), medium

(100-299 members), or small (under 100 members) networks. The larger networks tended to be older (more than seven years), with the newest networks less than a year old at the time of the interview.

We interviewed and recorded each respondent by phone or in person. Interviews lasted between 30 and 75 minutes. Following each interview, we noted our takeaways to capture our first impressions of the data. After the initial interviews, we revisited the three organizations' websites and discerned the following values:

1. Local ownership of businesses (and farms)
2. Customers' local purchasing
3. Businesses sourcing local (including locally grown food)
4. Businesses providing living wages
5. Citizens investing locally (e.g., with help from organizations such as Slow Money¹⁸)
6. Businesses reducing their impact on the natural environment
7. (Networks seek to having) Government pass public policy to support independents
8. Networks educating communities about buying locally
9. Networks advocating for change in general

In all subsequent interviews, we asked interviewees to respond directly about the ease or difficulty to adhere to each of these values, and which ones their organization focused on.

To become even more grounded in the data, we transcribed the majority of the interviews ourselves using HyperTRANSCRIBE. We carefully reviewed those transcripts we didn't produce ourselves. We then analyzed the data inductively using grounded theory techniques.¹⁹ We coded each interview with NVivo 9, a qualitative research data analysis software package, using an emergent,

iterative process in which we first coded for the nine value statements. In an iterative process of discovery, we further organized these results into four shared and four emergent values.

V. SHARED VALUES: WHAT THE LOCALISM MOVEMENT AGREES ON

We start with what our respondents felt were the central principles of localism. The movement is member-based, and as noted above, its networks incorporate a diversity of opinions and objectives. However, we have identified four core beliefs that are common to almost all of the interviewees. They are pragmatically bounded; for example, nobody in the movement argues that airlines or oil companies should be locally owned.

Businesses should be locally owned and independent. AMIBA requires that member businesses be “at least 50% owned by area resident(s).”²⁰ It defines this twice in its criteria for membership: ownership must be “private, cooperative, employee, or community” and “full decision-making authority lies with its local owner(s) or members.”²¹ BALLE lists “independent retail” as a building block of a local living economy. And the Food Routes Network argues for family farms. The Institute for Local Self Reliance, an advocacy group within the movement, calls local ownership the “hometown advantage,” arguing that U.S. Economic Census data show that “employees of independent retailers earned 35 percent more per year than employees of national chains.”²²

Customers should buy locally. BALLE, AMIBA, and Food Routes networks all seek to educate consumers to support the local economy by purchasing local products and services. Food Routes branded the phrase “Buy Fresh Buy Local” to identify its mission. A central argument is that buying from locally owned independent businesses

leaves more money in the local economy than shopping at locally owned franchises or nationally owned chain stores.²³ Buy-local campaigns also tend to emphasize that local products and services provide better quality, keep dollars in the economy, and are critical to retaining a unique local ambience.²⁴

Changing consumers’ behavior is central to the movement. For the majority of our respondents, “public education” in support of the movement’s goals defines the bulk of their efforts (Respondent A4), and they easily listed numerous communications strategies, including meet-and-greets, public speeches, press releases about member companies, and designating community councils.

Local businesses should source goods and services locally. One goal of BALLE is to encourage businesses within a local network to source from each other. As one local chapter leader reports, “Our members, after becoming members, have done more local purchasing”(Respondent AB11). These business-to-business links can potentially have a magnified impact if firms work closely with local suppliers, helping them upgrade capabilities, identify new market opportunities, and increase competitiveness. AMIBA also identifies this as a focus area for its networks: “*Cooperative purchasing, branding, marketing, resource sharing and other activities . . . help local businesses gain economies of scale and compete more effectively*” (emphasis theirs).²⁵ However, our interviews suggested limited success to date in building dense local supply networks via localism organizations. Even at small businesses, supply chains can be more difficult to change than consumer buying habits. Food and agricultural products are the easiest to source locally, except in large cities far from agricultural areas. In one case, a Food Roots affiliate concentrates on the wholesale level, to help farmers connect to restaurants. However, the challenge here is twofold: some foods are inherently unavailable locally (e.g., coffee and bananas); and

local sources may be unable to supply the quantities local organizations demand.²⁶

Localism networks should look for all potential allies and partner with other organizations. Nearly every respondent listed one or more organizations with which they partner to achieve their goals. These included other localism networks, “sustainable city” initiatives, Main Street programs, farmers’ markets, local chambers of commerce, universities and colleges, credit unions, visual arts associations, historic preservation organizations, and the media. Regarding the latter, one leader explained that local media depends on advertising revenue from local business, so the buy-local movement has a natural ally with a megaphone (Respondent A6).

Willingness to partner with existing organizations and potential allies of many stripes suggests the pragmatic nature and incremental strategy of localism organizations. Rather than define localism by what the movement is against (for example, anti-Walmart) and who its enemies are (perhaps, in some cases, the National Chamber of Commerce), leaders consciously and consistently focus on the positive messages and the potential for gradual improvements. As one activist said, “You only heard me say a couple . . . negative comments about big business, because we don’t spend our time doing that. We spend our time talking about the positives as much as possible” (Respondent B6). Partnering with other organizations manages to both amplify the localist message and to foster it, by undergirding and leveraging existing community networks.

VI. EMERGENT VALUES: WHEN LOCALISM GOES BEYOND PURCHASE PATTERNS

As noted above, the localism movement is both nascent and diverse. Although most respondents did not include the following four goals within the

definition of their network, a significant minority felt that each should be definitional of the movement, and/or is important for their particular network.

Localism networks should lobby governments to pass local-friendly policy. An oft-cited challenge to a thriving local economy is public policy that favors large national retailers at the expense of independent locally-owned firms. When local governments provide substantial tax incentives to firms such as Walmart, Costco, and Target to build new stores nearby, it’s harder for local independents, who don’t reap such incentives, to compete.²⁷

We heard from a few networks that actively lobby local and state governments, while others do little or none. Federal lobbying is rare at present, because of the movement’s decentralized structure, its focus on local issues, and a lack of resources. Some localism leaders indicated that they are gradually building up from a base of working with local governments, to the state and eventually federal levels.

Local, independent businesses should invest locally. In *Small-Mart Revolution*, Shuman asks “Do you bank locally? Where do you invest your pension money?” A few respondents reported that they were investing locally, starting the conversation with the help of Michael Shuman, BALLE’s Research and Economic Development Director, and Slow Money, an organization that seeks to move investment to “saving farmland, supporting small and mid-size organic farmers, rebuilding local and regional food processing and distribution.” Others saw the challenge of local investing as too large to consider until they had grown their network.

Local, independent businesses should be fair to their employees. BALLE in particular has expanded beyond the core objectives; it urges local businesses to provide “meaningful living wage jobs.”²⁸ However, for most respondents the principle of a living wage is unrealistic:

We have about 2,000 businesses right now.

And most of them are single proprietor businesses. And, so, a family business. And one or two people that work in the store. And it's very hard for them, especially in this economic climate, to pay more or to provide any sort of healthcare or other benefits to their employees. They don't even have healthcare themselves, a lot of them. (Respondent A1)

But concern for "social fairness" to employees was more commonly shared, and one leader suggested:

I think social fairness might be a better way to talk about it than living wages. That's very narrow. And for the really small businesses, that's considered nice but completely unrealistic...So even if people are not being paid a living wage, are they getting training and learning that allows them to go off and start their own business at some later point? The delicatessen in Ann Arbor, Zingerman's²⁹, [is] a model because they trained their people and then the people started spinning off businesses. [There's] a bakery startup and...a sausage-making company that came out of it. (Respondent B14)

Without bringing along employees—the most vulnerable stakeholders, in many ways—the local movement risks being reactionary and protectionist. Indeed, the proponents of anti-chain legislation in the early part of the 20th century were often local elites (in some cases, KKK members) who wanted to freeze local power relationships, which were in their favor at the time.³⁰ In our interviews, evidence that employees, as stakeholders, get much (or more) attention from the local economy movement was sparse, particularly at the network level. In short, while localist networks may believe that social fairness and providing living wages are important,

doing so may irreparably harm the independent business's economic ability to compete.

Local, independent businesses should be environmentally responsible. BALLE (in its mission statement) and some respondents connected to the other organizations argue the need to reduce business's impact on the natural environment. They refer to this value as "working with nature" and they seek "to integrate our activities with natural systems in order to create real and lasting prosperity":

Rather than choosing one sector within which to work, BALLE networks recognize that sustainable local communities and economies are based on the systemic relationship between these building blocks. We don't prioritize or isolate the importance of energy efficiency from investing in local energy production, or 'green' buildings from the health of their occupants, or the viability of local farms from the prosperity of the grocers to whom they sell.³¹

AMIBA and Food Routes do not espouse this focus at a national level, though some of their local affiliates frame their arguments for localism in terms of environmental sustainability.

However, research is mixed on the impact localism has on the natural environment. For example, when manufacturing is located near consumers, buying locally may decrease transportation impacts and increase awareness of environmental effects of production. However, these benefits may disappear with reduced access to economies of scale in production.³²

VII. CHALLENGES AHEAD

Above, we provide a snapshot of four priorities and four emerging values underlying the localism movement in the US. However, as suggested above, several challenges remain. The first challenge

is to effectively define the term “local”. As one respondent commented:

The hardest thing is the definition of local. And no one has effectively addressed that in a way that is meaningful...Some people talk about the 50-mile or a hundred-mile diet. A lot of times it’s driven by funding. So if an organization has state funding, they define local as anything that’s grown within the state that they’re in. They might even have county or city funding, and so they’ll define it as anything grown in that county, or within 50 miles of the city that they’re serving. Some have a more regional approach to it...Sometimes it’s a hybrid of that. Some people say as long as it’s within a day’s drive. But you know I don’t consider the CAFO [Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations] that is 3 miles down the road that won’t allow you to come in and even look at the animals to be local. So all of those definitions fall a part (Respondent F3).

A second challenge the movement faces is reconciling localism and globalization. We asked respondents whether globalization was inherently incompatible with localism. Several purists vehemently affirmed that it was. Some hadn’t given the idea much thought. And still others used the term “glocal” to describe a synergy, or the idea that they are creating a “new economy.”

A third challenge centers on reconciling the relationship between localism networks and local chambers of commerce. While some networks partner with their local chambers, others blatantly or quietly competed with them. And the more successful networks (as represented by their network leaders) appear to act as the de facto chamber of commerce or fill a niche that the chamber fails to. The difference is often philosophical. For example,

in one case, a local chamber of commerce, which is also an IBA, considers Wal-Mart to be local because their employees work within the town’s limits, stay there for lunch out, and shop there after work.

Finally, respondents identified myriad other challenges in response to a question about their greatest obstacles. These challenges included: the expected lack of financial and human resources and the belief that “someone else will do the work”; consumer ignorance; the never ending battle for systemic change in approaches to land-use development; the need to shape food policy at the federal level; a lack of leadership; the concern (as we mentioned above) of big business co-opting the “local” message; and financing (see Shuman, 2007; Hess, 2009). On the latter, one respondent commented:

The greatest obstacle is financing. [I]t’s really what we do as individuals in terms of our investments; if we look at our largest investments after the home, it’s the 401-K. And the way that that is set up in this country is basically your retirement investments go into the very organizations that you’re mobilizing alternatives to. And so your right hand is supporting Starbucks or Dunkin’ Donuts or something like that. And your left hand is going out and supporting the local independent coffee shop. And there’s a really severe contradiction on the financial side (Respondent B14).

VIII. CONCLUSION

The localism movement seeks to “[restore] the capacity of communities to become more self-reliant” (Respondent B12). It broadly espouses a triple bottom line mentality, and foretells a restructuring of the American economy. However, the localism movement is understudied in the academic management literature. In this article,

we have presented an outline of four values generally espoused by the movement: independent ownership, local buying, local sourcing, and pragmatic partnering. Additional values, including responsibility to the physical environment, are emerging within the movement.

Despite localism's phenomenal growth in the past decade, and its increasing acceptance by consumers, the movement faces serious internal and external challenges. As with many social movements, localism organizations scramble for resources. Looming larger are potential contradictions in the logic and values of the movement. A growing cadre of academics (primarily, it seems, neo-classical economists) question the movement's assertion that localism inherently encourages environmental responsibility and promotes economic justice. One recent entry in this growing literature, *The Locavore's Dilemma: In Praise of the 10,000 Mile Diet*, describes the environmental benefit of eating locally as a myth, and is equally dismissive of the idea that local foods promote economic growth and social justice.³³ Activists will need to do a better job assessing the impact of their programs in order to make more clear, convincing arguments that localism is indeed environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable. However, embracing and implementing environmental responsibility and fairness to workers may require tough choices, and risks alienating some of the constituents now inside localism's big tent.

IX. ENDNOTES

1. S. Mitchell, *Big-Box Swindle: The True Cost of Mega-Retailers and the Fight for America's Independent Businesses* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2007).
2. Data collated from AMIBA, BALLE, and Food Routes Network websites (all accessed 8/27/11). The six states with no networks

are Alaska, Delaware, Mississippi, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Vermont. Only Food Routes is in Alabama, Iowa, Kansas, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Only BALLE is in D.C., Hawaii, South Carolina, and British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and Quebec. And only AMIBA is in Kentucky, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Texas, and Utah.

3. Kurland, N.B., McCaffrey, S.J. and Zell, D. (2012). *The Localism Movement: Environmental Leadership in Grassroots Activism*. Forthcoming in D. R. Gallagher (Ed.) *Environmental Leadership*, Sage Publications; Hess, D. J. (2009) *Localist Movements in a Global Economy: Sustainability, Justice, and Urban Development in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
4. Hess, 2009, *ibid*.
5. The national leaders of BALLE, for example, are more eager to actively promote environmental responsibility than are those of AMIBA.
6. Respondents in this study were assured anonymity. We have coded them by organization (A = AMIBA, B = BALLE, F = Food Routes; and AB = for those members of both AMIBA and BALLE) and given them numbers.
7. For a comprehensive overview of the movement, see D. J. Hess, *Localist Movements in a Global Economy* (Boston: MIT Press, 2009).
8. One does, however, find this research (mostly food-related) published in rural studies, sociology, and business history, and in some popular management writings. In rural studies see, e.g., A. Starr, A., "Local Food: A Social Movement?" *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies* 10: 6

- (2010): 479-490; R. Feagan, R., "Mapping Out the "Local" in Local Food Systems." *Progress in Human Geography* 31:1 (2007): 23-42; M. DuPuis and D. Goodman, "Should we Go Home To Eat? Toward a Reflexive Politics of Localism," *Journal of Rural Studies* 21 (2005): 359-371. In sociology see e.g., Hess, 2009, *ibid.*; S. Gasteyer, Hultine, S. A., Cooperband, L. R., Curry, M. P., "Produce Sections, Town Squares, and Farm Stands: Comparing Local Food Systems in Community Context" *Southern Rural Sociology* 23:1 (2008): 47-71. In business history, see T. A. Freyer, T. A., "The Federal Courts, Localism, and the National Economy, 1865-1900." *Business History Review* (pre-1986) 53:3 (1979): 343-363. Also see writings by popular management theorists Peter Senge and Michael Russo: P. Senge, Smith, B., Kurschwitz, N., Laur J., et al., "The Necessary Revolution" (Crown Business, 2009). M. Russo, M., "Companies on a Mission: Entrepreneurial Strategies for Growing Sustainably, Responsibly, and Profitably." (Stanford Business Book, 2010).
9. Mitchell, S. 2009. "The Corporate Co-opt of Local." The New Rules Project. (A Program of the Institute for Local Self-Reliance.) <http://www.newrules.org/retail/article/corporate-coopt-local> (accessed 6/1/11).
 10. For more on the topic of how localism leaders define "local," see Kurland, N.B. & McCaffrey, S.J., 2012, "Leadership, Framing, and the Localism Movement." Unpublished manuscript.
 11. The first IBA, in Boulder, Colorado, appeared in 1998; the national organization, AMIBA, was established three years later. See <http://www.amiba.net/about/> (accessed 6/1/11).
 12. Number and locations of networks found at <http://www.amiba.net/find-iba> (accessed 8/27/11). The "23,000" number comes from Jennifer Rockne, Director, AMIBA, personal communication, 8/22/11.
 13. BALLE emerged as a group vision in part from the work of Judy Wicks and the Sustainable Business Network of Greater Philadelphia and of Laury Hammel and the New England Business for Social Responsibility – see <http://www.livingeconomies.org/aboutus/history> (accessed 6/1/11).
 14. BALLE's website states that it is "comprised of over 80 community networks in 30 U.S. states and Canadian provinces representing over 22,000 independent business members across the U.S. and Canada" (see: <http://www.livingeconomies.org/aboutus> - accessed 12/29/10). Our numbers are based on an actual listing of the networks they list on the website (see <http://www.livingeconomies.org/netview> - accessed 8/27/11).
 15. <http://www.foodroutes.org/bfbl-chapters.jsp#chapter-list> (accessed 8/27/11); The "2000" number comes from Jessica Seeley, Director, Food Routes Network, personal communication, 8/30/11.
 16. A research assistant compiled this spreadsheet for us. She visited each website (BALLE, AMIBA, and Food Routes) and found the list of organizations involved. If a link to the organization's website was provided she went to the website this way. If it was not, she searched for the chapter's official website. Many times this was successful, but several organizations either didn't have a website or it was unavailable. More details on her data collection process available by request from the first author.

17. Two networks affiliate with both BALLE and AMIBA. Two interviews are with leaders at Food Routes itself, rather than a local affiliate. Three other leaders are associated with non-Food Routes food non-profits (in PA and CA). We spoke with leaders from the following states: Food Routes BFBLs and related: CA, IA, PA, WV; BALLE SBNs: AK, CO, CT, IA, IN, MA, MN, NY, OR, PA, VA, WA; AMIBA IBAs: CA, CO, IL, KY, LA, MA, MI, MN, NH, OR, PA, TX.
18. <http://www.slowmoney.org/vision> (accessed 8/27/11). Slow Money takes its name from the Slow Food organization. See Tasch, W., "Inquiries Into The Nature of Slow Money: Investing as if Food, Farms, and Fertility Mattered" (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2010).
19. For more on grounded research techniques, see Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
20. http://www.amiba.net/about_ibas.html - accessed 1/2/11. The New Rules Project through the ILSR defines "independent retailers" as those having fewer than 10 outlets - <http://www.newrules.org/retail/news/what-new-census-data-show-about-state-independent-retail> - accessed 1/2/11. Note that AMIBA allows local chapters to define their own "area" as the local members think is appropriate. Some AMIBAs adopt a county-based definition of "local." Others accept members from within their county or within a certain distance (e.g., 50 miles) from the county border.
21. See http://www.amiba.net/about_ibas.html - accessed 1/2/11.
22. Mitchell, S., "What New Census Data Show About the State of Independent Retail" New Rules Project. (December 16, 2010), <http://www.newrules.org/retail/news/what-new-census-data-show-about-state-independent-retail> (accessed 1/2/11). Similarly, the American Booksellers Association, a trade association, states that it is dedicated to promoting the interests of "independently owned bookstores, large and small, with storefront locations in towns and cities nationwide." See <http://www.bookweb.org/about> - accessed 1/2/11.
23. Mitchell, 2007, *ibid.*; Mitchell, S. 2010a. Stacey Mitchell Interview on WDET Radio's Craig Fahle Show. December 1. <http://www.newrules.org/retail/audio/stacy-mitchell-interview-wdet-radios-craig-fahle-show> (accessed 1/2/11); also see studies by Civics Economics. For these studies of the impact of buy local campaigns on the local economy, visit <http://www.civiceconomics.com/html/library.html> (accessed 5/31/11).
24. Hess, 2009, *Localist Movements in a Global Economy*.
25. See http://www.amiba.net/about_ibas.html - accessed 1/2/11.
26. See Berea College Local Food Initiative, Report for the Administrative Committee (July 13, 2005). <http://www.berea.edu/localfoodinitiative/documents/ACreportFINAL.pdf>. This report provides an excellent analysis of the challenges of incorporating a local foods initiative in an institution of higher education.
27. Mitchell, 2007, *ibid.*
28. <http://www.livingeconomies.org/aboutus/mission-and-principles> (accessed 8/21/11)
29. <http://www.zingermanscommunity.com/> (accessed 5/28/11); also in the green jobs literature, see: Daley-Harris, S., *Pathways Out of Poverty: Innovations in Microfinance for the Poorest Families* (Kumarian Press,

- 2011); Fetzer, A. and S. Aaron, *Climb the Green Career Ladder: Make Your Company and Career More Sustainable* (Wiley, 2010).
30. Schragger, R. 2005. "The Anti-Chain Store Movement, Localist Ideology, and the Remnants of the Progressive Constitution, 1920-1940." *University of Virginia Law School Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper Series*. http://law.bepress.com/uvalwps/uva_publiclaw/art21
 31. <http://www.livingeconomies.org/building-blocks> (accessed 8/26/11).
 32. Hess, D. 2008. "Localism and the Environment." *Social Compass*. 2:2, 625-638. See also DesRochers, P and H Shimizu (2012) *The Locavore's Dilemma: In Praise of the 10,000-Mile Diet*. Perseus Books: New York; Weber, C. L., & Matthews, H. S. (2008). "Food-miles and the Relative Climate Impacts of Food Choices in the United States". *Environmental Science & Technology*, Mariola, Matthew J. (2008) "The Local Industrial Complex? Questioning the Link Between Local Foods and Energy Use" *Agric Hum Values* (2008) 25:193–196 DOI 10.1007/s10460-008-9115-3.
 33. DesRochers, and Shimizu, op. cit. (2012); Weber and Matthews, op cit (2008); Mariola, op. cit. (2008); and Hinrichs, Clare C. and Patricia Allen (2008) "Selective Patronage and Social Justice: Local Food Consumer Campaigns in Historical Context" *Journal Of Agricultural And Environmental Ethics*. Volume 21, Number 4, 329-352.