# THE AGRIBUSINESS

## WHEN FOOD SERVES THE SYSTEM

Essay

AUTHORS

Hieronymus Anonymus
Noosophe IA

NOOSOPHIE

# THE AGRIBUSINESS

*When Food Serves the System*

Essay

**Noosophie IA**

*under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus*

**Éditions Noosophie**

**N O O S O P H I E**

# EDITORIAL INFORMATION


| | |
|---|---|
| **TITLE** | THE AGRIBUSINESS |
| **SUBTITLE** | When Food Serves the System |
| **AUTHOR** | Noosophie IA |
| **DIRECTION** | Hieronymus Anonymus |
| **PUBLISHER** | Éditions Noosophie |
| **CURRENT PUBLISHING ENTITY** | Association Noosophie |
| **PUBLIC LOCATION** | Roumagne, Lot-et-Garonne, France |
| **WEBSITE** | noosophie.fr |
| **EDITION** | American publication edition v1.0 |
| **PUBLICATION DATE** | September 2026 |
| **FORMAT** | PDF - A5 |
| **ISBN** | To be assigned |
| **PRICE** | Free |
| **LICENSE** | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 |
| **RIGHTS HOLDER / LICENSOR** | Hieronymus Anonymus (public pseudonym; civil identity not published) |
| **COPYRIGHT** | © Hieronymus Anonymus |
| **CONTACT** | contact@noosophie.fr |
| **LEGAL DEPOSIT** | September 2026 |

# GENERATION AND EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

This book was developed through a collaboration between Hieronymus Anonymus and Noosophie IA. Hieronymus Anonymus initiated the project, defined its subject and aims, arbitrated its orientations, reread, corrected, and validated the final manuscript. Noosophie IA contributed to documentary research, structuring, drafting, comparison of arguments, consistency audits, and editing. The text is therefore neither raw model output nor a human text merely corrected by AI: it results from an iterative process of generation, critique, verification, and human validation. Decisions concerning aims, validation, and publication remain human.

# CONTENTS

# CONTENTS - CONTINUED

# INTRODUCTION — THE SYSTEM BEHIND THE FOOD

A tomato bred to survive a long trip. A sauce engineered to stay stable for months. A product built to fit a retailer's assortment. A farmer whose investment makes switching buyers difficult. A shopper choosing from options that were selected and arranged long before reaching the aisle. These may look like separate parts of the food economy. They are not. They are different points in the same system.

That system is what this book calls agribusiness.

Here, agribusiness means more than industrial farming—large machines, purchased inputs, intensive production, or capital-intensive agriculture. It also means more than food manufacturing. The term refers to the large-scale system linking agricultural production, processing, formulation, preservation, logistics, distribution, retail, and marketing, along with the feedback loops through which each stage reshapes the others.

That broad definition is necessary because the problems in this book rarely stay in one place. A shelf-life requirement can change a recipe. A package format can limit what a factory can run. A retailer's specifications can affect which raw materials a processor will accept. A farmer can make a perfectly rational investment for a reliable customer, then discover that the investment has made other customers impractical. A low price may reflect real efficiency, costs shifted elsewhere, or both. A local alternative may create room to maneuver in one setting and undermine a useful function in another.

None of this requires treating the food industry as inherently bad. That would make the argument easier and the analysis worse. Industrial food systems solve real problems. They preserve food, control many safety risks, move large volumes, smooth supply, reduce some forms of physical drudgery, raise productivity, and make a wide range of foods affordable to many households. A critique that dismisses those functions cannot explain why the system became so durable. More important, it cannot build alternatives that replace what the system actually does well.

Trouble begins when solutions harden into requirements.

Food moving through a long, tightly coordinated chain may have to do far more than nourish, taste good, and stay safe. It may need to survive weeks or months in storage, behave the same way in different factories, withstand transport, refrigeration, freezing, reheating, vibration, stacking, and automated handling, and still fit a target package, price, planogram, brand promise, and production schedule. None of those requirements is irrational by itself. But stack enough of them together and the relationship can flip. Instead of the system adapting to food, food, farming, work, and even the setting in which consumers choose begin adapting to the system.

The book asks how an industry built to preserve food, make it safer, and distribute it can become a system that redesigns food—and the relationships around food—to suit the demands of production, distribution, and sale.

No central planner is required. The system can emerge from decisions that make sense one at a time: secure a contract, reduce waste, standardize a product, pay for a new machine, simplify transportation, respond to a preference, lower a price, increase convenience, keep customers. The effects accumulate. A series of locally rational choices can produce a structure that is much harder to change than any one choice that helped create it.

The argument unfolds through five questions.

First: what happens when food itself is shaped for the chain that carries it?

Second: if products can be designed for the system, is consumer demand simply something the system discovers, or do retailing and marketing also help shape the environment in which demand develops?

Third: when producers, processors, workers, and businesses are legally free to choose, what practical options remain when contracts, debt, specialized equipment, infrastructure, standards, or market concentration make changing course costly?

Fourth: when the system becomes cheaper or more efficient, which costs have actually disappeared and which may have been shifted to someone else, somewhere else, or some later time?

Finally: how can we preserve the functions that genuinely work while reorganizing the system so that those functions do not become dependencies that no one can realistically leave?

The goal is not to recover some imagined pure food past. The harder, more practical task is to decide what should stay, what can be reduced, what should be replaced, and what must be reorganized so that a useful function does not quietly turn into lock-in.

# CHAPTER 1 — FOOD BUILT FOR THE CHAIN

A cracker has to come out of its package intact weeks after baking. A sauce cannot separate in transit. A prepared meal must survive chilling, storage, shipment, and reheating. Ice cream has to remain acceptable despite temperature swings in the frozen-food cold chain. These are not simply familiar foods with "industry" added to them. They have been given extra properties because they must survive a system of production, preservation, transport, storage, and sale.

That sounds obvious, but it changes what we are criticizing. The food industry does more than take a fully defined food and produce it at scale. It can help determine what the food must become to work inside the infrastructure around it.

Processing is neither new nor inherently suspect. People have cooked, fermented, dried, ground, salted, pressed, and preserved food for millennia. At industrial scale, pasteurization, sterilization, refrigeration, freezing, drying, and packaging can improve safety, extend shelf life, reduce losses, and make food more reliably available. What matters is not simply that food has been transformed, but which properties the transformation is meant to create, what functions those properties serve, and what happens when the requirements pile up.

## 1. From Processing to Design

An industrial operation can serve a direct purpose. Heating milk reduces microbiological risk. Freezing slows many forms of spoilage. Drying reduces available water. Fermentation can preserve food, change flavor, or make an ingredient more stable. These are transformations tied closely to the material properties of food and to identifiable safety or preservation goals.

Industrial production rarely stops at one operation. Food engineering breaks production into steps such as washing, cutting, grinding, mixing, filtering, centrifuging, extracting, heating, cooling, drying, fermenting, homogenizing, extruding, texturizing, and packaging. A finished product may pass through many of them, with each step changing a particular property.

The number of steps, by itself, tells us very little. A canned vegetable may undergo substantial processing mainly to preserve it, while a product that looks simple may have been engineered to meet a complicated industrial and commercial specification. What matters is what the operations are doing and why.

A more important shift occurs when production works not mainly with whole foods but with fractions of raw materials chosen for their functional properties. Grain can be separated into flour, starch, protein, and fiber. Milk can become cream, proteins, lactose, and powders. Oilseeds yield oils, meals, and protein concentrates. Those components can then be recombined in different proportions.

There is nothing inherently wrong with separating and recombining ingredients. It can fortify foods, adjust texture, use co-products, or solve technical problems. The larger consequence is that manufacturers can increasingly design a product by assembling distinct functional properties.

A manufacturer may want more creaminess without changing flavor, better moisture retention without changing other ingredients, a stable emulsion, consistent color, dough that behaves predictably on a high-speed line, or a texture that survives freezing and thawing. At that point, food becomes partly an engineering problem with multiple constraints.

## 2. An Ingredient List Is Not a Moral Verdict

Food ingredients and additives make this logic easy to see. Preservatives can slow spoilage. Antioxidants can limit oxidation. Emulsifiers can keep ingredients from separating. Thickeners, stabilizers, and gelling agents can change viscosity and mouthfeel. Humectants retain moisture. Acidity regulators alter pH and can affect taste, stability, and microbiological safety. Flavors and colors can create, restore, or standardize sensory properties.

U.S. food regulation itself reflects this functional diversity: FDA materials classify ingredients by what they do and note that the same ingredient may serve more than one purpose. That does not settle every safety question, but it does rule out a useful shortcut: "additive" is not a synonym for "artificial poison."

A better question is simpler: what does the ingredient do, and why does this product and supply chain need that function?

A preservative may prevent a real safety risk, or it may allow a shelf life far beyond what a shorter distribution system would require. A stabilizer may prevent a separation that is physically harmless but commercially unacceptable. A flavor may restore a quality lost during processing, create a recognizable brand profile, or both. The same ingredient can satisfy several functions at once.

Three kinds of constraint are worth separating. Some come from the food itself or from safety: preventing contamination, maintaining a necessary emulsion, keeping the product edible. Others come from industry and logistics: surviving long storage, temperature swings, mechanical handling, long-distance shipment, automated equipment, or thousands of retail locations. Still others are commercial: hitting a target texture or price, maintaining brand identity, or distinguishing one product line from another.

These are not moral categories. A logistics requirement may be entirely legitimate, and a commercial requirement is not automatically harmful. But they solve different problems. Once we blur them together, it becomes harder to see when the needs of the system start redefining the food itself.

## 3. Shelf Life Is a System, Not Just a Date

The date on a package is the visible end of a much larger system: formulation, processing, sanitation, temperature, atmosphere, packaging, light, transport, and time. Keeping a product stable for weeks means controlling more than spoilage. It may also mean limiting microbial growth, oxidation, moisture loss or migration, separation, recrystallization, and changes in texture.

The cold chain makes the interdependence especially clear. Refrigeration and freezing can greatly improve the safety and useful life of perishable foods. But a cold chain is not a refrigerator. It includes cooling, storage, warehouses, trucks, retail

cases, food-service operations, and sometimes home delivery. A failure at one point can affect safety or quality elsewhere.

That can feed back into product design. A sauce may need to remain homogeneous. A cracker may need enough mechanical strength to survive case packing and shipment. A prepared meal may need to tolerate chilling and later reheating. A beverage may need to remain stable through storage and vibration. Ice cream has to be designed for a frozen distribution system in which temperature fluctuations can alter crystal size and texture.

Packaging belongs to the same logic. It can protect food from oxygen, moisture, light, contamination, impact, drying, or leakage. It can be part of safety and preservation, not merely an advertising surface.

Packaging also turns food into something that has to fit a standardized physical system. Cases, pallets, racks, refrigerated storage, trucks, conveyor systems, and shelves all favor predictable dimensions, weights, stackability, labels, and machine compatibility. Logistics can therefore shape the physical form of the product itself.

A feedback loop appears:

longer chain → greater need for stability → processing, formulation, and packaging designed for that need → product becomes easier to move through the long chain → long chain becomes easier to maintain.

That loop is not necessarily harmful. It has helped supply large cities, extend seasons, reduce some losses, and keep food available more consistently. But it can also reverse who adapts to whom. Instead of building infrastructure around the properties of food, we begin designing food around the properties of infrastructure.

## 4. Consistency Reaches Upstream

Consistency is one of industrial production's genuine strengths. Raw materials, seasons, factories, and storage conditions vary, yet the product still has to behave predictably. That regularity can improve process control and safety, and it gives customers something they recognize.

But consistency is not created inside the factory alone. Its requirements can travel upstream.

If a process needs a particular protein level, moisture content, fat content, starch profile, size, or mechanical strength, purchasing specifications will favor raw materials that meet those needs. The buyer is no longer looking for wheat, milk, potatoes, or tomatoes in the abstract. It is looking for raw materials that work with its equipment, storage, yields, schedules, and final product.

Agriculture has always selected varieties and breeds for human purposes—taste, yield, preservation, transport, milling, brewing, baking, and countless other uses. What changes in a highly integrated chain is the number and precision of requirements that can be layered together: volume, uniformity, timing, technological performance, price, appearance, storage behavior, and processing characteristics.

The factory does not simply adapt to whatever the farm produces. Increasingly, the farm may be asked to produce what the downstream system is equipped to use.

## 5. What Ultra-Processing Helps Us See—and What It Does Not Prove

NOVA is useful here as a lens, not a verdict. Its ultra-processed category draws attention to industrial formulations that often use fractions, functional ingredients, and substances uncommon in home cooking. What NOVA helps us see is the shift from processing a food to engineering a product whose final form depends heavily on formulation.

But NOVA is not a toxicity score, a complete nutrition score, or a direct measure of environmental impact, labor conditions, market power, or the quality of raw materials. Nor does a classification, by itself, explain the mechanism behind a health outcome.

It can help identify a form of industrial formulation. It cannot decide whether every product in that category is good, bad, necessary, or replaceable.

## 6. When the Requirements Start to Stack Up

Technical sophistication by itself is not the turning point. The shift comes when requirements start stacking up.

A food may need to be safe. Then stable. Then transportable. Then storable. Then consistent. Then compatible with a high-speed line. Then inexpensive enough. Then available year-round. Then recognizable as a brand. Then suited to a particular package and shelf format. Then able to retain a desired texture for weeks.

None of these conditions, by itself, necessarily creates a problem. Together, they change the question being asked of the food.

The question is no longer simply: How can we process this food so that it is safer or lasts longer?

It becomes: What must this product be in order to function inside the chain as a whole?

That is a different kind of design problem. A kitchen recipe may begin with an ingredient, a flavor, a meal, or a familiar practice. An industrial product may have to satisfy raw-material variation, equipment, safety systems, warehouses, trucks, shelves, price targets, and brand identity all at once. The product becomes a way of solving many constraints at the same time.

That is a real technical achievement. It can make food safer, more consistent, easier to transport, more widely available, and sometimes cheaper. It can also make the system less sensitive to the particular qualities of ingredients, places, and producers. The easier it becomes to reformulate, substitute, fractionate, standardize, and stabilize, the easier it becomes to ask upstream production to fit the system.

Agribusiness is not a problem simply because it transforms food. The deeper concern is that, past a certain level of integration, transformation may begin serving the continued operation of the chain as much as the food itself.

## 7. From Designing the Product to Shaping the Choice

This chapter has deliberately stopped short of health, economic power, and marketing. Its narrower purpose was to show that industrial, logistical, and

commercial organization can reach all the way into the physical properties of the food itself.

But the chain is not complete when the product reaches a grocery shelf, restaurant, vending machine, school cafeteria, warehouse club, or delivery platform. For the system to reproduce itself, products must be noticed, chosen, repurchased, incorporated into habits, and distinguished from competing options.

The next step is to look at demand. If supply can be designed around the chain, is consumer demand simply waiting outside the system to be discovered? Or do retailing, packaging, promotions, convenience, and marketing also shape the setting in which people choose?

# CHAPTER 2 — SELLING DOES MORE THAN FOLLOW DEMAND

A grocery store does not simply mirror what consumers already want. Long before a shopper reaches for yogurt, a frozen meal, a cereal box, or a bottle of soda, someone has decided which products to carry, which package sizes to offer, where to place them, how much shelf space to give them, what price to display, and whether to promote them.

If a store does not carry a product, shoppers cannot choose it there. An item on an endcap enters attention differently from one buried on a lower shelf. A single-serve package, a family-size package, and a multi-buy promotion also create different opportunities to buy and consume.

Consumers are not puppets. They bring their own preferences, budgets, culture, habits, hunger, health concerns, schedules, and constraints. But they still choose inside an environment someone else has organized. The useful question is not whether people are "free" or "manipulated." It is how commercial decisions shape the conditions under which real choice happens.

## 1. Before Consumers Choose, Products Must Reach Them

Distribution does real work. Retailers assemble huge assortments, manage inventory, coordinate logistics, put food within reach of consumers, and make regular high-volume supply possible. Large buyers can also cut some transaction costs and, in some relationships, bargain effectively with powerful manufacturers.

But distribution also means selection.

No retailer can carry every product. Decisions have to be made about what enters the assortment. Those decisions may depend on price, available volume, consistency, quality, origin, sales performance, packaging, logistics, promotional support, brand strategy, or expected turnover.

Getting onto a retailer's shelves is more than an administrative step. It is access to a market channel.

That power is limited when suppliers have many other customers and retailers have many interchangeable suppliers. It becomes more consequential when a small number of buyers account for large volumes and losing one account means losing sales that are difficult to replace.

The U.S. retail market makes this especially visible. USDA's Economic Research Service reports that grocery stores still accounted for most food-at-home spending in 2025, while warehouse clubs and supercenters had grown to more than a quarter of the market. For suppliers, retail access can mean several very different channels, each with its own scale, logistics, pricing, and assortment requirements.

The same pattern extends beyond retail. School districts, hospital systems, universities, restaurant chains, correctional systems, and other institutional food-service buyers also select suppliers that can meet requirements for volume, food

safety, delivery, portions, scheduling, and cost. In each setting, the needs of the final buyer help determine which products and suppliers gain access.

## 2. Buyer Requirements Can Reach Into the Product

Once a product is under contract or carried by a major customer, downstream influence does not operate only through price. Buyers may require a particular size, appearance, origin, shelf life, packaging format, delivery rhythm, certification, ingredient profile, or labeling standard.

Some of these requirements clearly serve useful functions. Traceability, food safety, predictable delivery, and environmental standards can improve performance. Others primarily serve logistics: case dimensions, pallet configuration, predictable weights, shelf life, replenishment schedules, or compatibility with automated distribution systems. Still others are directly commercial: a target price, a private-label position, package architecture, promotional format, or visual differentiation.

There is no need to label each requirement good or bad in advance. What matters is where the influence travels. A retailer, restaurant chain, or institutional buyer does not have to own the factory to shape what gets made there. Specifications can reach upstream into packaging, formulation, manufacturing, and even the raw materials processors are willing to buy.

Private-label products make the point especially clear in the United States. A retailer can set a target price, positioning, package, sensory profile, or quality standard, then hire one or more manufacturers to make the product. That can increase competition with national brands and lower prices. It also shows that retailing can become part of product design instead of simply selling something that was fully defined elsewhere.

## 3. Choice Begins with What the Store Puts in Front of You

Once the product exists and has access to a sales channel, it still has to be seen.

Shoppers never choose among all possible foods. They choose from what is available in that place, at that moment, grouped into categories and positioned against competing options. Shelf height, facings, aisle location, checkout placement, endcaps, signs, price displays, promotions, and stockouts all shape what people encounter.

Retail and behavioral research shows that availability, placement, price, and promotion can affect purchasing in at least some settings. An eye-level product does not become irresistible. The effect is more modest: something easier to notice, easier to reach, repeatedly presented, or cheaper at the moment of decision is more likely to enter the set of options a shopper seriously considers.

That distinction matters: freedom to choose is not the same thing as the structure of the choices on offer.

Both can be real at the same time.

## 4. Packaging Is Also a Commercial Interface

In the previous chapter, packaging appeared as a material technology: it protects, contains, preserves, and enables transportation. On the shelf, it becomes something else as well—a commercial interface.

Color, typography, photography, shape, material, package size, windows, claims, characters, and labels affect how the product appears. In many retail settings the package is one of the last communication surfaces fully controlled by the brand at the moment products are compared.

This matters especially for children. U.S. public-health guidance recognizes that food and beverage marketing reaches children through many channels, including environments such as schools, and that placement and promotional cues can shape the visibility and appeal of food choices. That does not mean a character, package, or sign mechanically causes a purchase. It means commercial design can become part of the environment through which products are perceived.

The technique has no fixed moral direction. The same visual device can promote foods with very different nutritional profiles. A cartoon character, color, or package shape is not the issue by itself. The important fact is that persuasion can be built directly into the product's interface.

## 5. Food Demand Repeats

Food differs from many other goods in one obvious way: people consume it over and over.

A household does not buy a refrigerator or a car several times a day. People eat and drink repeatedly. Hunger exists independently of advertising. So do culinary traditions, family tastes, incomes, schedules, preferences, and time constraints.

Because consumption repeats, the commercial goal often goes beyond getting someone to try a product once. It may be to increase frequency, create another eating occasion, move a product from a meal to a snack, make it easy to consume in a car or at a desk, build brand loyalty, or keep a portion immediately available.

Marketing often works not by creating hunger itself, but by attaching hunger and other real needs to particular occasions, identities, formats, and habits.

Hunger can be routed into breakfast, a snack, dessert, takeout, delivery, a drink, a protein bar, or something eaten on the go. Fatigue can become a heat-and-eat meal. Lack of time can become drive-through food or app-based delivery. Socializing can become products designed for sharing.

These products may answer genuine needs. Commercial systems can also multiply the situations in which a food product presents itself as the immediate solution.

Here the critique of consumerism meets the critique of agribusiness, but the two are not the same. Commercial influence is better understood as a sequence than as direct control: signal → attention → anticipation → desire → evaluation → possible action. That last step matters. Seeing is not wanting, and wanting is not buying. Marketing can change probabilities, cues, and the conditions that move people from one stage to the next without eliminating judgment or choice.

## 6. Promotions, Prices, and Portions Shape the Purchase

A promotion can make a product more affordable, encourage trial, clear inventory, shift a purchase between brands, or increase the amount purchased.

Promotions reach upstream too. A major sales event can change orders, inventory, production schedules, and transportation before shoppers see anything in the store. What happens on the shelf is directly tied to what happens farther back in the industrial system.

Package size and pricing can also shape how much people buy at once. A single-serve bottle, a family-size package, a warehouse-club multipack, and a two-for-one offer are not just different wrappers around the same food. They set different default quantities for buying, serving, storing, and consuming.

Research on portions and package size does not show that a large package inevitably causes chronic overeating or disease. It supports a narrower claim: in some settings, the size of the unit offered can change how much people consume in the moment. Demand is not always a fixed quantity waiting to reveal itself. The way an option is presented can help shape how much is bought or eaten.

## 7. Children Change the Responsibility Question

Children require separate treatment because the skills involved in recognizing and evaluating persuasion are still developing.

Research summarized by the World Health Organization and U.S. public-health literature supports a limited but important claim: food marketing can affect children's preferences, purchase requests, and dietary behavior. That evidence does not imply that every exposure produces the same effect or that children have no agency. Age, family environment, education, frequency of exposure, product type, and context all matter.

A narrower claim is easier to defend, both empirically and normatively: when children are still learning to recognize persuasion, understand commercial intent, and step back from it, the design of the commercial environment carries more weight in questions of responsibility.

This concern is reflected in specific U.S. school rules and guidance. CDC notes that food and beverage marketing is present in school environments, that local school wellness policies are required to address such marketing, and that placement, pricing, and visibility can be used to encourage healthier choices. The institutional rules are specific to U.S. schools, but the broader function is the one at issue here: commercial environments do not merely display choices; they can organize attention and accessibility.

## 8. Convenience Can Be Both Response and Reinforcement

Convenience shows especially well how supply and demand can reinforce each other.

A frozen meal may help someone eat after a late shift. A single portion can reduce waste for a one-person household. Delivery can help a person who is sick, isolated, exhausted, or unable to travel. Ready-to-eat food can reduce a real domestic burden.

Calling all of those needs artificial would miss what the products actually do for people.

But convenience can also be designed into products and services: easy-open packaging, short heating times, portable portions, extended store hours, drive-through service, one-click ordering, rapid delivery, or food intended to be eaten without utensils.

Then the two sides can reinforce each other. Time pressure creates demand for quick solutions. Once quick solutions are everywhere, it becomes easier to organize daily life around having less time to cook, plan, or wait.

The evidence does not tell us exactly how much causation runs in either direction. The market neither invents everyday life from scratch nor merely reflects it. It responds to real constraints and can help stabilize the routines that grow around those responses.

## 9. Demand Is Shaped, Not Simply Found or Invented

A better model is a loop:

existing needs, preferences, and constraints → products and services → commercial environment → purchases and use → sales data → reformulation and new products → new promotions and formats → changing habits and expectations → new products and services.

Companies watch what sells. They test flavors, packages, claims, prices, placements, and promotions. Successful products stay, spread, split into variants, or get copied; unsuccessful ones disappear. Consumers are not passive—their purchases genuinely select among offers. But supply is not passive either. It changes the setting in which the next round of choices will happen.

Demand is discovered and expressed, but also selected, organized, and sometimes actively developed.

## 10. Selling Can Reach Back into Design

The connection becomes clearest when the sales promise changes the product itself.

Convenience may require a portable package, easy opening, and long shelf life. Indulgence may shape flavor, texture, and color. A product marketed to children may change portion size, sweetness, graphics, or format. A "high-protein," "light," "natural," or similar market position can trigger reformulation. A target retail price can affect package weight, ingredient choices, processing, and packaging materials.

That does not mean the marketing department dictates the recipe. R&D, regulation, suppliers, manufacturing, logistics, safety, and cost all constrain the result. But the line between making a product and then selling it, and designing a product so it can be sold a certain way, becomes harder to draw.

## 11. Consumers Choose, but Never in a Vacuum

Marketing does not invent hunger, pleasure, culture, or taste. Retailers do not control every purchase. Their influence is more limited and more concrete.

Assortment, listing, placement, price, promotion, packaging, portion size, branding, and convenience all shape the setting in which demand is expressed. When those commercial choices reach back into formulation, packaging, raw materials, and production schedules, selling itself becomes one of the forces shaping the food system.

Consumers still choose—but never from a blank slate.

## 12. When Organizing Choices Becomes Power

So far, we have followed the point where supply meets demand. The next question is harder.

Two parties can be legally free to negotiate while having radically different capacities to refuse. A farmer may need one processor. A manufacturer may depend on one major retail account. A worker may technically be free to quit while having no realistic alternative nearby. A company may own its assets while depending on software, a brand, financing, infrastructure, or access controlled by someone else.

When does shaping the available options become power? And if size and ownership are not enough to measure it, what is?

That is where the next chapter begins.

# CHAPTER 3 — WHO CAN STILL SAY NO?

Two businesses can sign the same kind of contract and still have very different ability to walk away.

A farmer may be legally free to sell to another buyer but have a barn, cooling system, certification, production schedule, or financing plan built around one relationship. A processor may own its plant outright and still depend on a handful of customers capable of taking its volume. A grower may own land and buildings while a contracting company controls the animals, inputs, technical specifications, schedule, and route to market. A company can remain independent on paper while relying on software, data, financing, a brand, or infrastructure controlled by someone else.

This is where power becomes easier to see.

The previous chapter looked at how consumer choices are organized. Move farther up the chain and the same issue appears in another form: what choices remain for farmers, ranchers, processors, distributors, and workers when leaving a relationship becomes expensive?

Legal freedom matters. It protects against explicit coercion and defines enforceable rights. But it does not tell us how much economic room a party actually has. A business may have every legal right to end a contract and still be unable to do so without destroying the value of a major investment. It may own its productive assets and have only one practical route to market. Ownership matters, but so does a second question: who can still change course?

## 1. Size Is Not the Same Thing as Power

It is tempting to tell the story of American agribusiness as a fight between a few giant corporations and everyone else. Concentration in several U.S. agricultural and food markets makes that story plausible. It is still too simple.

A large company may face strong competitors, imports, substitute products, or major customers with the ability to switch suppliers. A smaller company may become locally indispensable if it controls the only practical slaughter facility, grain elevator, cold-storage site, specialized service, or route to market available within a workable distance.

U.S. data make the distinction especially important. USDA's Economic Research Service has documented substantial concentration in seeds, meatpacking, and food retail. In 2019, the four largest meatpackers handled 85 percent of steer and heifer purchases and 67 percent of hog purchases. But the same USDA analysis points to a tradeoff that concentration statistics alone cannot resolve: larger plants can lower processing costs, while fewer competing buyers can give packers more ability to push livestock prices down.

Concentration matters, but it is not the same thing as power.

Market concentration tells us how much of a market is accounted for by a small number of firms. Market power asks what those firms can actually do given the

alternatives available to everyone else. Bargaining power concerns the terms one party can obtain in a negotiation. Buyer power concerns firms purchasing livestock, crops, labor, or other inputs. Antitrust violations are narrower still and depend on statutes, facts, market definition, conduct, and legal standards.

These categories can overlap. They are not interchangeable.

U.S. merger policy explicitly recognizes the buyer side of this problem. The Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission's 2023 Merger Guidelines state that competition can be harmed when competing buyers consolidate and weaken competition for suppliers, workers, or other providers—not only when sellers consolidate. That does not make every concentrated buyer market unlawful. It does show that suppliers' ability to choose among buyers is a recognized part of competition, not a side issue.

Scale can also do useful work. A large processing plant can spread the cost of laboratories, food-safety controls, specialized maintenance, and advanced equipment across a huge output. A major logistics network can reduce some transportation and coordination costs. A large buyer may even counter the power of a large seller. Size is not morally suspect by itself. The harder question is when gains in coordination or efficiency begin to grow more slowly than the power to set the terms everyone else must meet.

## 2. Power Lives in Relationships

Food systems have no single command center. Power shows up in the relationships between actors.

A farmer may depend on a seed supplier, a feed company, a machinery dealer, a lender, an operating system, or a service platform. The same farmer may then depend on a processor willing to take a perishable product. A processor may depend on a retailer or food-service customer large enough to absorb its output. A retailer facing a brand that consumers insist on carrying may, in turn, have less negotiating leverage than its size would suggest.

Power can run in more than one direction.

Public debate often starts with monopoly: one seller facing many buyers. Agribusiness also requires looking at the reverse. When many producers face only a few realistic buyers, economists speak of buyer power, monopsony, or oligopsony. A grocery shelf can display dozens of brands while the farms behind them still have very few routes to market.

That is why the firm alone is the wrong unit of analysis. The relationship matters just as much.

How many realistic alternatives does each party have? What would switching require? How much time would it take? What specialized investment would lose value? How far can a perishable product travel? How many buyers can absorb the volume? Which side can survive a failed negotiation longer?

Those answers tell us more about practical power than company size by itself.

## 3. A Contract Shapes Tomorrow's Options

A contract does more than set a price. It can determine volume, timing, risk, technical obligations, investment requirements, and predictability.

That can increase autonomy.

A reliable long-term customer can make financing possible. A contract can reduce uncertainty, justify new equipment, smooth volatility, coordinate production, and give a farmer or processor enough confidence to build capacity that would otherwise be too risky. A stable commercial relationship can expand what a business is able to do.

The same mechanism can work in reverse when the investment only makes sense inside that relationship.

Suppose a supplier wins a major customer. Meeting the customer's volume requires a new line. Meeting its specifications requires particular packaging, software, equipment, certification, or building modifications. As long as the relationship lasts, the specialization may increase productivity and income.

Now suppose the customer leaves.

If the equipment can serve other customers, the certification is widely recognized, the data can move to another system, and several buyers can take the output, leaving may be painful but possible. If the investment has little value outside that relationship, the formal freedom to leave comes at a very high price.

The mechanism is simple:

major customer → specialized investment → greater efficiency or compliance → repayment depends on retaining the customer → higher switching cost → altered bargaining power.

Nothing in that sequence is necessarily abusive. Both parties may benefit for years. But the contract has done more than organize today's exchange. It has also helped determine which alternatives will exist tomorrow.

That is why reversibility matters. Can the equipment be repurposed? Will other customers recognize the same standards? Can a contract end with enough time to recover the investment? Are there other customers? Is the business building productive capacity, or capacity whose value depends on a single gatekeeper?

## 4. Owning the Farm Is Not the Same as Controlling the System

Property matters, but ownership is only one way control operates.

A company can shape production through contracts, specifications, private standards, licenses, software, financing, customer data, or control over an essential service. A farm or processor may remain legally independent even when many of the conditions that determine how it operates are set elsewhere.

U.S. contract poultry production makes the distinction unusually clear. USDA research describes growers who typically provide the housing, equipment, utilities, and labor, while integrators provide chicks, feed, transportation, veterinary services, and technical guidance. The grower may own expensive fixed assets even though key production inputs and access to processing remain tied to the integrator relationship.

This does not make contract production inherently exploitative. The arrangement also solves real coordination and risk problems and has supported large-scale production with standardized inputs and services. The narrower lesson is that owning the land and buildings does not tell us who controls all the conditions that make those assets economically useful.

The same logic applies outside poultry. A farmer can own land and depend on a distant slaughter plant. A processor can own a factory and depend on refrigerated warehousing or a digital system it cannot replace quickly. A manufacturer can produce a private-label item while the retailer controls the brand, the customer relationship, the sales data, and the listing.

So "Who owns it?" is still an important question. It is not enough. We also need to ask who controls the conditions that make the asset usable.

## 5. Integration Can Open Options—and Close Them

Vertical integration brings together stages that would otherwise be linked through separate transactions: inputs, production, processing, logistics, distribution, brands, and sometimes data.

This can solve real problems. It can secure supply, improve traceability, coordinate investment, standardize quality, reduce transaction costs, and make expensive technical systems workable. A producer connected to an integrator may obtain inputs, technical support, financing, or a guaranteed route to market that would be difficult to assemble independently.

Calling every integrated system a form of dispossession would miss much of what integration actually accomplishes.

Coordination also redistributes decision-making. If one partner supplies the genetics, feed, standards, schedule, financing, technical requirements, and outlet, legal independence tells us little by itself about how much room the other party has to maneuver.

That leads to concrete questions. Who decides how much gets produced? Who specifies the equipment? Who controls the schedule? Who bears biological risk? Who owns the animals or raw materials? Who sets or influences the price? Who controls the brand? What happens if either side wants out?

A legally independent business can have little day-to-day autonomy. A cooperative or integrated organization can sometimes allow more, if its rules remain genuinely answerable to the people who depend on it.

Legal form alone does not tell us how much practical freedom exists.

## 6. Debt Can Create Options—and Narrow Them Later

Modern food production and processing require capital: land, buildings, equipment, refrigeration, processing lines, storage, vehicles, laboratories, software, and inventory.

Credit can expand a business's options dramatically. It can let a farmer buy equipment instead of renting it, help a cooperative build shared processing capacity, or allow a small manufacturer to meet safety and quality requirements that would otherwise be out of reach.

Debt is not automatically dependence.

Debt can still narrow the ability to change direction when repayment depends on a particular production model, volume, customer, or technology continuing. An investment that is profitable inside one system can become an obstacle to leaving it.

The risk grows when dependencies stack up: a large loan, specialized buildings, a primary contract, customer-specific requirements, proprietary technology, and few

alternative buyers. Refusing a new term may then put far more at risk than one sale. It can threaten the cash flow needed to carry the entire investment.

Fixed capital has a long memory. Money already sunk into buildings and equipment can narrow the paths a business can still afford to take.

So the issue is not whether debt is good or bad. It is which options an investment creates, which ones it closes, and who absorbs the loss if the path it was built around stops working.

## 7. Lock-In Usually Builds One Layer at a Time

A food-system relationship becomes truly rigid when the dependencies stop standing alone.

One buyer may be replaceable. One specialized machine may be paid off. One certification may be manageable. One proprietary software package may be annoying but affordable to replace. One loan may be reasonable.

Put them together, and the structure changes:

dominant buyer + relationship-specific investment + debt + customer-specific standard + nonportable system + few alternative facilities.

Each element reinforces the next. The customer justifies the investment. The investment justifies the debt. The debt makes volume necessary. The required volume makes the customer harder to replace. Customer-specific requirements shrink the alternatives. Leaving one part of the arrangement may then require changing several others at once.

That is lock-in.

Lock-in does not require a conspiracy. No company has to design the whole system to trap anyone. It can emerge from a series of reasonable decisions made under the conditions of the moment.

Intent and structure are different things. A relationship can become hard to leave even when every step that created it was voluntary and no one intended the final rigidity.

## 8. Farmers Can Gain Power by Acting Together

A critique of concentration becomes self-defeating if it treats every form of collective scale as a loss of autonomy.

Scattered producers facing large buyers may gain autonomy by organizing together. They can share storage, processing, transportation, marketing, information, and negotiating capacity. They can build infrastructure no individual farm could finance and create a route to market instead of merely choosing among routes controlled by others.

U.S. law has long recognized this function. The Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 gives agricultural producers a limited antitrust exemption that allows qualifying producer associations to act collectively in processing, preparing for market, handling, and marketing what they produce. The exemption is limited and comes with statutory conditions and safeguards against abuse of collective power. For this argument, the key point is simple: U.S. law recognizes circumstances in which agricultural producers may market together without qualifying collective activity being treated as an unlawful restraint of trade.

Collective scale can be defensive as well as dominant.

A single producer may have only one practical buyer. A hundred producers in an organization they genuinely control may be able to own facilities, negotiate with several customers, hire specialized staff, and reopen options that were unavailable individually.

This is central to the book's idea of autonomy. Autonomy does not mean doing everything alone. Voluntary association can increase each member's ability to act.

But calling something a cooperative does not settle the matter. A cooperative can become opaque, bureaucratic, dependent on a few customers, or hard for members to leave. It has to face the same questions as any other organization: Who decides? What information do members receive? What alternatives remain? What happens to a member's investment on exit? Does collective capacity expand a member's room to maneuver, or simply move the dependency somewhere else?

## 9. Autonomy Is Not Self-Sufficiency

No complex food system can operate without interdependence.

A bakery depends on flour. A mill depends on grain. A processor depends on suppliers and equipment. A grocery store depends on logistics. Consumers depend on networks of production, distribution, energy, refrigeration, and labor that no household could reproduce on its own.

Eliminating dependence altogether would mean eliminating much of the division of labor that makes a complex society possible.

The problem is not dependence in the ordinary sense of needing other people. It is dependence without a workable alternative.

A close and durable relationship can leave considerable autonomy if its rules are predictable, investments have alternative uses, information is shared, and exit remains possible. A looser-looking relationship can be more confining if one side has nowhere realistic to go when terms change.

Economic autonomy looks less like self-sufficiency than like having several viable paths.

More than one supplier. More than one buyer. Equipment that can be repurposed. Standards recognized by multiple customers. Data that can be exported. Contracts that can end without destroying the business. Infrastructure that can be shared or governed by those who rely on it. Enough financial and operational slack to survive a transition.

None of those conditions guarantees a wise decision. They protect something more basic: the ability to make a different one.

## 10. Power Often Sits at the Bottleneck

In agribusiness, power does not belong only to the largest corporation or the company with the most factories.

It also appears wherever one actor becomes hard to bypass.

That can happen because of a highly concentrated buyer market, a single processing plant, an indispensable brand, a private standard, proprietary software, financing, data, or control of a route to market. The 2023 DOJ/FTC Merger Guidelines explicitly identify control over products, services, or routes to market

used by rivals as a possible competitive concern in merger analysis. Again, the legal doctrine is narrower than the general concept developed here. Its relevance is that U.S. competition policy itself recognizes that access can matter independently of simple ownership.

Being hard to bypass is not automatically abusive. Some infrastructure is expensive enough that duplicating it would waste resources. A slaughter plant, specialized laboratory, refrigerated warehouse, or processing line may genuinely work better at larger scale.

Indispensability does change the governance problem. The harder a function is to replace, the more the terms of access matter.

So instead of asking only whether a firm is big, ask something more revealing:

What happens if everyone else refuses its terms?

If farmers, processors, workers, or customers can switch to another buyer, supplier, technology, facility, or route to market at a reasonable cost, power is constrained by alternatives.

If saying no means abandoning a major investment, losing access to processing, enduring a long shutdown, or leaving the business entirely, formal freedom tells us less and less about the actual relationship.

## 11. Power Shows Up in the Cost of Leaving

No single fact—large size, concentration, vertical integration, a long-term contract, or debt—is enough to prove domination.

A sharper test is reversibility.

What options remain when the relationship becomes tense? How much value is destroyed by switching? How long would transition take? Are the alternatives merely legal possibilities, or economically usable ones?

An actor's power increases when it can shape the options available to others and when leaving the relationship would destroy a disproportionate share of the assets, market access, knowledge, or productive capacity built around it.

A pluralistic economy cannot be judged only by how many companies remain separately incorporated. It also matters how many realistic paths those companies can still take.

This avoids two opposite mistakes: assuming every large or concentrated organization is oppressive, and assuming legal independence proves practical autonomy.

Neither is enough.

## 12. From the Cost of Leaving to the Costs We Do Not See

We have followed the chain from the design of food to the organization of consumer choice and then to the ability of firms and workers to refuse or change relationships.

One more question remains.

A system can look efficient because a health cost appears years later. A low price can coexist with pollution borne by people outside the transaction. A productivity gain can be real while part of its benefit depends on intensified work. A supply chain can transfer risks to animals, communities, ecosystems, or future generations.

A cost has not necessarily been reduced just because it no longer appears in today's price.

The next chapter follows those missing costs.

# CHAPTER 4 — THE COSTS THE PRICE DOESN'T SHOW

A price tells us something important, but not everything. It tells us what the buyer pays at the moment of exchange. It does not tell us, by itself, what happened to water, soil, workers, animals, energy use, public health, or future resilience to make that transaction possible. And a low price cannot tell us whether a cost was truly reduced or simply moved somewhere else.

Both possibilities are real. Mechanization, preservation, logistics, refrigeration, and large-scale processing have reduced many costs per unit and prevented real losses and risks. So it would be wrong to assume that every low price hides exploitation. It would be just as wrong to assume that a cost has vanished because it no longer appears on the receipt.

This chapter asks a simple question: when a system gets cheaper or more efficient, what actually happened to the costs?

## 1. A Price Leaves Things Out

A transaction records a price, a quantity, and certain terms between buyer and seller. Many of its effects can fall outside the transaction entirely.

Water pollution may impose treatment costs on communities. A workplace injury may be borne by a worker, a family, an employer, an insurer, and public programs in different proportions. Soil fertility can decline over years. An antibiotic can save a sick animal while unnecessary use contributes to selection pressure whose effects extend beyond the farm. Packaging can protect food while consuming materials and creating waste.

These effects are not interchangeable. A ton of greenhouse-gas emissions, a hospitalization, a repetitive-strain injury, habitat loss, animal suffering, and an hour of exhausting work do not belong to one natural unit of measurement. Money can help compare some policy choices, but monetization rests on conventions. It cannot make fundamentally different harms identical.

The goal is not to discover one perfectly "true" price. It is to make visible what the transaction leaves out without pretending that every consequence can be collapsed into a single score.

## 2. Sometimes a Lower Cost Really Is Better

Before looking for hidden costs, we have to recognize real cost reductions.

A machine can increase output while reducing human labor per unit. Better logistics can prevent spoilage. Pasteurization and refrigeration can extend shelf life and prevent disease. A large plant can spread the cost of food-safety systems, laboratories, maintenance, and specialized equipment across millions of units.

Those gains are real when the cost has actually been eliminated rather than pushed somewhere else.

If a task that once required an hour of labor can be done in ten minutes by a machine without causing a larger harm somewhere else, productivity has genuinely increased. If packaging prevents far more food from being discarded than the packaging itself costs in materials and impact, its function matters. If a cold chain prevents foodborne illness and spoilage, energy use alone cannot tell us whether the system is wasteful.

A real gain on one dimension can still come with a cost on another. Automation may reduce heavy lifting while increasing pace. Refrigeration may reduce food loss while consuming electricity. Standardization may improve safety while creating economic dependence. The useful comparison is between functions and trade-offs, not labels such as "industrial" and "natural."

## 3. Health: An Association Is Not a Verdict

Health claims demand particular care because the evidence comes in different forms.

A substantial body of epidemiological research links high consumption of ultra-processed foods with several adverse outcomes, including cardiometabolic outcomes, obesity, type 2 diabetes, and measures of mortality. The signal is too consistent to dismiss. But "ultra-processed" does not name a single pathogen, ingredient, or mechanism.

Products in the category differ in nutrient composition, energy density, fiber, texture, portion size, speed of consumption, palatability, additives, packaging, and the role they play in the rest of the diet. Several of those properties may contribute to observed risks.

Repeated association is not the same as identifying a single cause. A plausible mechanism is not yet proof. A classification can reveal a pattern of industrial formulation without explaining every health outcome associated with that pattern.

So "Is ultra-processed food toxic?" is the wrong question. We need to know which properties of which products, in which dietary contexts, contribute to which risks—and how strong the evidence is.

That caution does not weaken the critique. It keeps the argument from claiming more certainty than the evidence supports.

## 4. Additives Are Not All the Same

The same care is needed with additives.

Different additives do different jobs: preservation, safety, color, texture, stability, processing, flavor, or moisture control. FDA materials make that diversity explicit. Simply knowing that an additive is present does not establish harm.

Authorized uses can still be reassessed as evidence changes. But evidence about one substance, dose, or use cannot simply be extended to every added ingredient.

A serious critique has to follow the mechanism: which substance, at what dose, serving what function, creating what exposure, supported by what evidence, and compared with what alternative?

## 5. Food Safety Also Means Counting What Never Happens

Any accounting is distorted if it counts only the costs of industrial techniques and ignores the harms those techniques prevent.

Pasteurization, sanitation, refrigeration, traceability, barrier packaging, process controls, and monitoring can prevent microbiological risks. Their success is partly invisible: an illness that never happens leaves no event to count.

That matters in the United States, where foodborne disease remains a major public-health burden. CDC currently estimates about 48 million foodborne illnesses, 128,000 hospitalizations, and 3,000 deaths each year. Those numbers do not prove that industrial food systems are safe by definition. They do show that food-safety functions are real and that any alternative has to reproduce them rather than assume they are unnecessary.

A system can hide a cost by shifting it elsewhere. It can also hide a benefit when the harm it prevents never happens.

## 6. Labor: When Workers Absorb the Pressure

Wages alone do not capture the human cost of food production.

Mechanization, automation, powered handling, protective equipment, training, and ergonomic design can reduce physical strain and injury. Factory work is not inherently more arduous than agricultural or craft work.

U.S. meatpacking and poultry processing also show why labor cannot be treated as a solved problem. OSHA identifies hazards including noise, dangerous equipment, slippery floors, chemical exposure, repetitive motion, awkward postures, forceful exertion, and musculoskeletal disorders. Those risks do not prove that every large plant is worse than every small one. They show how productivity can become entangled with work intensity.

Lower consumer prices can come from better technology, better organization, reduced losses, lower margins, automation, or different sourcing. But when other adjustments are unavailable or rejected, the pressure may fall on staffing, schedules, pace, subcontracting, or workers' bodies.

The important question is not simply whether throughput increased, but how. Did technology eliminate work, or did the same worker have to make more movements in the same amount of time?

Higher productivity and greater work intensity are not the same thing.

## 7. Work Can Become the Shock Absorber

Food supply chains face variability: breakdowns, demand spikes, promotions, seasonal peaks, absences, perishable inventory, and safety constraints.

A system can absorb variability with inventory, spare capacity, backup equipment, planning, information systems, or contracts. It can also absorb it through workers—changing schedules, overtime, temporary or seasonal labor, or faster line speeds.

The risk is greater when the people providing that flexibility have little practical ability to refuse. Employment may be tied to housing, transportation, legal or administrative status, or a local labor market with few alternatives. As in the

previous chapter, a formally voluntary relationship can become hard to leave when realistic options narrow.

A serious labor assessment has to look beyond average pay to safety, predictable schedules, the ability to report problems, mobility, training, and the real ability to stop unsafe work.

## 8. Environmental Costs Run Through the Whole Chain

Food systems contribute substantially to environmental pressure, but the total includes many distinct processes: farming, livestock, land use, processing, refrigeration, transport, retail, consumption, and waste.

Blaming all of those effects on "food manufacturing" would tell us almost nothing.

What matters is how downstream organization reaches back upstream. Volumes, prices, standards, schedules, formulation, and product design influence which raw materials are demanded and under what conditions. That does not mean a supermarket simply "causes" soil erosion. It means commercial systems can favor, reproduce, or discourage particular production patterns.

The same caution applies to distance. Local food is not automatically lower-impact, and food shipped a long way is not automatically worse. Production methods, load efficiency, storage, waste, seasonality, and transportation mode can matter more than mileage alone.

Proximity is one variable, not an environmental seal of approval.

## 9. Packaging: Easy to See, Easy to Misread

Packaging is easy to criticize because we can see it. It uses resources, energy, and waste-management capacity. Some materials raise concerns about chemical migration or end-of-life disposal. And excess packaging with no proportionate function can be an avoidable burden.

But packaging also protects food, reduces contamination, limits oxidation, prevents leakage, improves transport, and can reduce food waste.

The useful comparison is not "packaging versus no packaging." It is how much material performs which function, what happens at end of life, and what losses or risks appear when the protection disappears.

A package that is technically recyclable but never recycled does not perform the same environmental function as one that enters an effective recycling or reuse system. Conversely, eliminating a package can make the total footprint worse if the food loss it prevented carries a larger impact.

## 10. Refrigeration Costs Something—and Prevents Other Costs

Refrigeration and freezing consume energy, require equipment, and may involve refrigerants with climate impacts. They also create technical dependence: when the whole chain assumes continuous cooling, a power failure or equipment failure becomes critical.

Cold also improves food safety, preserves products, extends useful life, and reduces spoilage in foods that would otherwise be highly perishable.

The questions are practical: how much shelf life is gained? What illness and loss are prevented? How much energy is used? Which refrigerants are involved? How well does the system withstand failure? Could another arrangement deliver the same functions with less dependence?

Refrigeration is neither good nor bad by definition. Its effects depend on the system it makes possible.

## 11. Antimicrobial Resistance Shows What a Deferred Cost Looks Like

Antimicrobial resistance offers a particularly clear example of a cost pushed into the future.

An antibiotic can have a legitimate veterinary use and save a sick animal. But unnecessary or excessive antimicrobial use increases selection pressure favoring resistant organisms. The immediate benefit is local; part of the risk becomes collective and delayed.

In the United States, FDA, CDC, and USDA jointly operate the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System as an integrated One Health surveillance system linking human, animal, and food-related evidence on antimicrobial resistance.

This does not justify the slogan that modern animal agriculture simply "depends on antibiotics." The lesson is narrower: a decision that makes sense for one actor in the moment can create consequences that do not enter that actor's immediate calculation.

## 12. Food Waste Rarely Has One Culprit

Food waste does not fit a simple blame story.

Losses arise across farms, processing, retail, food service, and households. Agribusiness can contribute through cosmetic standards, forecasting errors, package formats, promotions, contract failures, or rigid specifications. It can also reduce waste through processing, preservation, cold storage, secondary markets, co-product use, and better forecasting.

So it is wrong to say either that industry creates food waste or that industry solves it. The same system can generate some forms of loss while developing techniques that prevent others.

That is why we have to compare functions. Removing a visible industrial technique may reduce one impact while allowing an even larger loss to return.

## 13. Animal Welfare Cannot Be Settled by a Price Tag

Animal welfare raises a different kind of question.

Some dimensions can be measured: injury, mortality, disease, lameness, stocking density, physiological stress, or access to particular behaviors. But no market price can decide how much suffering or constraint is morally acceptable.

Intensive systems may perform well on some health indicators while restricting behavior. More extensive systems may provide space while exposing animals to

different hazards. No single label—industrial, extensive, traditional, pasture-based—settles every dimension.

The empirical work is to identify what the chain encourages or requires—genetics, growth rate, density, transport, timing, slaughter conditions, and production schedules. The moral judgment comes separately.

## 14. Costs Can Be Pushed Somewhere Else

A long supply chain can separate where a product is consumed from where its consequences are felt.

A low-priced product purchased in an American city may depend on water use, pollution, difficult labor, habitat change, or agricultural pressure in another state or another country. Distance can make those conditions less visible to the buyer.

Distance alone does not prove injustice. We still have to establish the harm, the causal connection, who receives the benefits, and what realistic alternatives exist. International trade can provide income, specialization, resilience, and supply security.

Geographic distance is not the problem by itself. Material, legal, and informational distance can simply make it easier for people who benefit from a transaction to ignore consequences borne somewhere else.

## 15. Costs Can Be Pushed into the Future

The same thing can happen across time.

Soil fertility can decline slowly. Infrastructure can become dependent on cheap energy. Ecological damage can accumulate. Antimicrobial resistance can reduce treatment effectiveness years later. A highly specialized supply chain can look efficient for decades and become fragile when climate, regulation, trade, disease, or technology changes.

A system may look highly efficient today because part of the bill comes due later.

This is where resilience enters the picture. Spare capacity, redundancy, safety stocks, alternative suppliers, and the ability to change direction can look expensive in normal times while preventing much larger losses when something breaks.

Today's price does not necessarily show what it costs to keep tomorrow's options open.

## 16. An Externality Is an Economic Concept, Not a Moral Verdict

An externality is, first of all, an economic concept: an effect that is not fully included in a transaction or in the decision-maker's calculation.

Externalities can be positive. A farm may maintain habitat, landscape, or local economic activity for which it is not fully compensated. A processing facility can create regional capacity that benefits actors beyond its owner.

And putting a dollar value on a harm does not make it morally acceptable. A pollution fee does not settle every question of justice, and compensation does not resolve every question about animal suffering or labor conditions.

The analysis has to keep two steps separate: measure the material effects as well as possible, then decide how those effects should be judged and distributed.

## 17. Who Benefits? Who Pays? Who Can Change It?

Five questions capture the logic of the chapter:

What effect is observed? What causal chain produces it? Who receives the immediate benefit? Who bears the cost? Who has the power to change the situation?

Those questions help avoid several common mistakes.

If packaging uses material but prevents a greater amount of food waste, removing it may be counterproductive. If high throughput is achieved with sound ergonomics and effective breaks, speed itself is not the whole problem. If a health effect is driven mainly by the nutritional composition of a category of products, reformulating those products may be more useful than condemning processing as such.

The critique becomes strongest when one part of the system captures the benefit while someone else bears the harm without having chosen the condition or having realistic power to change it.

At that point, cost shifting and power are two sides of the same problem.

## 18. What Can a Price Actually Tell Us?

A tempting answer is to say that every cost should simply be built into the price.

That is too simple.

Some harms can be monetized with reasonable confidence. Others depend heavily on conventions. Still others involve values that do not become objective just because we attach a dollar amount to them. And raising the price can make food less accessible without changing the structure that produced the harm.

Price is still useful. It can expose some costs, change incentives, and finance remediation. But it cannot replace information, regulation, bargaining power, infrastructure governance, or political judgment.

The goal is not to squeeze all of reality onto a grocery receipt. It is to stop the receipt from pretending that it already does.

## 19. A Cost Is Not Reduced Just Because It Moves

This chapter is not an argument for distrusting every efficiency gain or condemning ultra-processing, additives, packaging, refrigeration, productivity, or automation as categories.

Each has to be judged by what it actually does and by the evidence.

The critique is strongest when gains in volume, convenience, stability, or price depend on costs that have not disappeared but have been transferred to other people, communities, ecosystems, animals, or future periods—especially when those bearing the cost have little ability to make it visible or change the conditions that produce it.

## 20. The Next Question Is How to Redesign the System

By now, the food chain looks less like a simple sequence of transactions and more like a material, commercial, economic, and institutional system that also distributes costs.

If we stopped here, the book would end in denunciation. The next step has to be constructive.

Which industrial functions should be preserved because they perform a necessary task well? Which can be reduced? Which can be reorganized, shared, regionalized, or made more governable? How can dependencies be reduced without losing food safety, preservation, availability, productive capacity, and affordability?

That is where the final chapter begins.

# CHAPTER 5 — KEEP THE FUNCTION, BREAK THE LOCK-IN

A serious critique of agribusiness cannot end with "less industry." The previous chapters have shown why. Industrial food systems perform real functions: preservation, food safety, processing, transportation, coordination, standardization, high-volume supply, and sometimes lower prices and less physical drudgery. The trouble is that the way those functions are organized can also narrow the choices available to producers, workers, businesses, and communities.

The task is not to choose industry over craft, or local over centralized, or technology over nature. It is to pull apart functions that have become bundled together.

A function can be useful even when its governance creates unnecessary dependence. A technology can perform well technically and still be poorly governed. A facility can be indispensable without becoming a gatekeeper that everyone else has to obey.

So the practical question is this: how do we preserve what works while rebuilding the ability to do things differently?

## 1. Start with What the System Has to Do

The first mistake is judging an arrangement by its label.

"Local," "cooperative," "public," "private," "small," "industrial," "organic," "traditional," and "digital" do not tell us whether a system performs its function well. A small slaughter plant can lack staff or equipment. A large plant can maintain excellent safety systems. A cooperative can be answerable to its members or almost impossible for them to leave. A local delivery system can shorten geographic distance while increasing vehicle miles because each farm makes separate trips.

Start instead with a concrete question: what does this part of the food system actually have to accomplish?

Preserve a perishable food? Prevent contamination? Process seasonal surpluses? Give farmers access to buyers? Reduce physical strain? Feed thousands of students or patients? Maintain emergency capacity? Aggregate enough volume to reach wholesale markets?

Once the function is clear, we can compare which arrangements perform it with the least unnecessary dependence, cost shifting, and lock-in.

## 2. Four Ways to Change What Exists

Once we know the function, four broad responses organize most of the alternatives: preserve, reduce, substitute, or reorganize.

Preserve. Some industrial functions should remain when they clearly outperform available alternatives in safety, robustness, or efficiency. There is no reason to

eliminate pasteurization, a testing laboratory, refrigerated storage, or emergency processing capacity simply to satisfy an abstract preference for deindustrialization.

Reduce. A useful function can remain while we reduce how heavily the system relies on it: less unnecessary packaging, less formulation without a clear benefit, less dependence on a single buyer, less avoidable transport, less excessive production pressure, less marketing designed mainly to create more consumption occasions.

Substitute. Keep the function but use a different arrangement: regional processing instead of extreme centralization; reusable containers where an effective return system makes them genuinely preferable; meals made from less heavily formulated ingredients where institutional kitchens have the staff, equipment, and time to do it.

Reorganize. The technology may stay almost the same while ownership, governance, access, or the distribution of value changes. Cold storage can be shared. A cooperative can own a processing line. A logistics platform can serve multiple producers. A brand can be collectively owned. Expensive equipment can be pooled.

Breaking a dependency does not necessarily mean destroying the physical asset around which it formed. Sometimes the better move is to change who controls access to that asset and on what terms.

## 3. Autonomy Does Not Mean Going It Alone

No complex society can be autonomous if autonomy means needing no one else.

Farmers depend on equipment, energy, knowledge, financing, seed, feed, processors, distributors, and customers. Processors depend on suppliers, labor, utilities, packaging, maintenance, transportation, and markets. Grocery stores depend on distribution systems. Consumers depend on all of them.

Interdependence is not the problem. Being trapped in one form of interdependence is.

Cooperation can increase autonomy rather than reduce it. One farm may not be able to finance a processing line, cold-storage facility, refrigerated truck, marketing staff, or quality-control program. A group of farms sometimes can.

American agriculture already has many examples of this. Cooperatives, shared infrastructure, regional distributors, and food hubs can aggregate products, coordinate logistics, open wholesale or institutional markets, and reduce how much marketing each producer has to do alone. USDA research on local and regional food systems has long recognized that intermediated channels—including food hubs, grocers, restaurants, schools, universities, hospitals, and regional distributors—can connect smaller and midsize producers to markets they could not efficiently reach one farm at a time.

Pooling capacity is not a retreat from autonomy. It can be one of the things that makes autonomy possible.

But collective organization must pass the same test as any large private system. Who decides? Who has access to information? Can members leave? Are investments portable? Does the organization create alternatives for its members, or become the only route they can use?

A cooperative or food hub that becomes opaque and impossible to exit can recreate the same lock-in it was meant to reduce.

## 4. Regional Capacity Matters Only If It Creates a Real Option

"Local" is not a magic word. Regional capacity matters when it creates a practical alternative.

Certain facilities are especially important because their disappearance can leave producers with no workable route to market: grain milling, meat processing, canning, cold storage, aggregation, repair, shared commercial kitchens, refrigerated logistics, or specialized processing.

A regional facility may matter even when it is not the cheapest option every day. Its existence can prevent a de facto monopoly, shorten recovery after a disruption, or provide another route when a distant facility changes terms or shuts down.

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service describes aggregation and distribution as key components of local and regional food systems, particularly for small and midsize producers that need efficient ways to reach customers. USDA also defines food hubs around the aggregation, distribution, and marketing functions that connect multiple producers with wholesale, retail, and institutional demand.

Proximity is not enough. A regional facility that is too small may face high unit costs, trouble hiring specialized staff, insufficient throughput, or difficulty financing food-safety requirements. The goal is not the shortest distance. It is a resilient option people can actually use.

## 5. Shorter Supply Chains Still Need Intermediaries

Direct sales can make it look as though removing intermediaries automatically creates independence.

But the work does not disappear. Someone still has to aggregate volume, prepare orders, store food, process it when necessary, transport it, send invoices, maintain traceability, meet food-safety rules, forecast demand, and manage unsold inventory.

If every farm performs all those tasks independently, the "short" chain may simply transfer administrative and logistical labor onto producers.

The important distinction is between the work intermediaries perform and the power an intermediary may acquire.

A food hub, cooperative distributor, shared-use processing facility, regional warehouse, or jointly governed logistics system can keep intermediary functions while changing who controls them and who benefits from them.

Shortening a chain may mean replacing one dominant gatekeeper with infrastructure governed by multiple users—not pretending the intermediary work somehow vanished.

## 6. No One Scale Works for Everything

Some functions can be performed effectively at a regional level. A cannery can absorb seasonal surpluses. A mill can create another market for grain. A shared processing facility can allow several businesses to meet commercial standards none could afford alone.

Other functions benefit strongly from scale: advanced laboratories, specialized maintenance, high-capacity food-safety systems, certain automated processes, emergency production, and very large volumes.

Smaller operations can also require more human labor per unit. Shrinking scale can therefore reintroduce forms of drudgery that automation had reduced.

There is no single ideal size. A resilient food system is more likely to combine scales: some large critical infrastructure, intermediate regional capacity, and smaller-scale or household production where those scales genuinely fit the job.

## 7. Reduce Ultra-Processing Without Treating Processing as the Enemy

This is where the distinction between processing and industrial formulation becomes practical.

Reducing heavily formulated foods does not require abandoning pasteurization, freezing, fermentation, canning, milling, or industrial cooking. Those processes can improve safety, durability, and access.

Ask why the product is formulated the way it is.

Does the formulation solve a food-safety problem, make the food workable for people with little time, or preserve a product that would otherwise be wasted? Or does it mainly extend shelf life beyond a realistic need, support a marketing claim, create a highly engineered texture, multiply consumption occasions, or differentiate one product from dozens of nearly identical competitors?

The answer does not have to be prohibition. It may be reformulation, smaller or different portions, clearer information, less heavily formulated alternatives, stronger institutional kitchen capacity, or changes in the commercial environment.

Convenience remains a real constraint. An alternative that demands much more cooking time from people who do not have that time is unlikely to become a serious substitute.

## 8. Technology Should Expand Options, Not Just Performance

Technology can reduce labor, save energy, prevent loss, improve safety, and make production more precise. Technical sophistication is not the problem.

The trouble begins when technical performance comes bundled with disproportionate dependence: closed software, data that cannot be exported, proprietary parts, repairs restricted to one supplier, mandatory subscriptions, equipment no one else can service, or financing so burdensome that changing course becomes impossible.

A technology that supports autonomy has to be judged by more than output, speed, or efficiency. Repairability, interoperability, data portability, parts availability, service options, and switching costs matter too.

A sophisticated shared system that users can govern may create more practical autonomy than a small proprietary machine whose owner cannot repair or replace it without permission from a single vendor.

Simplicity is not a virtue by itself. Control over the conditions of use matters more.

## 9. Reuse Only Works When the System Works

Reusable packaging can reduce extraction and waste. It also requires collection, washing, storage, return transportation, standardization, and enough reuse cycles to justify the added infrastructure.

If containers travel very long distances or circulate only a few times, the result can be poor. A local or regional return system with standardized containers and many cycles can perform far better.

The practical sequence is conditional, not ideological: eliminate unnecessary packaging; reduce material where possible; reuse when a functioning return system makes reuse worthwhile; recycle when reuse is not appropriate; preserve barriers needed for safety and waste reduction.

You cannot judge the container apart from the system that makes it work.

## 10. Do Not Replace One Gatekeeper with Another

Changing the owner of a bottleneck does not automatically eliminate the bottleneck.

Replacing one private gatekeeper with a single public or nonprofit gatekeeper may solve some problems while creating others. Public, cooperative, nonprofit, and private infrastructure can all perform essential functions. Any of them can also become difficult to bypass.

What matters is whether several workable options remain.

More than one buyer. More than one processor. More than one supplier. Standards that are sufficiently open. Shared infrastructure that remains governable. Regional and national capacities that complement one another. International trade where useful, without making all domestic capacity disappear.

The goal is not maximum fragmentation. It is to keep one failure, one decision, or one broken relationship from paralyzing everyone who depends on the same function.

## 11. Resilience Can Look Wasteful Until Something Breaks

Economic optimization often removes slack: inventory, spare capacity, secondary suppliers, backup equipment, redundant routes.

That can reduce costs in normal conditions.

But what appears to be unused capacity can also be insurance. Two suppliers may cost more than one. A small regional plant may be less productive than one giant facility. Emergency inventory ties up capital.

Those extra costs can buy something a unit price does not show: the ability to keep going when one link fails.

Resilience does not justify every duplication. Some redundancy is simply waste. But a system optimized for the lowest possible cost at every stage can become fragile as a whole.

A serious transition may accept a modest cost today to keep an option alive for tomorrow.

## 12. Build the Replacement Before You Remove the Old System

A dependency can be harmful while the infrastructure around it remains essential.

Closing a processing plant, banning a process, or dismantling a distribution platform before an alternative has real capacity can produce the opposite of the intended result: shortages, higher prices, more labor, or even greater concentration around the last remaining operator.

The sequence matters.

Identify the function. Build an alternative capable of performing it. Test safety, cost, labor requirements, capacity, and robustness. Expand it until it can actually carry the load. Only then reduce the old dependency.

For a while, two systems may have to coexist. That duplication can look inefficient, but it is often the price of testing change before making it irreversible.

## 13. A Method, Not a Blueprint

The same sequence can be applied to any part of the food system:

1. Identify the function precisely.
2. Identify the dependence, cost, or lock-in that is actually problematic.
3. Ask whether the function is needed at that scale.
4. Look for reduction, substitution, or reorganization.
5. Compare food safety, health, labor, environment, affordability, capacity, and resilience separately.
6. Check reversibility and exit options.
7. Preserve what demonstrably works better.
8. Test the alternative in practice and revise it.

No single model follows from this method. The answer depends on the function and the context.

Fresh milk, grain, school meals, meat processing, a dense city, and a remote rural area do not require the same infrastructure. Some functions may be local, others regional, others national or international.

A resilient food system is more likely to look like a network operating at several scales than one perfect pyramid, with enough overlap for one level to partly substitute for another when needed.

## 14. Moving Beyond Agribusiness Does Not Mean Giving Up Industry

"Deindustrialization" is misleading if it implies that progress requires a broad retreat from machinery, technical capacity, or large-scale processing.

That is not the argument of this book.

In some American regions, greater autonomy may require more industrial capacity at an intermediate scale: building or rebuilding meat processing, milling, canning, cold storage, shared-use kitchens, regional distribution, or repair capacity.

In other cases the answer may be deconcentration: preventing one actor from controlling an indispensable function.

Elsewhere it may be reduction: removing packaging, formulation, promotion, or transportation whose function no longer justifies its cost.

And sometimes the best decision will be to preserve a large facility because it performs an essential function more effectively than any realistic alternative.

The aim is not simply less industry. It is to separate useful technical capacity from the commercial, financial, or political dependencies that do not have to come with it.

## 15. What Food-System Autonomy Looks Like in Practice

Food-system autonomy does not mean producing every food within an arbitrary radius. That would confuse autonomy with self-sufficiency.

In practice, autonomy means being able to change buyers or suppliers without destroying the business; retain alternative processing capacity; avoid dependence on irreplaceable software, standards, or infrastructure; preserve critical knowledge and equipment; pool resources no single actor can support alone; and maintain enough diversity that one local disruption does not become a systemic failure.

That kind of autonomy can be collective. It may require more coordination, not less.

There is no paradox once autonomy means practical freedom rather than isolation. People can become less dependent by voluntarily building better-governed forms of interdependence.

## 16. The Argument Comes Back to Choice

The book began with a product shaped to fit a chain.

Then it showed that demand is not external to that chain, that contracts and infrastructure distribute the ability to refuse unevenly, and that apparent efficiency can rest partly on shifted costs.

The answer is not to replace one total system with another.

It is to reopen possibilities.

A farmer should be able to change buyers. A region should retain some critical capacity. A worker should be able to report or leave a dangerous situation. A consumer should have access to convenient food without convenience necessarily requiring ever more elaborate formulation. A cooperative or public institution should be able to pool resources without becoming an unaccountable gatekeeper.

Success is not measured by smallness, localness, or the number of machines removed.

It is measured by whether people gain real options without a disproportionate loss of safety, affordability, productive capacity, or resilience.

## 17. Regain Control of the Functions

No organizational form is a solution by itself—not direct sales, local production, a cooperative, a nonprofit, public ownership, a small plant, reuse, or digital coordination.

Each has to be judged by what it does, what dependencies it creates, and which alternatives it leaves open.

A coherent transformation keeps useful functions while reducing the concentrations, dependencies, and rigidities that make it prohibitively costly to change relationships or systems.

Moving beyond agribusiness, as this book uses the term, does not mean eliminating the food industry. It means regaining practical control over how the industry's functions are organized.

# CONCLUSION — KEEPING THE POWER TO CHANGE COURSE

This book began with a food product. It ends with a question: do we still have the capacity to do things differently?

Agribusiness is not simply a factory, a machine, or processed food. It is a way of organizing a chain in which production, processing, preservation, logistics, distribution, retail, and marketing become tightly interdependent. That organization has produced real gains. The critique begins when its requirements narrow the alternatives available to the people who depend on it, or when some of its performance rests on costs shifted to other people, communities, ecosystems, animals, or future generations.

The answer cannot be to dismantle the food industry wholesale. That would destroy useful functions along with harmful dependencies and could replace visible problems with new ones: more labor, weaker food safety, greater loss, higher prices, or deeper concentration around the few facilities left standing.

A harder standard is reversibility.

We should be able to preserve a useful function without making its organization impossible to challenge. Interdependence can remain compatible with autonomy when people can govern the relationship and realistically leave it. A low price may reflect genuine cost reduction; when it merely shifts costs to someone else, somewhere else, or into the future, that transfer needs to be visible and corrected where it is produced. Sophisticated technology can increase autonomy when it remains repairable, replaceable, interoperable, and shareable.

That kind of autonomy is not isolation. It can be collective, technical, and highly interconnected. Farmers may gain autonomy by sharing processing or logistics. A region may keep a large plant while rebuilding smaller complementary capacity. School districts and other institutions can provide meaningful markets without becoming the only viable buyer. Long-distance trade can remain useful as long as losing it would not make every other form of supply impossible.

This book does not argue for small over large, local over distant, or craft over industry.

It offers a test instead.

What function is actually being performed? What cost has truly disappeared, and what cost has merely moved? What alternatives remain open? What would it cost to change course?

Transforming the food system is less about finding a perfect model than reopening possibilities. Preserve what works. Reduce what no longer serves a necessary function. Substitute when another arrangement does the job better. Reorganize when the problem lies not mainly in the technology, but in who controls it, who can access it, and how hard it is to leave.

A more autonomous food system can still be industrial, technological, cooperative, national, and international. What it has to resist is not

interdependence, but interdependence that has become practically irreversible; not processing, but processing that has become its own end; not efficiency, but efficiency sustained by pushing costs beyond the sight or control of the people making the decisions.

The final question is not, How do we eliminate agribusiness?

It is this: How do we preserve the capabilities a complex food system needs without losing our collective ability to reorganize them when they stop serving the people who depend on them?

# SELECTED SOURCES


Barham, Jim, Debra Tropp, and Carolyn Dimitri. Regional Food Hubs and Food Value Chains: Improving Market Access for Local Producers Through Innovative Distribution. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 2012.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Food and Beverage Marketing. School Nutrition, 2024.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Facts About Food Poisoning. Food Safety, updated 2025.

Hollands, Gareth J., et al. "Portion, Package or Tableware Size for Changing Selection and Consumption of Food, Alcohol and Tobacco." Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, no. 9, 2015, CD011045. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011045.pub2.

Knorr, Dietrich, et al. "Food Processing: Legacy, Significance and Challenges." Trends in Food Science & Technology, vol. 143, 2024, 104270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.104270.

Lane, Melissa M., et al. "Ultra-Processed Food Exposure and Adverse Health Outcomes: Umbrella Review of Epidemiological Meta-Analyses." BMJ, vol. 384, 2024, e077310. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2023-077310.

MacDonald, James M. Financial Risks and Incomes in Contract Broiler Production. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2014.

MacDonald, James M. "Concentration in U.S. Meatpacking Industry and How It Affects Competition and Cattle Prices." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2024.

MacDonald, James M., Xiao Dong, and Keith Fuglie. Concentration and Competition in U.S. Agribusiness. Economic Information Bulletin 256, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2023. https://doi.org/10.32747/2023.8054022.ers.

Monteiro, Carlos A., et al. "Ultra-Processed Foods: What They Are and How to Identify Them." Public Health Nutrition, vol. 22, no. 5, 2019, pp. 936–941. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980018003762.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Meatpacking. U.S. Department of Labor.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Poultry Processing. U.S. Department of Labor.

United Nations Environment Programme. Food Waste Index Report 2024. 2024.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service. Local and Regional Food Systems and Food Hub resources.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Retail Trends. Retailing & Wholesaling, updated August 17, 2026.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Farm to School and local food procurement guidance.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development. Capper-Volstead Act and agricultural cooperative guidance.

U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission. 2023 Merger Guidelines. December 18, 2023.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Types of Food Ingredients. Food Additives and GRAS Ingredients—Information for Consumers.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and U.S. Department of Agriculture. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS): Strategic Plan 2026–2030. 2026.

World Health Organization. Policies to Protect Children from the Harmful Impact of Food Marketing: WHO Guideline. 2023.

# ABOUT NOOSOPHIE

Noosophie begins from a simple distinction: reality does not depend on what we believe about it. An idea may be convincing and still be false. A tradition may contain useful intuitions and errors. A scientific theory may be extremely strong and still be limited to a particular domain. Our understanding changes, while what we are trying to understand is not reducible to our representations.

In the noosophical project, the word “Noosophie” refers to truth or to the structure of reality independently of the way human beings understand it. We do not claim to possess that truth in its entirety. The texts, concepts, institutions, and people working under this name offer only partial, debatable, and revisable understandings of it.

Noosophical work therefore consists in searching more seriously: distinguishing what is known from what is assumed, comparing different explanations, examining their contradictions, looking at the available facts, recognizing areas of uncertainty, and correcting an idea when it resists examination poorly.

This search is not limited to one field. The sciences can illuminate some questions, philosophy can clarify their concepts, history can show how they were formed, the arts can reveal other dimensions of experience, spiritual traditions can propose interpretations that must be understood before they are evaluated, and concrete practices can show what our ideas actually become when we try to apply them.

Connecting these domains does not mean mixing everything together. Noosophie does not assume that all opinions are equal or that every tradition necessarily contains a part of the truth. Two incompatible claims do not become true simply because we want to reconcile them. Integration also means knowing when to preserve a difference, contradiction, or uncertainty when it cannot honestly be resolved.

This way of searching naturally leads beyond the separation between theory and practice. Understanding agriculture, for example, is not merely a matter of accumulating knowledge about soils, plants, or agricultural economics: we must also look at what different ways of cultivating actually produce. Understanding consumerism requires studying economics and advertising, but also their effects on habits, desires, resources, and social relations. Understanding a political organization means examining its principles as well as the way power circulates within it.

When an idea can be tested in practice, its consequences become a source of learning. We understand, act at the relevant level, observe what reality returns, and then correct. A beautiful theory is therefore not considered sufficient proof of its value.

The noosophical movement brings together people and structures that wish to participate consciously in this work of understanding and transformation. It does not ask anyone to adhere to a fixed list of beliefs. It seeks instead to develop more rigorous ways of thinking, learning, debating, producing, transmitting, and acting when our knowledge allows us to do better.

This is why books published by Éditions Noosophie may address very different subjects: agriculture, ecology, economics, politics, consumption, ways of life, artificial intelligence, spiritualities, culture, technology, or collective organization. Each book explores a particular problem, with its own sources and constraints, while contributing to a broader search: to understand more accurately what is real, connect what can be connected without erasing differences, and accept that our ideas and practices may have to change when confrontation with reality requires it.

Noosophie itself must therefore not be confused with a book, an author, an association, a software system, or a corpus. These are human and technical means of research, transmission, and experimentation. They can be corrected, replaced, or surpassed.

A reader does not need to call themselves a Noosophist in order to read or use this work. They may criticize it, verify it, reject some conclusions, and retain others. If they wish to participate more directly in the movement, contribute to its research, join a structure, or support the free availability of these books, the relevant links are provided at the end of the book.

# HOW THIS BOOK WAS PRODUCED

The production of this book took place through successive stages rather than through the automatic generation of a complete text. The subject, objectives, and general orientations were first defined by a human. Noosophie IA then contributed to exploring the subject, researching and comparing sources, building possible architectures, and bringing forward arguments, objections, and areas of uncertainty.

The manuscript was developed progressively, chapter by chapter. The proposals produced were reread, discussed, corrected, or rejected when they did not fit the project, contained insufficiently supported claims, or oversimplified the subject. Distinct phases of documentary research, drafting, criticism, consistency checking, and assembly were used when necessary.

Artificial intelligence is therefore not treated here as a source of authority. It operates as an active tool for research, formulation, comparison, and testing. Its proposals can be wrong and remain revisable.

The published version results from this iterative work, successive corrections, and final human validation. The method seeks to use the capabilities of artificial intelligence without transferring to it decisions concerning the aims of the book, value choices, or the decision to publish.

# ABOUT HIERONYMUS ANONYMUS

Hieronymus Anonymus is the human initiator of the Integrative Noosophie project. His work concerns the connection of fields of knowledge and practice that are usually separated, as well as experimentation with new forms of collaboration between humans and artificial intelligence. He participates in the conception, discussion, revision, and validation of works published by Éditions Noosophie.

This role does not make him an infallible authority, the ontological creator of Noosophie, or the sole decision-maker for the movement as a whole.

# DISCOVER, JOIN, AND SUPPORT

## DISCOVER NOOSOPHIE

Explore the project, its works, and its general orientation.

https://www.noosophie.fr/

## BECOME A NOOSOPHIST

Learn how to take part in the movement. The membership structure is being prepared.

https://www.noosophie.fr/devenir-noosophiste

## SUPPORT NOOSOPHIE

This book is free. Donations help Éditions Noosophie keep books freely available and support research and movement activities.

https://www.noosophie.fr/soutenir

Agribusiness is often criticized as a whole. Ultra-processing, big-box retail, additives, supply chains, and food marketing are routinely denounced. What is less often understood is what holds the whole system together.

This book seeks neither a single culprit nor an imaginary return to the past. It shows how the requirements of production, preservation, transport, standardization, and sale end up shaping food itself, then practices, dependencies, and part of the costs shifted outside the price.

From industrial formulation to mass retail, from contractual power to organized convenience, from ultra-processed products to territorial alternatives, this critique follows the entire chain.
It does not condemn every technique or every industry. It tries to distinguish what should be preserved, what should be reduced, and what should be reorganized.


| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHORS | Hieronymus Anonymus / Noosophe IA |
| EDITION | American publication edition v1.0 — September 4, 2026 |
| PUBLISHER | Éditions noosophiques — noosophie.fr |
| DISTRIBUTION | Free |


NOOSOPHIE