



## **Constructing Common Causes: Justifications for and against Organic Agriculture in the Finnish Media**

TOMI LEHTIMÄKI

*[Paper first received, 15 July 2017; in final form, 12 July 2018]*

**Abstract.** This article examines how organic agriculture has been justified as a public issue. Using Boltanski's and Thévenot's pragmatic sociology, the article examines media discussions on organic agriculture in two Finnish newspapers. During the periods under examination (1982–1988, 1995–2000, 2008–2012), organic agriculture grew from a marginal movement into an established part of agricultural policy. The results show that different justifications for organic and conventional agriculture were connected to differing conceptions of collectivities and the common good. According to the analysis, issues related to the economic, environmental and technical aspects of agriculture have been the most dominant ones. These different 'orders of worth' have provided differing possibilities for actors to make connections between general principles and particular claims. In addition, a central way of structuring justifications has been a national conception of food and production, which has influenced conceptions of common good. Whereas advocates of organic agriculture constructed their justifications according to the opposition between organic and conventional, critiques conceptualized the issue as an opposition between organic and domestic production. This national framework has both downplayed the relevance of organic agriculture and framed it as an economic issue. Therefore, the study concludes by suggesting elaborations for the understanding of the organic–conventional dichotomy as well as on economic justifications in the politics of organic agriculture, interpreting both through the conceptions of collectivity and the common good.

### **Introduction: Analysing Contestations over Organic Agriculture**

During the last few decades, organic agriculture has experienced marked growth and has become part of institutionalized agricultural policy. It has been associated with attempts to account for the negative impacts of agricultural production and to make production more sustainable (Padel et al., 2009). While many welcome the expansion of organic agriculture, numerous studies have raised concerns about the nature and consequences of this growth. It has been understood either as a co-optation of organic agriculture (Buck et al., 1997; Tovey, 1997; Guthman, 1998) or as a change

Tomi Lehtimäki is a Doctoral Candidate at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 35, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland; email: <tom.lehtimaki@helsinki.fi>.

in its basic principles (Guthman, 2004). In these perspectives, organic agriculture is seen primarily as a value-driven practice (e.g. Michelsen, 2001; Padel et al., 2009) and growth is conceptualized as a move away from values and principles (Kjeldsen and Ingemann, 2009; Darnhofer et al., 2010).

However, as a response, numerous studies have emphasized a need for more complex conceptualizations on the development of organic values and principles (Mansfield, 2004; Lockie and Halpin, 2005; Sonnino and Marsden, 2006; Rosin and Campbell, 2009; Andersen, 2011; Campbell and Rosin, 2011; Schewe, 2015). Critical conceptualizations have been seen to operate with too simplistic binaries in which the alternative organic movement is merged into mainstream markets, simultaneously losing its positive value component. Contrary to this, studies have emphasized the moral complexity of organic agriculture and food (Andersen, 2011) and how it has developed in different situations (Kjeldsen and Ingemann, 2009). While dichotomies are clearly used to make sense of complex issues in agri-food politics and in the construction of narratives (see Vanderplanken et al., 2016), the overall development of organic agriculture should not be reduced to this.

Following these discussions, I examine debates about organic agriculture in the Finnish media, focusing on how its public relevance has been justified and criticized in these discussions. Media materials make it possible to analyse how different actors argue for their case and how they justify its public relevance (Luhtakallio, 2012). And, as Lockie (2006, p. 313) has argued, 'mass media representations of food-related issues do provide a useful focus to analyze the ways in which words, symbols, and meanings are deployed in bids to influence others and thus order, or structure, food production–consumption networks.' Media debates have not yet received much attention in previous studies on organic agriculture. Nevertheless, they open a view into how conceptions are shaped between different actors, both promoting and opposing alternative food movements (Campbell and Liepins, 2001; Sutherland, 2013). Most importantly, they show that the public status of organic agriculture is a contested issue and its benefits have been negotiated in various situations.

The analytical perspective is based on Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot's (1999, 2000, 2006) pragmatic sociology, which examines how actors rely on different principles of the common good to justify their claims. Pragmatic sociology (or conventions theory) has proven useful in the analysis of organic agriculture (Murdoch and Miele, 1999; Truninger, 2008; Rosin and Campbell, 2009; Andersen, 2011; Bernzen and Braun, 2014). These analyses have emphasized practical coordination of organic agriculture as well as tensions between different forms of coordination. However, they have paid less attention to the contentious nature of organic agriculture. Therefore, this article examines how actors are able to justify their claims and connect them to the different forms of common good.

The analysis shows how nationality – as a form of commonality – has been a central factor in these discussions on the common good. In addition to the opposition between organic and conventional, used by advocates of organic agriculture, critics have juxtaposed organic with domestic production. This juxtaposition has been used to question organic agriculture, as domestic production has been seen to have similar benefits as organic (qualities such as safety and naturalness). At the same time, the nationalist frame has promoted conceptions about organic agriculture as benefiting the common good in, for example, economic terms and in boosting conceptions about the naturalness of Finnish food. This continues and elaborates on Lockie's (2006) findings, according to which media coverage frames issues on

sustainability and food with binaries of 'good' organics and 'bad' industrial food. The analysis shows how organic agriculture has been a debated issue and how conceptions about the common good have been constructed in these debates. Analysing conventions of justification bring forth a perspective that examines multiple forms of (common) good.

The next section first examines the development of organic agriculture in Finland and then moves on to different ways of conceptualizing its growth. The subsequent section then elaborates on these discussions and articulates the theoretical perspective on the study of public justifications. The next section presents the materials and methods used in the analysis, as well as a contextualisation for the study. These are followed by three analysis sections, which analyse public discussions on organic agriculture in Finland. These are then followed by discussion and a concluding section.

### **The Growth of Organic Agriculture in Finland**

Agricultural policy communities have been described as being often 'stable and closed-circuit', with a tendency to depoliticize issues (Jokinen, 1995, p. 209). This applies to Finnish agri-policy as well, which has traditionally been comprised of a stable scene of well-established actors (Jokinen, 1997). The central actors in the field of agricultural policy have had an established position in maintaining policies and, specifically, in articulating their interests as representing the common good. What has been understood as the 'internal' agenda of the agricultural sector – that is, what they consider to be their own justification for activity – has focused on the economic aspects of production, whereas environmentalist aspects have traditionally been regarded as an 'external' constraint, only inhibiting activity (Hildén et al., 2012, p. 3392).

Nevertheless, organic agriculture has been able to change these conceptions and different forms of sustainability have become part of valuing and assessing the legitimacy of agriculture (Jokinen, 1995, 1997; Hildén et al., 2012). Starting from the mid-1980s, organic agriculture in Finland has gradually grown from a marginal movement into occupying currently 9% of cultivated land (Heinonen, 2004, 2015) and it has gained an official status in agricultural policy in Finland (Mononen, 2012; Nuutila, 2016).

In the 1980s, organic farming emerged as a public issue in Finland. Even though organic agriculture can be argued to have long roots in the history of alternative 'life reform' movements (Heinonen, 2006), in the beginning of the 1980s it started to receive public attention more widely (Mononen, 2012, p. 137). The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry established two committees that examined the state of organic agriculture in Finland (their reports were published in 1984 and 1986). In 1985, the Finnish Association for Organic Farming was founded, which was then responsible for organizing surveillance of production during the decade (the Finnish biodynamic association had been founded already in 1946, however). In the end of the decade there were approximately 400 organic farms, whereas the number had risen already to 1,800 in 1994 (Heinonen, 2004, 2015). Jokinen (1995) as well as Mononen (2012) have noted that even though organic agriculture did start to gain public attention alongside the environmental movement, environmental concerns related to agriculture were not considered to have much public relevance.

In the 1990s, there was a significant increase in the number of organic farms as Finland joined the EU (in 1995), which situated agricultural production into a new context. EU membership brought organic agriculture within its support system and boosted the organic sector significantly. In the period between 1995 and 2000 the number of farms rose rapidly, reaching approximately 5,200 at the end of this period (Tike, 2014).

In the 2000s, organic agriculture gained a somewhat institutionalized status, as there was a new increase in the number of organic farms as well as in political interest. The number of organic farms increased after a period of decline and organic agriculture was included in a number of governmental programmes. (Heinonen, 2004, 2015; Mononen, 2008). By the end of 2013, the number of organic farms had risen to approximately 4,200 after a short decline. While the number of organic farms had declined from the earlier peak, the relative share of organic farms had still risen. In 2000, 6.5% of all farms in Finland were organic, whereas the number was 7.4% in 2013, when approximately 9% of agricultural land was organic (Tike, 2014). At the same time, the market share of organic products remained approximately 1–2% (Mononen, 2012).

The development of organic agriculture in Finland can therefore be characterized as a process of institutionalization and incorporation into official policies and certificates (see Seppänen and Helenius, 2004). As mentioned, the institutionalization and standardization of organic agriculture has been dealt with critically, conceptualizing it as a form of appropriation (e.g. Buck et al., 1997; Tovey, 1997; Guthman, 1998, 2004). In this view, organic agriculture has become conventionalized, meaning that it has become increasingly similar to conventional production. At the same time it is seen to lose its value base. Darnhofer et al. (2010, p. 72), for example, conceptualize the conventionalization of organic agriculture as the substitution of organic 'values' with 'economics'. These developments are generally described as a gradual move away from the original principles and values of the movement, and shifting towards mainstream market-led practices (Kjeldsen and Ingemann, 2009). What is relevant for the current study is that the mainstreaming of organic agriculture has been seen to undermine the critical potential of organic practices and thus its legitimacy, as it is distanced from its original principles (cf. Stolze and Lampkin, 2009).

However, standards and certificates have also been defined as an expression of quality (e.g. Michelsen, 2001), connecting the development of organic agriculture with the more general development on the 'turn' to quality (Murdoch et al., 2000; Goodman, 2003). In this literature, alternative agri-food networks and especially organic agriculture are seen as challenging the mainstream and initiating discussion on qualities. Quality products and production bring out different ways of conceptualizing the meaning of agriculture and food. This refers to the recognition of the various meanings of food and production. As Murdoch and Miele (1999, p. 480) noted: 'No longer is price the only guide; now ecological, health and animal welfare issues combine to reconfigure both consumption demands and production practices in the food sector.' The various meanings, which reconfigure production and consumption, provide differing possibilities for articulating their value base.

This emphasizes that, instead of being an opposition of two stable alternatives, the 'good' organics and 'bad' conventional, conceptions emerge in negotiations between different actors. Rosin and Campbell (2009) as well as Lockie et al. (2006) criticize previous perspectives that operate with dualist models between alternative and mainstream production and have instead exemplified in their studies the multiple

ways of conceptualizing agricultural production. Studies have also explored different tensions over, for example, political and economic aims (Rogers and Fraszczak, 2014), environmental values (Sutherland, 2013), and even over fundamental conceptions of nature within the organic movement (Mansfield, 2004). These studies have argued that analyses should focus on the situational negotiations and struggles, which would also account for this heterogeneity (Campbell and Liepins, 2001; Kjeldsen and Ingemann, 2009; Andersen, 2011). They therefore bring forth the different and competing evaluative criteria related to organic agriculture.

Negotiating the collective benefits of organic agriculture as well as convincing others of new solutions requires actors to deal with the complexity of different forms of assessing value. The next section will turn to discussing the analytical framework of this study, presenting a perspective on how actors justify the societal relevance of different causes.

### Making Public Justifications

Pragmatic sociology, or conventions theory, has been applied in numerous agri-food studies (e.g. Murdoch and Miele, 1999; Raynolds, 2004; Rosin and Campbell, 2009; Andersen, 2011; Sage and Goldberger, 2012). These studies have emphasized the multiple qualities of (organic) agriculture and food (Murdoch et al., 2000) as well as the different forms of practical coordination needed beyond official certification (Seppänen and Helenius, 2004; Truning, 2008; Bernzen and Braun, 2014).

According to Ponte (2016), two strands can be identified in agri-food studies using conventions theory: the 'worlds of production' framework, based primarily on Salais and Storper's (1992) work; and the 'orders of worth' approach by Boltanski and Thévenot. Here, I will focus on the latter, examining how conventionalized principles justify and legitimize different forms of agriculture. While authors have argued for the usefulness of Boltanski and Thévenot's approach on the analysis of 'quality' production (Murdoch et al., 2000; Ponte, 2009), here I will emphasize their focus on political sociology (e.g. Blok, 2011; Thévenot, 2011, 2014; Luhtakallio, 2012; Blok, 2013; Gladarev and Lonkila, 2013) as an important strand of research. This strand also focuses on conventions of qualification, but emphasizes that the different conventions of justification are debates about the common good.

In their work Boltanski and Thévenot (1999, 2000, 2006; Thévenot et al., 2000) have identified seven broad conventions, which they refer to as *orders of worth*, through which actors can justify and evaluate claims: *civic worth*, which is based on principles of equality and equal access; *industrial worth*, based on efficiency, accuracy, and technical coordination; *market worth*, based on competition and wealth; *domestic worth*, based on traditions, close personal ties and hierarchy; *worth of fame*, based on recognition and popularity; *inspirational worth*, valuing creativity, spirituality and charisma; and *green worth*, based on environmentalism and respect for nature.<sup>1</sup> According to Boltanski and Thévenot, each of these principles is a distinct form of common good, which has developed in the coordination of disputes and collective action.

Through these principles actors attempt to convince others how the issue at hand has implications for the whole collective, that it is of public concern. Therefore, when someone supporting organic agriculture challenges mainstream agriculture he or she can justify that claim by, for example, arguing that the right way to organize

food production is to use natural resources efficiently, according to accurate measurements (industrial worth). Nevertheless, one can argue that agriculture is essentially economic activity and producers should focus on maximizing profit (market worth). And yet it is equally possible for someone to argue that agriculture is much more than mere efficiency or profits, and the focus should be on the preservation of traditional lifestyles and landscapes (domestic worth). These and all other orders of worth can be used to justify how organic agriculture benefits the common good (see Rosin and Campbell, 2009).

This perspective does not set any prior public status for different issues but instead assumes that establishing public and collective status for something is a pragmatic and situational task rather than an inherent quality of the issues (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2000, p. 210; Ponte, 2009, p. 239). Justifications, then, attempt to articulate the connections between the particular issues and the general principles of common good, legitimizing them as ways to organize a good society. This also manages the difference between 'internal' and 'external', discussed above, as public justifications formulate issues as common causes. That is, one can argue that organic agriculture is not just in the interests of the particular organic farmers or even the organic movement, but of common interest.

I argue that insufficient attention has been paid to this notion of *publicity* in previous research using conventions theory. Rosin and Campbell (2009, p. 42) as well as Ponte (2009, p. 240) combine the civic and green worths due to their focus on the 'greater wholes' of civil society and the ecosystem. However, in Boltanski and Thévenot's framework all orders of worth are understood to be concerned with the common good and therefore with greater wholes. Similarly, Bernzen and Braun (2014, p. 1257) refer to certain firms and actors as having 'altruistic' motives. This is problematic as the 'altruism' (as well as 'egoism') of motives, used to coordinate action, is at the centre of debates when discussing the legitimacy of action. The main point here is to note that no form of worth is set as more legitimate than any other. All orders of worth are seen to put forward a distinct conception of the common good that can be mobilized in the coordination of common issues.

Debates revolve around the (a) credibility of the connections between particular claims and general principles, assessing whether something actually is of public concern; and (b) on the form of worth chosen, debating whether issues of agriculture and food are about the environment, the economy, social justice, or something else. To solve conflicts, actors must therefore settle on a common form of value, or to form compromises between different orders of worth. Boltanski and Thévenot (2006, p. 217) note that critique can also be based on 'unveiling' hidden values or on the ambiguous presence of multiple forms of value. Accusations of greenwash (Allen and Kovach, 2000) or farmers being motivated only by economic interests (Guthman, 1998) are prime examples. These critiques attempt to show that behind the alleged, public justifications there are actually hidden private interests.

Justifications, then, are seen to be constructed as based on a particular conception of the common good and to argue that they are of public concern. Only when worth detaches itself from *private* interests it can obtain the status of a common cause and can be established as a *public* and generalized form of good. Public justifications are understood as acts through which issues are transformed into common causes, connecting them to different collectives of which the common good is under discussion.

## Data and Methods

Newspaper data have been useful in the analysis of social movements and collective action (Earl et al., 2004), and, as mentioned, can be used to analyse how actors attempt to mobilize and influence others (Lockie, 2006). The materials for this study have been gathered from two Finnish newspapers, *Helsingin Sanomat* (*HS*) and *Maa-seudun Tulevaisuus* (*MT*). The first, *HS*, is the biggest newspaper in Finland and in the Nordic countries. The second, *MT*, is owned by the Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners and it has the second largest readership in Finland. Even though the status of *HS* is unusual, as it has such a strong position and wide readership in Finland (see Luhtakallio, 2012), here it represents more the ‘urban’ perspective on the issue. *MT*, then, represents a more ‘rural’ perspective, but also the views of established agricultural actors, which can be seen in its negative approach towards organic agriculture in the early years examined in this article. Selecting articles from *MT* therefore serves the purpose of presenting critical views towards organic agriculture. It also brings out the contentious nature of organic agriculture. However, as mentioned, *MT* also has a wide readership, and is a central source of media data on issues related to agriculture in general. Overall, both papers were chosen for the study due to their centrality as media arenas in Finland.

The time periods from which the materials are gathered are: 1982–1988, 1995–2000 and 2008–2012, focusing on central periods in the development of organic agriculture in Finland during a 30-year period (see above). All of the articles from *HS* have been gathered from digitalized archives and include all articles that mention organic production (using Finnish search words for ‘organic’ and ‘biodynamic’). Biodynamic agriculture was included in the analysis as organic and biodynamic farming were, especially during the first years, treated in the materials as part of the same phenomenon. The digital archive for *MT* starts from the year 2000 and articles from earlier periods have been collected from microfilm archives of the National Library of Finland. For the materials retrieved from the microfilms the criterion was that they had to have the mentioned search words in the headline or subheading. The data were collected as part of a larger research project on the development of organic agriculture in Finland.

This resulted in a data set of 5,010 articles (*HS* 1,992, *MT* 3,088). After the initial data collection, duplicates and articles that did not discuss organic agriculture were removed. The Finnish word for organic does not have the same kind of meanings as in English (e.g. ‘organic soil matter’), but after organic food had become more mainstream, the word has been used to connote something natural (e.g. giving birth ‘organically’, which means no modern medicine is used in pain relief). These articles as well as those that only referred to organic agriculture or food but did not really discuss the issue – i.e. articles that mentioned it in passing – were not included in the data set. From these a random sample of every fifth article from the 1980s materials and every twentieth from the 1990s and 2000s was selected to form representative samples for this study. This resulted in sample of 72 articles from the 1980s (*HS* 37, *MT* 35), 84 from the 1990s (*HS* 38, *MT* 46) and 151 from the 2000s (*HS* 51, *MT* 100) – 307 articles in total. This wide sample for the content analysis, obtained from the two largest newspapers in Finland, provides rich data for the analysis of different rationales according to which organic agriculture has been justified and criticized.

The materials were analysed through a content analysis informed by the theoretical perspective outlined in the previous section. The analysis focused on identifying

different *statements* from the materials. A statement is taken to be any kind of definition of the situation. The status of the speaker or claim maker (cf. Luhtakallio, 2012), the one making the statement, is identified in the data samples (e.g. organic advocate, chef, expert) if it was brought out in the materials. Editorials and letters to the editor or opinion pieces are also distinguished. If no speaker was clearly identifiable (i.e. not a direct quote or a reference to a specific statement) the statement was attributed to the journalist. The units of analysis are therefore these statements, instead of whole newspapers or articles, which then gives more room to different views. Following Alasuutari et al. (2013, p. 693), it is noted that, aside from journalists, other actors (interviewees, expert sources, politicians, etc.) also take part in situating issues discussed in the media through their statements. This then elaborates the view on how issues are treated in the media, giving possibility to analyse different ways of making sense of issues that actors engage in. And, as Alasuutari et al. continue, even though the media has the power to shape different news stories according to their agendas, 'the media cannot be separated from the rest of society' (Alasuutari et al., 2013, p. 695) – they are not independent of the rationales according to which one can justify or criticize. Through this framework, the analysis examines how different justifications construct meaning for organic agriculture by articulating its public relevance (Eriksen, 2014).

The first phase of analysis focused on identifying statements, speakers and justifications from the materials: 371 statements, of which 351 were seen to be based on some of the orders of worth. The statements were then analysed through a content analysis informed by the theoretical perspective outlined above (cf. Lehtonen and Liukko, 2010; Luhtakallio, 2012; Gladarev and Lonkila, 2013). The distribution of justifications and their development are presented in Table 1. Second, continuing on from the classification of statements, a more thorough content analysis focused on the themes presented in these statements. In addition to the different orders of worths, the analysis focused also on the form of collectivity into which these justifications situated organic agriculture (e.g. the EU, Finland, global environment, local food circles). The results of this analysis, focusing on the justifications and their

**Table 1.** Justifications according to period and newspaper (%).

	Market	Industrial	Green	Domestic	Civic	Inspiration	Fame	Green-Market	Green-Other
<i>HS</i>									
1982-1988	8	27	30	0	3	3	3	11	3
1995-2000	20	7	28	6	2	2	2	13	9
2008-2012	14	5	27	9	5	7	5	4	9
Total	15	12	28	5	3	4	3	9	8
<i>MT</i>									
1982-1988	19	36	6	0	8	3	0	19	3
1995-2000	44	22	13	3	0	0	6	3	1
2008-2012	37	17	22	2	3	0	5	6	3
Total	36	21	17	2	3	0	5	7	3
All periods	28	18	21	3	4	2	4	8	5

Note: HS: *Helsingin Sanomat*; MT: *Maaseudun Tulevaisuus*.

change, are presented in the following sections.

## Analysis

The classification of claims indicates some broad developments in the distribution of justifications. As Table 1 shows, the long-term developments of both newspapers include the growth in market justifications as well as a decline in industrial justifications. At the same time, green justifications enjoy approximately the same amount of room in *HS* during all periods but experience a marked growth in *MT*. These developments can be taken as, first, reflecting the growth in the legitimacy of organic agriculture as a form of production. Second, as organic agriculture and food become more common as well as an officially certified practice, the disputes over definitions decline. And, third, they show the growth of environmental concerns and disputes being situated in the green order of worth. *HS* also shows a diversification of justifications during the last period examined, reflecting the discussions on the 'turn' to quality (as discussed above). The following sections will examine these overall developments in more detail, focusing on how actors were able to format their claims into the orders of worth and how these were debated.

### *Emergence (1982–1988)*

The first period was characterized by the emergence of organic agriculture as a new issue and discussions on environmental problems related to agriculture. During the first years examined, discussions in *MT* took an explicitly negative stance on organic agriculture and denounced it by stating, 'only techno-chemical production is feasible'. Therefore, dealing with the critique posed by organic agriculture was one of the central topics of the period. While organic agriculture was considered primarily an issue of sustainability, other ways of framing were also in place. The central orders of worth were industrial, market and green. A central compromise was the one between market and green justifications.

Industrial worth was the most frequent order of worth during this period in both newspapers. This engagement is characterized by the theme of constructing clear definitions for organic agriculture and producing accurate knowledge about the subject, as well as the need to come up with clear and well-defined rules. Rules and definitions are stated to be beneficial for everyone as they bring order to agricultural markets and alleviate the confusion that resulted from the emergence of organic agriculture:

'The demands for "organic" products have increased year by year. The supply of these products has grown enormously in stores, yet no one is really responsible for how ecological, biological, organic or biodynamic products are grown... The situation is going to get completely out of hand if the concepts, production and markets are not sorted out.' (*HS*, 14 March 1983)

The committee also emphasized that, according to studies, organic and conventional

products did not differ significantly from each other. This was, however, brought up only in relation to the possibilities of organizing surveillance based on product qualities. Industrial justifications also noted that research on organic agriculture as well as the development of organic methods produced knowledge that was useful for agriculture in general. Knowledge about, for example, soil ecology or new ways to counter pests were stated to be of common interest and therefore beneficial for everyone.

Whereas most of the industrial justifications were neutral towards organic agriculture, there were several negative ones, especially in *MT*. They criticized the feasibility of organic methods and emphasized the need for agro-chemicals in maintaining production levels. The head of the first committee on organic agriculture, Professor Martti Markkula, stated this clearly as he reported the results of the committee:

‘The majority of farmers and agriculture researchers – as far as I know – hold organic production to be a lot of talk about nothing... Agricultural research and farmers’ experiences indeed have not brought up anything that would suggest that changes are needed in current agricultural practice. Contemporary use of fertilizers and pesticides is not going to lead to a catastrophe – on the contrary, if anything it is going to prevent one.’ (*MT*, 25 September 1984)

These statements rejected the green justifications made by the organic movement and countered them by relying on research knowledge. Contrary to the critiques made by the advocates of organic agriculture, efficient methods based on technological agriculture were seen to be the ones benefiting society.

On the other hand, advocates of the conventional side, or actors who were not explicitly committed to organic production, considered organic agriculture to be justified on market worth terms. Committee head Markkula (*MT*, 25 September 1984), for example, continued that a ‘realistic starting point’ was to acknowledge that there were people who want to buy organic product and they are going to get them somewhere. Organic farming could also produce extra revenue for Finnish agriculture in general. Here organic production was characterized mainly as a legitimate form of ‘specialized’ production, conducted on the side of conventional agriculture. Therefore, this justification presents a sort of intermediary form in regards to generality and particularity. Organic agriculture benefits the common good by producing extra revenue, but it does not challenge conventional production in general, as it is qualified as a form of specialized production. Articles dealing with the first committee also noted that labels such as ‘toxin-free or pesticide-free are to be banned’ because ‘the idea is to prevent indirect mocking of conventional production with these suggestive phrases’ (Committee Member, *HS*, 15 October 1984).

Another market justification was focused on consumer demand and agricultural imports. Advocates of conventional production acknowledged that, even though they preferred conventional production, there was demand for organic production and this would be met with supply in one way or another. If there would be no domestic organic production, demand would be answered by importing organic products. There was then a need to produce organically in Finland because it would lower the imports of (organic) food. Importing was not seen as desirable as Finland was characterized as a ‘sparsely populated and relatively clean country’, while imports come from crowded and urbanized Central Europe, which was, according to

both newspapers, polluted by acid rain and other environmental problems. These counterclaims were supported by stating that domestic produce contains very little pesticide residue, arguing against the distinction between organic and conventional. In these cases, the green order of worth was accepted as a way to assess worth, but this was seen to justify domestic production, not organic.

Regardless of the critiques towards the green order of worth, grounded in the industrial and market worths, different actors were able to present environmentalist justifications for organic agriculture. The discussion about the environment and about ecological benefits of organic agriculture referred to avoiding pesticides and other chemicals, maintaining soil fertility and pollution in general. Environmentalism appeared much more prominent in *HS* than in *MT*. Still, advocates of organic agriculture in the latter gained some opportunities to justify their actions based on green justifications. One advocate for example noted that getting rid of artificial fertilizers and pesticides does not yet make production organic, continuing that 'we are trying to enhance nature's own production' (*MT*, 4 September 1984).

Rather interestingly, apart from a few exceptions, advocates of organic agriculture did not use green justifications during this period. Instead, justifications related to environmental concerns were based on a market-green compromise, in which the attempt was to argue that there is no tension between the two orders of worth. According to them, the choice is not between ecology and economy, but rather that these two fit together and support each other: 'Agriculture and environmental protection have common interests. The more we are able to direct plant nutrients back to the use of the crops, the more the farmer saves in fertilizer costs and the fewer nutrients get washed into waterways' (Organic advocate, *HS*, 13 September 1985).

Especially in *MT* this appeared as an attempt to counter the opposition, according to which environmentalism is merely 'ideological' and against economic or technological 'realities'. Organic agriculture was also justified by noting that it did not have the 'frightening reliance on fossil fuels', which makes conventional agriculture both risky and dependent on imported inputs. Organic agriculture was therefore seen as a way to achieve independence from foreign resources.

Overall, the period included the gradual acknowledgement of organic production and of environmental issues as part of agriculture. The emergence of organic agriculture as a new issue brought the need to reassess conceptions about agricultural production. Industrial justifications, focused on accurate knowledge, definitions and rules, were primarily concerned with re-establishing order and grounding it in technical knowledge. Even though many remained rather sceptical towards the relevance of environmental issues and organic agriculture, they were seen to fit together with domestic production, both through the idea of clean Finnish nature and by hopes that organic production would boost Finnish agriculture and countryside.

### *Expansion (1995–2000)*

The latter half of the 1990s is characterized above all by, first, the expansion of organic agriculture and, second, Finland joining the EU in 1995. Especially at the beginning of the period, articles reported on the rapid growth of organic farming, referred to the numbers of farms doubling annually and increasingly expanding organic farmland. The expansion is attributed in the media first and foremost to

the EU support for organic farming. Therefore, market justifications became central. 'Surprising growth', as it was characterized in the materials, brought up the need for reconceptualizing organic production as it gave credibility to claims based on its economic viability.

In the previous period there were already claims of organic production being economically sound, made mainly by those advocating it. Others also noted organic production to be justifiable in market worth terms as there was some demand for organic products. Here the situation changed due to Finland's EU membership and the rapid growth of organic farming. 'EU membership pushing the organic sector into growth' (*MT*, 21 January 1995) is a headline characteristic of this period, and numerous articles quoted farmers who had converted to organic saying that without EU support they would have gone out of business. The strengthening of market justifications is exemplified by the statements that qualify organic farming through the distinction between idealism and realism: 'The main reason for converting to organic production [now] is economic, not ideological as it was in years past' (Chair of the Finnish Organic Association, *MT*, 27 January 1996).

Organic farmers argued that people should not think they are doing it 'just for the good cause'. Instead, they referred to themselves as professionals running a business, who also needed to get a fair compensation for what they were doing: 'Organic farmers are business professionals and not idealists (as they might have been in the past)' (*MT*, 27 February 1997). Together with increased profitability via EU support, organic farming continued to be justified as one of the possibilities to reinvigorate Finnish agriculture: 'Organic agriculture benefits the whole national economy by enhancing the employment situation and by decreasing fertilizer and pesticide imports' (Editorial, *HS*, 1 April 1997).

The shift in justifications can be observed in the concerns presented in some statements. Central agricultural actors did welcome the growth in organic agriculture, but added that this rapid growth should not bring about a shift 'from quality to quantity' (*HS*, 26 July 1996). The expansion was seen to be too fast and it might affect the expertise and skills of organic farmers. Both newspapers reported about a study in which researchers warned that previously organic farmers were 'guarded by ideology', whereas new business-oriented organic farmers might not endure the fluctuations in yield sizes as they were defined as motivated purely by profits.

Industrial justifications emphasized the need for common coordination, strategic planning and research in developing the growing organic sector. The calls for coordination in agricultural policy appeared mostly in *MT*, whereas in *HS* they were justifications focusing on research knowledge and regulations. In the previous period, organic production and food were criticized for being vague and lacking clear definitions. In this period advocates were able to defend organic agriculture by referring to regulations and strict guidelines. For example, when organic agriculture was criticized to be dangerous because it did not use pesticides, an advocate of organic agriculture was able to defend it by referring to guidelines and regulations: '[The writer] seems to be totally unaware of the statutory surveillance system that makes organic products the most strictly supervised foodstuffs. All organic products go through the normal food regulation procedures, but organic production has its own surveillance system in addition to this' (Letter to the Editor, *HS*, 17 October 1998).

The green justifications in this period brought in new topics, of which the most common was the one focusing on genetically manipulated organisms (GMOs). In this case, organic food was seen as the only guarantee against GMOs and their possi-

ble spread into nature. Second, the topic of animal welfare appeared as a new issue, in which consumers emphasized the need for more 'ethical' production methods. And, third, there was the discussion on nutrient run-off to the Baltic Sea. Possibly due to the strengthening of both market and green justifications, the compromise between the two did not seem to appear in *MT* almost at all.

The fame justifications assessed how well organic products are known, mostly with attempts to show that the products and the label were widely recognized and established among consumers. In addition, they also referred to the popularity of organic products. Domestic justifications argued for local production and for food circles, which were stated to be the guarantee for quality food.

Again, the justifications based on the green worth were specifically judged in relation to domestic production. The regional markets of the EU as well as other international trade shifted the previous discussions about the authenticity of organic products to a new context. *MT* reported how the customs agencies found out that 10% of imported organic products had (too many) traces of chemicals in them (*MT*, 12 September 1995). *HS* (24 June 1998) reported that all domestic organic products inspected by food safety officials during 1992–1997 were 'really organic', meaning that they did not contain any pesticide residue, whereas one tenth of imports were found to have too much residue. Organic activists and environmentalists attempted to challenge this, claiming that domestic cannot be simply equated with clean or natural. Therefore, even though EU support was considered to be boosting organic farming, the national community and the forms of good connected to it prevailed as the main frame of reference for assessing organic agriculture.

#### *Institutionalization and Divergence (2008–2012)*

In this period, local food emerged as a central new topic reconfiguring many of the themes that were previously discussed in reference to organic food. The majority of these articles treat local food together with organic food, in most cases joining them together with the idiom of 'organic and local food'. The first articles to set these two explicitly against each other or to discuss their differences appeared in 2010 (*MT*, 29 January 2010; *HS*, 23 June 2010).

Organic agriculture also gained official recognition during this period. In 2008, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Finland set up a committee to develop a 'country brand' for Finland. In its final report the committee declared that one of the 'key tasks' for enhancing this country brand was to make half of the overall agricultural production organic by 2030. The committee characterized Finland as a country with clean, pure nature, an image that they associated with organic production. This can be seen as one instance of the institutionalized status of organic production, as it was established equal in size to conventional production in the committee's vision. This then brought in fame justifications, concerned with the public image of the country. These justifications were still, however, partly connected to market worth. Fame justifications were also based on surveys that emphasized that organic products were popular.

Green justifications appeared as frequently in *HS* as they did in the previous periods, but now they also gained space in *MT*. However, advocates of organic agriculture still relied mostly on market or market–green justifications. This rise of green

justifications is not explained by the rise in organic actors presenting their claims, but in a more general increase in their use. In *HS*, there were also numerous different green compromises, exemplifying the general rise in discussions related to the environment. The green-market compromises continued to argue that organic agriculture is beneficial in both ecological and economic terms.

Most of the market justifications for organic agriculture referred to its economic viability. There was a consensus that demand was constantly exceeding supply, in Finland and abroad, therefore creating a positive outlook for organic farmers. Again, producers who had converted to organic agriculture were quoted saying that production became viable after shifting to organic. Market worth critiques dealt with the higher prices of organic food. Organic food was said to be only for a small elite who can afford it and who use it as a way to distinguish themselves (see Rosin and Campbell, 2009, p. 41). While organic agriculture was previously marginalized as an alternative form of food for hippies, the marginal group was now transformed into an elite, either way undermining its public and general status. Both forms of critique defined organics as a particular cause and attempted to delegitimize it with this reduction of generality. However, the two examples present a shift in market worth: in the 1980s the environmentalist cause was defined as 'hippie idealism', which was not economically feasible, whereas the latter case was grounded on civic worth and equal access.

Industrial justifications again emphasized clear definitions and standards, according to which organic agriculture should be defined. A few of them also criticized organic agriculture by relying on natural scientific studies and stated that there were no significant differences between organic and conventional products or production methods.

In domestic justifications, the similarity between organic and local food was emphasized, stating that consumers were interested in them because they want to know about the origins of the food. Domestic worth then offers a guarantee against the uncertainties of (globalized) food markets, much in the same way as organic food was qualified before. Here consumers were mobilized through interests in fresh, seasonal ingredients, which were opposed to the highly processed, industrial food, also combining it with other orders of worth: 'Consumers increasingly value wholeness, traceability, ethics and ecology in food. Organic and local food fulfil these requirements' (Retailer, *MT*, 10 June 2011).

Together with the emphasis on these qualities, local and organic food challenged the distribution channels by opposing the centralization of food distribution and cutting out the intermediaries. This opposition was justified mainly with reference to market worth, stating that in local food arrangements 'everyone benefits... when the intermediaries are left out, the producer gets a better price and the consumer pays less' (Food circle organizer, *HS*, 30 November 2008). Cheaper prices were mentioned mostly in *HS*, which is understandable due to *MT*'s producer orientation. The editorial in *MT* concluded that: 'The most sustainable and safe solution is that food is produced as nearby as possible and that the price for it makes possible to produce it there also in the future' (*MT*, 5 October 2012).

However, the localness of local food was a matter of debate and it drove a wedge into the unity of 'organic and local food'. In a letter to the editor (*MT*, 29 January 2010) a CEO declared that, unlike organic food, local food was understandable to the consumer and its positive elements are self-evident for everyone: "there is no need to bang the positive elements [of local food] into the consumer's head", as he

thought was the case with organic food. Local food brings people ‘within the sphere of clean domestic food’ – giving a clear example of how domestic and clean were again thought to be the same. Another CEO of a restaurant chain stated that not that many clients preferred organic food, continuing that their restaurants started from the principle that the ingredients should be found somewhere near, that is ‘from Finland’ (*HS*, 21 October 2010). Their restaurants would promote organics but only in the case that the taste was also good, therefore bringing into the picture some inspirational justifications. Handling the uncertainty about the origins of the food operated through the national collective: ‘We prefer to say that we provide handmade Finnish food, from which the producer also gets a fair price’ (Chef, *HS*, 10 October 2011).

Among other things, these statements also show how ‘organic’ could still be criticized as being vague and not properly defined, even though organic agriculture had been officially certified for years. In a guest editorial in *MT* (6 August 2012) an advocate of organic agriculture criticized this national focus and emphasized that organic agriculture has always been an international movement.

During this period, green justifications appeared also in *MT* quite often. Even though there was still a clear focus on market worth, green justifications could gain space in its pages as a legitimate rationale. This last period also shows a clear change in the tone in *MT*. While organic agriculture was treated very sceptically in *MT* during the first period, organic agriculture received much more positive accounts in these later periods examined.

### **Conclusions and Discussion: Constructing Organic Agriculture as a Public Issue**

Organic agriculture and food have been shown to be debated and contentious issues in the media, and these debates concerned their public relevance and justifiability. The analysis focused on how actors attempted to make connections between particular claims and the general principles of justification. While the perspective demonstrated various ways in which organic agriculture was seen as justifiable, it also highlighted tensions between different forms of justification as well as critiques of organic agriculture.

In the time periods examined here, the justification for organic agriculture remained contentious. Therefore, there was much more variation when compared to Lockie’s (2006) findings on ‘good’ organics and ‘bad’ industrial food. In numerous situations, organic was assessed against domestic, not conventional, which conditioned its possibilities. This can be taken to have wider relevance for the study of organic agriculture movements, as it suggests that the organic–conventional dichotomy can be too general in some situations in understanding the opposition or support these movements receive. In general, it emphasizes that the meaning and justifiability of organic agriculture was constructed relationally (Campbell and Liepins, 2001; Kjeldsen and Ingemann, 2009) and through different dichotomies (cf. Vanderplanken et al., 2016).

Industrial justifications focused on institutionalizing organic agriculture through the production of knowledge and providing accurate definitions. The focus on technical knowledge in public disputes, as well as a low level of civic justifications in Finnish public discussions, support previous studies on public justification (e.g.

Luhtakallio, 2012). The decline in industrial justifications shows that while certification is important to the practical coordination of organic agriculture, it does not show that clearly in media discussions (cf. Seppälä and Helenius, 2004). Justifications in media texts aim at convincing and mobilizing others or to settle disputes, in which industrial worth has not been as prominent as one could assume. Therefore, as was mentioned in the beginning of the analysis, the decline in industrial justifications should not be taken as suggesting an overall decline in industrial coordination (cf. Reynolds, 2004; Bernzen and Braun, 2014). Even though certification and standards can be used to justify organic agriculture in disputes, this was not resorted to.

Although overarching developments can be recognized in the development of organic agriculture (e.g. Guthman, 2004), many of these meanings are not completely captured by the perspectives focused on marketization and industrialization of organic agriculture. Especially the debates on the scientific credibility of organic agriculture have not been captured by previous conventions theory studies (e.g. Reynolds, 2004; Sage and Goldberger, 2012; Bernzen and Braun, 2014). Knowing the controversies in which organic agriculture is criticized by drawing on natural scientific knowledge (e.g. Trewavas, 2001), one would have assumed the share of industrial justifications to be higher in the latter periods as well.

One reason for the declining share of industrial justifications identified in this analysis could be that some of these controversies were situated more clearly in the green order of worth. In the case of GMOs – and especially in the opposition towards them – organic standards were indeed emphasized as one of the last certainties that consumers could fall back on. Some of these justifications did emphasize strict certificates, but in general they emphasized environmental protection and set to oppose techno-scientific methods. This shows a certain overlap between the orders of worth and some of the ambiguities related to the green order of worth (see Blok, 2013).

Market justifications promoted organic agriculture by referring to its capabilities to bring extra revenue to agricultural production. Although this does not suggest the practice of organic agriculture to be completely devoid of critical environmentalist ideas, it does imply that public discussions have laid emphasis very much on the economic side. And it shows that market justifications, focused on profitability, were considered to be convincing and legitimate when arguing for (and against) organic agriculture.

Market worth raises questions about the use of conventions theory. The analysis of market justifications demonstrated how they developed from being minor issues of extra revenue to one of the possible key areas of maintaining Finnish agriculture. Through this development, market justifications were firmly grounded in the common good, and were not in any way value-free (cf. Darnhofer et al., 2010, p. 72). From this perspective, Rosin and Campbell's (2009, p. 42) and Ponte's (2009) conceptualizations associating civic and green justifications with a focus on 'a greater whole' is somewhat misleading. Even though economic activity can be taken as a specifically problematic aspect of building commonality because it can be rather easily associated with private gains, the analysis shows how arguments referring to market worth were indeed connected to moral claims about the common good (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006, pp. 43–61). This was clearly the case with industrial justifications as well, as they emphasized accurate definitions and efficiency as ways of coordinating common issues that are beneficial for everyone.

Domestic justifications emphasized locality and personal connections between producers and consumers. In addition, these justifications related to the building of

trust and certainty about food and production conditions. While in some cases locality and local food were understood explicitly as national, the overall national focus was present also in other justifications. Boltanski and Thévenot's framework would make possible to interpret these as compromises with the domestic and other forms of worth. However, justifications emphasizing nationality did not really attempt to construct these kinds of compromises, and did not emphasize the principles of the domestic worth (e.g. traditions, personal relations or hierarchy) that clearly.

Instead, the differences in justifications can be interpreted as differences in scope. Although the diversity of views is of course more complex, I would argue that this nationalist framework has been both effective in countering the claims made by the organic movement and to justify it in economic terms. Whereas organic farmers argued mainly for a distinction between organic and conventional agriculture, their criticism encountered the distinction between domestic and foreign production in which the national community is the relevant context of the common good. In these instances domestic and local production were seen to embody similar qualities as organics, thus hindering the possibilities for establishing a clear difference between the two forms of agriculture and food that would have been considered meaningful enough. This setting was identified in the three periods analysed, presenting different contextualized variations of it, showing therefore both continuity and change. The findings go together with studies that have emphasized that Finns tend to favour domestic products and view them as superior to foreign ones (Kakriainen et al., 2006).

Justifications and the capacities to enrol others are constructed situationally and they differ according to the order of worth on which they depend. This study has emphasized the need to analyse organic agriculture as a contested phenomenon that justifiability needs to be analysed in these relational and contextualized settings. Examining how different forms of justification make it possible to connect claims with principles of common good gives a view into how the worth of organic agriculture is perceived.

## Note

1. Domestic worth does not refer to family life or to domestic in opposition to foreign. Instead, it is based on the principle that what is worthy and beneficial for the collective, is to organize things according to traditions, customs and personal relations. Therefore, it should not be confused with domestic production either. Industrial worth is based on the principle that the collective should be organized efficiently, according to accurate measurements and technical knowledge, and should not be confused with industrial production.

## References

- ALASUUTARI, P., QADIR, A. and CREUTZ, K. (2013) The domestication of foreign news: news stories related to the 2011 Egyptian revolution in British, Finnish and Pakistani newspapers, *Media, Culture and Society*, 35(6), pp. 692–707.
- ALLEN, P. and KOVACH, M. (2000) The capitalist composition of organic: the potential of markets in fulfilling the promise of organic agriculture, *Agriculture and Human Values*, 17(3), pp. 221–232.
- ANDERSEN, A.H. (2011) Organic food and the plural moralities of food provisioning, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(4), pp. 440–450.
- BERNZEN, A. and BRAUN, B. (2014) Conventions in cross-border trade coordination: the case of organic food imports to Germany and Australia, *Environment and Planning A*, 46(5), pp. 1244–1262.
- BLOK, A. (2013) Pragmatic sociology as political ecology: on the many worths of nature(s), *European Journal*

- of *Social Theory*, 16(4), 492–510
- BLOKKER, P. (2011) Pragmatic sociology: theoretical evolvment and empirical application, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 14(3), pp. 251–261.
- BOLTANSKI, L. and THÉVENOT, L. (1999) The sociology of critical capacity, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(3), pp. 359–377.
- BOLTANSKI, L. and THÉVENOT, L. (2000) The reality of moral expectations: a sociology of situated judgement, *Philosophical Explorations*, 3(3), pp. 208–231.
- BOLTANSKI, L. and THÉVENOT, L. (2006) *On Justification: Economies of Worth*, trans. C. Porter. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- BUCK, D., GETZ, C. and GUTHMAN, J. (1997) From farm to table: the organic vegetable commodity chain of Northern California, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 37(1), pp. 3–20.
- CAMPBELL, H. and LIEPINS, R. (2001) Naming organics: understanding organic standards in New Zealand as a discursive field, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 41(1), pp. 22–39.
- CAMPBELL, H. and ROSIN, C. (2011) After the ‘organic industrial complex’: an ontological expedition through commercial organic agriculture in New Zealand, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(4), pp. 350–361.
- DARNHOFFER, I., LINDENTHAL, T., BARTEL-KRATOCHVIL, R. and ZOLLITSCH, W. (2010) Conventionalisation of organic farming practices: from structural criteria towards assessment based on organic principles. A review, *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 30(1), pp. 67–81.
- EARL, J., MARTIN, A., MCCARTHY, J.D. and SOULE, S.A. (2004) The use of newspaper data in the study of collective action, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, pp. 65–80
- ERIKSEN, S.N. (2014) Meanings of local food in Danish print media: from marginal to mainstream, *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 21(2), pp. 209–226.
- GLADAREV, B. and LONKILA, M. (2013) Justifying civic activism in Russia and Finland, *Journal of Civil Society*, 9(4), pp. 375–390.
- GOODMAN, D. (2003) The quality ‘turn’ and alternative food practices: reflections and agenda, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1), pp. 1–7.
- GUTHMAN, J. (1998) Regulating meaning, appropriating nature: the codification of California organic agriculture, *Antipode*, 30(2), pp. 135–154.
- GUTHMAN, J. (2004) The trouble with ‘organic lite’ in California: a rejoinder to the ‘conventionalisation’ debate, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(3), pp. 301–316.
- HEINONEN, S. (2004) Luonnonmu- kainen maatalous, in: P. MARKKOLA (ed.) *Suomen maatalouden historia vol. 3: Suurten muutosten aika. Jälleenrakennuskaudesta EU-Suomeen*. Helsinki: Suoma- laisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, pp. 331–345.
- HEINONEN, S. (2006) Raitis, raadoton ravinto: vaihtoehtoviljelijät ja -kuluttajat 1900-luvun alun Suomessa, in: T. MONONEN and T. SILVASTI (eds) *Ruokakysymys. Näkökulmia yhteiskuntatieteelliseen elintarvike- tutkimukseen*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 88–112.
- HEINONEN, S. (2015) *Country Report: Finland 2012*. Brussels: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL). Published online: <<http://www.organic-europe.net/country-info/finland/country-report.html>>, accessed 6 July 2017.
- HILDÉN, M., JOKINEN, P. and AAKKULA, J. (2012) The sustainability of agriculture in a northern industrialized country: from controlling nature to rural development, *Sustainability*, 4(12), pp. 3387–3403.
- JOKINEN, P. (1995) The development of agricultural pollution control in Finland, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 35(2), pp. 206–226.
- JOKINEN, P. (1997) Agricultural policy community and the challenge of greening: the case of Finnish agri- environmental policy, *Environmental Politics*, 6(2), pp. 48–71.
- KAKKRIAINEN, S., MONONEN, T. and SILVASTI, T. (2006) Luomutuotteiden kuluttamisen motiivit Suomessa ja Saksassa, in: T. MONONEN and T. SILVASTI (eds) *Ruokakysymys. Näkökulmia yhteiskuntatieteelliseen elintarvike- tutkimukseen*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 131–155.
- KJELDSEN, C. and INGEMANN, J.H. (2009) From the social to the economic and beyond? A relational approach to the historical development of Danish organic food networks, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 49(2), pp. 151–171.
- LEHTONEN, T.-K. and LIUKKO, J. (2010) Justifications for commodified security: the promotion of private life insurance in Finland 1945–90, *Acta Sociologica*, 53(4), pp. 371–386.
- LOCKIE, S. (2006) Capturing the sustainability agenda: organic foods and media discourses on food scares, environments, genetic engineering, and health, *Agriculture and Human Values*, 23(3), pp. 313–323.
- LOCKIE, S. and HALPIN, D. (2005) The ‘conventionalization’ thesis reconsidered: structural and ideological transformations of Australian organic agriculture, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 45(4), pp. 284–307.
- LOCKIE, S., LYONS, K., LAWRENCE, G. and HALPIN, D. (2006) *Going Organic: Mobilizing Networks for Environmentally Responsible Food Production*. Wallingford: CABI.
- LUHTAKALLIO, E. (2012) *Practicing Democracy: Local Activism and Politics in France and Finland*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MANSFIELD, B. (2004) Organic views of nature: the debate over organic certification for aquatic animals,

- Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(2), pp. 216–232.
- MICHELSSEN, J. (2001) Organic farming in a regulatory perspective: the Danish case, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 41(1), pp. 62–84.
- MONONEN, T. (2008) *Luomun verkostot. Tutkimus suomalaisen luomutuotannon toimijaverkostojen muutoksesta*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Joensuu.
- MONONEN, T. (2012) Miksi suomalainen luomu on yhä marginaalissa?, in: T. MONONEN and T. SILVASTI (eds) *Hyöä ja paha ruoka. Ruoan tuotannon ja kulutuksen vaikutukset*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 134–155.
- MURDOCH, J. and MIELE, M. (1999) ‘Back to nature’: changing ‘worlds of production’ in the food sector, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(4), pp. 465–483.
- MURDOCH, J., MARSDEN, T. and BANKS, J. (2000) Quality, nature, and embeddedness: some theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector, *Economic Geography*, 76(2), pp. 107–125.
- NUUTILA, J. (2016) *The Finnish Organic Food Chain: Modelling towards 2020 Goals with Change and Innovation*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Institute of Behavioural Sciences.
- PADEL, S., RÖCKLINSBERG, H. and SCHMID, O. (2009) The implementations of organic principles and values in the European Regulation for organic food, *Food Policy*, 34(3), pp. 245–251.
- PONTE, S. (2009) Governing through quality: conventions and supply relations in the value chain for South African wine, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 49(3), pp. 236–257.
- PONTE, S. (2016) Convention theory in the Anglophone agro-food literature: past, present and future, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 44, pp. 12–23.
- RAYNOLDS, L.T. (2004) The globalization of organic agro-food networks, *World Development*, 32(5), pp. 725–743.
- ROGERS, J. and FRASZCZAK, M. (2014) ‘Like the stem connecting the cherry to the tree’: the uncomfortable place of intermediaries in a local organic food chain, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(3), pp. 321–340.
- ROSIN, C. and CAMPBELL, H. (2009) Beyond bifurcation: examining the conventions of organic agriculture in New Zealand, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(1), pp. 35–47.
- SAGE, J.L. and GOLDBERGER, J.R. (2012) Decisions to direct market: geographic influences on conventions in organic production, *Applied Geography*, 34, pp. 57–65.
- SALAIS, R. and STORPER, M. (1992) The four ‘worlds’ of contemporary industry, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 16(2), pp. 169–193.
- SCHWE, R.L. (2015) Letting go of ‘conventionalisation’: family labour on New Zealand organic dairy farms, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 55(1), pp. 85–105.
- SEPPÄNEN, L. and HELENIUS, J. (2004) Do inspection practices in organic agriculture serve organic values? A case study from Finland, *Agriculture and Human Values*, 21(1), pp. 1–13.
- SONNINO, R. and MARSDEN, T. (2006) Beyond the divide: rethinking relationships between alternative and conventional food networks in Europe, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(2), pp. 181–199.
- STOLZE, M. and LAMPKIN, N. (2009) Policy for organic farming: rationale and concepts, *Food Policy*, 34(3), pp. 237–244.
- SUTHERLAND, L.-A. (2013) Can organic farmers be ‘good farmers’? Adding the ‘taste of necessity’ to the conventionalization debate, *Agriculture and Human Values*, 30(3), pp. 429–441.
- THÉVENOT, L. (2011) Power and oppression from the perspective of the sociology of engagements: a comparison with Bourdieu’s and Dewey’s critical approaches to practical activities, *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 19(1), pp. 35–67.
- THÉVENOT, L. (2014) Voicing concern and difference: from public spaces to common-places, *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 1(1), pp. 7–34.
- THÉVENOT, L., MOODY, M. and LAFAYE, C. (2000) Forms of valuing nature: arguments and models of justification in French and American environmental disputes, in: M. LAMONT and L. THÉVENOT (eds) *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229–271.
- TIKE (INFORMATION CENTRE OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY) (2014) *Maatilatilastollinen vuosikirja 2014* [Yearbook of Farm Statistics 2014]. Helsinki: Tike.
- TOVEY, H. (1997) Food, environmentalism and rural sociology. on the organic farming movement in Ireland, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 37(1) pp. 21–37
- TREWAVAS, A. (2001) Urban myths of organic farming, *Nature*, 410(6827), 409–410.
- TRUNINGER, M. (2008) The organic food market in Portugal: contested meanings, competing conventions, *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology*, 7(1–2), pp. 110–125.
- VANDERPLANKEN, K., ROGGE, E., LOOTS, I., MESSELY, L. and VANDERMOERE, F. (2016) Building a narrative: the role of dualisms when interpreting food systems, *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 23(1), pp. 1–20.