More than ten years ago, as a postdoctoral fellow in public health with a newly minted PhD in anthropology, I began to study Kraft Dinner as a point of entry into community-based responses to persistent inequities in the health outcomes of Canadians. At the outset of these investigations, I neglected to give any thought whatsoever to milk as a crucial but separately added ingredient, despite the clear indication of this ingredient in the preparation instructions and nutritional information printed on the box. Had I done so, my interest in Kraft Dinner would have been so much easier to justify. Instead, public health colleagues, social science colleagues, journalists, and food activists often assumed that I would be critical of the nutritional deficiencies of the package’s contents, the powdered cheese’s apparent artificiality, and the deskilling in the realm of food preparation. These concerns, it would appear, reflect in part how Canadians tend to communicate about Kraft Dinner. Rarely is milk mentioned in the same breath (or paragraph) as Kraft Dinner in Canada. Secure access to milk tends to be presumed, even when Kraft Dinner features in discussions and gestures concerning poverty. Yet insecure access to milk due to a lack of money is pervasive and pernicious among people living in poverty across
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In the Canadian context, food insecurity means “the inability to obtain sufficient, nutritious, personally acceptable food through normal food channels or the uncertainty that one will be able to do so” due to a lack of money (Davis and Tarasuk 1994, 51). Approximately 10 percent of Canadian households experience food insecurity to varying degrees, and food insecurity has consequences for both physical and mental health. Food insecurity begins with the worry about running out of money to buy food, which is followed by dietary compromises and strict rationing within the household. In the most severe cases, children are deprived of food for a whole day or more (Health Canada 2007). 1 Charities are not “normal food channels,” yet, across Canada, charitable redistribution through food banks is routine (Tarasuk and Eakin 2003). More than 450 food banks, across every province and territory, are affiliated with an umbrella organization called Food Banks Canada, whose affiliates together serve approximately 85 percent of the people receiving charitable food assistance throughout the country. 2 These food banks are supplied in two ways. More than half of the supply comes from corporate donations, with the remainder donated by individuals (Tarasuk and Eakin 2005). As individuals, Canadians commonly donate Kraft Dinner to food banks for charitable redistribution. Canadians do not commonly donate milk, and not all food banks are equipped to handle corporate donations of milk or to purchase milk with individual donations of money.

What might the popularity of individual donations of Kraft Dinner tell us about how Canadians communicate with and about food? This question anchors the present chapter. The intent of this exercise in cultural critique is not only to interpret what has already been said and written about food insecurity in Canada but also to grapple with the silences in popular culture as well as gaps in the academic literature. Misunderstandings and partiality are important to consider, for they too represent dimensions of communication in relation to food (Elliott 2009, 388). Consequently, this chapter attempts to “read into” silences and gaps, as opposed to reading strictly for manifest content. I submit that the iconic status of Kraft Dinner
as a charitable food donation is deeply emblematic of Canadian society, representing cultural practices of eating, sharing, and generosity, but at the same time, it represents an abiding ignorance, and even denial, of deeply ingrained inequity in this country.

THE SOCIAL LIVES OF KRAFT DINNER

Canadians hardly require an introduction to Kraft Dinner, as it is so regularly consumed throughout the country, regardless of income and education levels. While Kraft now sells this product in many formats, and imitation products are colloquially called “Kraft Dinner,” the original version remains highly popular. This original version of Kraft Dinner is sold in a colourful rectangular cardboard box. Each box contains 225 grams of narrow, dried macaroni tubes made from enriched wheat flour and a white packet that contains fluorescent orange powdered cheese.

A mass-produced commodity such as Kraft Dinner might seem like a single object, yet it does not have one common “social life.” Rather, each box of Kraft Dinner has a different social life or “biography” (Appadurai 1986; Kopytoff 1986), even as trends or tendencies may be discerned. Methodologically, the “social life of things” approach directs attention to how a particular object or class of objects may change hands and change status over time and as the object or objects in question are made to travel over social and geographic distances. Theoretically, this approach emphasizes that what appears to be the very same thing can have very different uses, meanings, and consequences in different sets of hands and in different circumstances. In addition, theorizing the social life of things foregrounds people’s preferences and values, differences in people’s capacity to exert influence and exercise choice, and processes of social stratification that may range from subtle to overt.

As Charlene Elliott (2009) has demonstrated for the entwined history of butter and margarine in Canada, tracing a food’s social lives is productive when one is seeking to examine both the problematization and the normalization of consumption. In fact, tracing the trajectories of objects, like foodstuffs, can illuminate cultural values and power dynamics precisely because the politics of knowledge and the politics of value are indistinguishable in many contexts (Appadurai 1986; Kopytoff 1986). Regarding communication about and with food, this fundamental insight from the anthropological
literature on the social lives of things is important to bear in mind, because when people donate food for charitable redistribution, they do so from a position of relative privilege and based on limited knowledge of where their donation will ultimately end up. By implication, some degree of misunderstanding is not only possible but probable across the social distances bridged by Canadian food banks: that is, between those who offer and those who receive food donations. The social lives of a commonly donated food can therefore be revealing about what is known, imagined, and misconstrued in mainstream Canadian society about the nature, experience, and impact of poverty.

The acts of eating and digestion transform food into its nutritional components, and life depends on the absorption of these nutrients. The social lives of purchased and donated foods thus extend into human bodies to such an extent that ingested food and human bodies eventually become indistinguishable. More generally, as discussed by Arjun Appadurai (1986), the moment at which an object ceases to have a social life is not always clearly discernible. One reason for this ambiguity is that knowledge of or misinformation about what became of a given object can be integral to that object’s social life. Furthermore, powers of imagination confer value on things and influence their circulation. An object can also be dismembered or repurposed. Sometimes an object is obtained precisely to be destroyed, surrendered, or rendered into something else. Food is, in some senses, destroyed by the act of eating, and ingested food does quite literally become something else, by ultimately melding with the consumer’s body. As the saying goes, “You can’t have your cake and eat it too.” Overall, for Appadurai (1986), a given thing’s social lives are replete with sacrifices, and he explicitly discusses monetary expenditures as well as gifts in these terms. In fact, Appadurai contends that each instance of giving, purchasing, or surrendering something is an act of sacrifice. The emotional states of all concerned in a given act of sacrifice are, for Appadurai, indicative of social status, social distance, people’s values, and the politics of knowledge. Thus, sacrifice imbues the social lives of mass-produced foodstuffs such as Kraft Dinner, and as the contents of each standardized package of Kraft Dinner dissolve into a human body, Kraft Dinner quite literally lives on.

Mass communication technologies augment the potential of a mass-produced item such as Kraft Dinner to acquire social lives by figuring in people’s memories and imaginations. Kraft Dinner connotes both comfort
and poverty, as illustrated by a few lines in the Canadian pop song, “If I Had a Million Dollars,” by the Barenaked Ladies:

If I had a million dollars,
We wouldn’t have to eat Kraft Dinner
But we would eat Kraft Dinner
Of course we would, we’d just eat more.³

With a different twist on the same theme, a recent advertisement in Québec depicts a male professional gleefully consuming Kraft Dinner within his upscale residence and then covertly slipping the telltale cardboard box into a neighbour’s recycling bin.⁴ Particularly given the extent to which dietary consumption has been problematized in Canada through narratives about public health (Elliott 2007), whenever Canadians communicate with one another by purchasing, donating, ingesting, writing about, or talking about Kraft Dinner, or even by refusing any association whatsoever with Kraft Dinner, these actions have repercussions for people’s bodies and selves.

This chapter is based on two main ways of tracing some of Kraft Dinner’s many possible social lives, with a focus on individual donations for charitable redistribution. One way involved semi-structured interviews. Leading up to these interviews, participant-observation research took place with members of a community-based coalition on poverty, which confirmed the ubiquity of Kraft Dinner as a charitable food donation in Montréal and documented some dilemmas posed by such donations for charitable organizations (Rock 2006). The other way of tracing this product’s social lives involved collecting and analyzing media coverage mentioning Kraft Dinner, which also informed the interviews (see Rock, McIntyre, and Rondeau 2009). The analyzed media coverage included items that I helped to bring about by deploying Kraft Dinner as a communicative device in an effort to increase sensitivity to Canadian experiences of poverty (Rock et al. 2011).⁵

**KRAFT DINNER: TASTY, QUICK, AND EASY TO STORE? IT DEPENDS**

To assist with tracing the social lives of Kraft Dinner, interviews were conducted in 2004 with eighteen food-secure francophone residents of metropolitan Montréal. The sample represented diverse perspectives on and
experiences of Kraft Dinner, as the participants ranged in age from early adulthood to senior citizens. Furthermore, the sample included people whose history of employment had involved Kraft Dinner, including someone who had worked on the assembly line in the Montréal factory where Kraft Dinner is boxed and a former product representative for Kraft in the province of Québec. Most of the participants’ work as paid employees, volunteers, or both brought them into direct contact with food-insecure people or encompassed advocacy for social justice.

These interviews brought to light three qualities that make Kraft Dinner seem especially suitable for donation. First, Kraft Dinner has a reputation for being palatable among the eventual recipients. Asked why food donors tend to favour it, one social worker said, “I have the impression it’s [given] because it is seen as a simple product that is well-known.” Another social worker provided a similar explanation. “People still have the impression that working-class people enjoy it,” she said, “despite everything.” A community activist recalled that her grandmother often prepared Kraft Dinner for her as a child, since she would walk to her grandmother’s house for lunch on schooldays. Later in life, when raising children of her own on a fixed budget, she returned to Kraft Dinner, but as an evening meal toward the end of the week, when she felt tired, and at the end of the month, when money was tight. As another example, a man who worked for a union at the time said, “You might serve it to your own kids, to your own family, or even to yourself. In the end, you make it yourself.” The association of Kraft Dinner with palatability was especially pronounced in the context of children, thus suggesting that donors are aware of child poverty and are trying to respond sensitively or sensibly when donating Kraft Dinner.

Second, these interviews highlighted the perception that Kraft Dinner is an easy-to-prepare meal in a nutritionally complete package. A lawyer remarked: “It’s easy to prepare and we assume, I suppose that people assume everyone knows how to prepare it.” An archivist elaborated: “Simply put, there’s the idea of a complete meal, in the sense of protein, pasta. Instead of giving a package of white spaghetti, you give a kit that is a meal.” Later on in the interview, however, this participant pointed out that the cardboard box does not contain any butter or margarine, nor does it contain any milk. In fact, the preparation instructions printed on the cardboard package call for the addition of one to three tablespoons (15 to 45 ml) of either butter or margarine and one-quarter to one-half cup (50
to 100 ml) of fluid milk, depending on whether the traditional or Sensible Solution™ instructions are to be followed. Yet, repeatedly, the notion of Kraft Dinner as a complete meal in a box was foregrounded in interviews. “You have water [to boil the pasta in]: Butter, margarine, you have these too!” said a college professor.\textsuperscript{11}

Third, these francophone Montréalers emphasized that Kraft Dinner is suitable for donation because this product is safely and conveniently stored. A social worker speculated, “Since it’s not expensive, people will rarely buy just one box. They will buy three or four. So you might buy a case. When you have a case at your house, and people come by for food donations, you have a lot. So why not give even half?”\textsuperscript{12} As highlighted once again in this excerpt, Kraft Dinner would not come to mind or to hand as a food donation if donors did not themselves purchase this product for consumption at some later date. The lawyer cited above had worked his way through law school as a product representative for Kraft, and at the time, he recalled, Kraft Dinner was unusual for containing a dairy product while also having a long shelf-life. This feature of Kraft Dinner made it a popular order in rural areas as well as for supermarkets and smaller neighbourhood-based stores in urban areas. The participants consistently stressed that food banks discouraged donations of goods that are perishable. Implicit here was that the time between donation and consumption was unknown and that the ultimate recipients were also unknown. Giving away a box (or two, or even ten) of Kraft Dinner did not appear to be too much of a sacrifice, and donors may have felt reassured that their gestures of solidarity would ultimately reach and be appreciated by recipients.\textsuperscript{13}

Yet the views of the recipients themselves engendered a very different set of perceptions. Low-income mothers have plainly said that the properties of Kraft Dinner described by the francophone Montréalers cited above do not hold true in their particular circumstances, because they rarely have enough money to last until the next cheque.\textsuperscript{14} And milk, which is needed to prepare Kraft Dinner according to the instructions and for the sake of nutrition and palatability, is strictly rationed yet often lacking in households headed by low-income mothers (McIntyre et al. 2002; McIntyre et al. 2003; McIntyre, Officer, and Robinson 2003; McIntyre, Tarasuk, and Li 2007; McIntyre, Williams, and Glanville 2007; Williams, McIntyre, and Glanville 2010).
Advertisements, websites, and over fifteen hundred items that originally appeared in English-language newspapers from across Canada were examined as part of inquiring into the social lives of Kraft Dinner. Of these, 155 mention food banks explicitly. Therein, attention tends to focus on the donors, and the tone is often celebratory, with an emphasis on civic generosity. Much of this coverage resonates with the themes drawn out from the interviews with francophone Montréalers and outlined above.

On occasion, the media coverage hints at the fact that Kraft Dinner forms part of a monotonous diet for low-income Canadians, whether or not they receive charitable food assistance, and at the fact that receipt of food charity can feel stigmatizing: for example, a newspaper article reported, “The Ryders don’t use the local food bank. When asked how they feed a family of five on their limited income, Travis responded, ‘We eat a lot of Kraft Dinner.’”

The newspaper quotation that best resonates with what low-income mothers have reported about Kraft Dinner is the following: “A 42-year-old single mother of three . . . makes the rounds of alleys at night scrounging for returnable bottles so she can buy milk for her kids. . . . The children eat a lot of watered-down Kraft dinners ‘but they don’t complain as long as it fills them up,’ she said.” In fact, Canadian newspapers rarely report on the extent to which socioeconomic circumstances and policies from multiple sectors and levels of government exert influence on population health. Canadian reporters and editors face numerous challenges when seeking to convey stories of this nature (Gasher et al. 2007). Out of a sample of 4,732 items originally published in Canadian daily newspapers, Hayes and colleagues (2007) found only nine items that deal with income as an influence on human health.

In light of the paucity of media coverage on poverty as a cause of ill health and the tendency for Canadian media to emphasize how those who are food-secure experience Kraft Dinner, even in stories about food insecurity, I initiated media advocacy (Wallack and Dorfman 1996). An experienced media relations specialist developed a comprehensive strategy that included a news release in print and video formats. The key messages were that poverty is a public health problem, that millions of Canadians live with food insecurity, and that ignorance of poverty exists in mainstream culture.
A news conference took place to facilitate interviews with reporters. The resulting coverage included online bulletins, radio interviews, and television stories on regional and national broadcasts, all highlighting that food-insecure Canadians are often obliged to eat Kraft Dinner prepared without milk because they have run out of money for food. The media advocacy encouraged donating money to food banks instead of boxes of Kraft Dinner, but it also stressed that charitable donations cannot prevent food insecurity from occurring. In sum, however compassionate the intent, the popularity of Kraft Dinner donations to food banks was presented as indicative of widespread misinformation about poverty and ill health in the Canadian population.

Overall, responses to the media advocacy illustrated the symbolic potency of Kraft Dinner in Canada. For example, consider the following response, which was posted to the website for CBC.ca: “This story informed me that my best intentions, while good, are misguided. I will be looking up what my local food bank needs before blindly donating next time.” A few posts referred to donating money instead of packaged foods. As one citizen wrote on the CBC.ca website, “When I donate to the food bank, I do it as cash. Hopefully then the food bank will buy real food for those in need.”

The advocacy messages about the advantages of donating money rather than packaged foods such as Kraft Dinner were facilitated by the involvement of James McAra, the chief executive officer of the Calgary Food Bank. He explained that his organization could redistribute more than four dollars’ worth of food for every dollar received. (That ratio has since increased to 5 to 1 [McAra, pers. comm., 1 March 2013].) Prior to becoming involved in repurposing Kraft Dinner for media advocacy, I had never considered that a food bank might negotiate directly with industry suppliers. Moreover, the Calgary Food Bank uses cash donations to purchase fluid milk and other perishable items for redistribution to households and community-based agencies.

Vitriolic responses were posted online, too: for example, “If the food bank recipients don’t like it or think we are just emptying out our cupboards, then I say, ‘Hey Dude/Dudette: GET A JOB.’” Yet many people experiencing food insecurity in Canada do, in fact, work for pay (McIntyre, Bartoo, and Emery 2014; Persaud, McIntyre, and Milaney 2010). The Calgary Food Bank reports that 38 percent of clients who accessed the
Food Bank from 1 September 2013 through 31 August 2014 had at least one employed person in the household.\textsuperscript{15}

Suspicion was also expressed about social research in several online responses, including this one: “What I would like to know is: a) How this study could possibly help the people in question? and b) How many needy families could have been fed with money wasted on this study?” Resistance to the messages on linkages between poverty and ill health had been anticipated, albeit in a general way, but suggestions that social research itself might be seen as a poor investment were unexpected.

CONCLUSION

The continued existence of food banks and the perennial popularity of Kraft Dinner donations cannot be explained by the recipients’ needs for food alone. In fact, because of the nature of food insecurity in Canada, more Kraft Dinner in their diet may be the last thing recipients need. Why, then, do Canadians continue to donate Kraft Dinner en masse?

I have attempted to respond to this question through consideration of Kraft Dinner’s social lives. More specifically, this chapter highlights that the social lives of Kraft Dinner donated by individuals for charitable redistribution diverges from, but also entwines with, the social lives of Kraft Dinner eaten by food-secure Canadians. Donated boxes of Kraft Dinner are often rerouted from “normal food channels” (Davis and Tarasuk 1994, 51), because individuals initially purchase them in grocery stores, often with their own families in mind. Canadians who are food secure tend to think about Kraft Dinner as a palatable meal-in-a-box that is simple to prepare and easy to store. These symbolic associations are regularly reinforced in the mass media and help guide Canadians’ purchases—and donations—of Kraft Dinner.

It follows that routine shopping for groceries is germane to the social lives of Kraft Dinner that is consumed in both food-secure and food-insecure households. To refute the notion that shopping for mass-produced commodities is a simple-minded chore, Daniel Miller (1998) draws on classic anthropological theories of sacrifice.\textsuperscript{16} Sacrifice is often thought of as giving up something of value for the sake of someone else out of altruism. Sacrifice also tends to be thought of as an extraordinary act or gesture. Anthropologists, however, have long discerned that many forms of sacrifice
are routine. Both ordinary and extraordinary sacrifices are made to shore up or confirm the moral worth of the givers. In addition, even when these recipients are supernatural beings—but also when recipients are close friends, family members, or strangers—sacrifices are often intended to influence the actions, sentiments, thoughts, and life course of recipients.

Miller (1998) emphasizes all of these points in focusing on familial consumption. Shoppers spend time and money in provisioning for their families, out of love. At the same time, taking care of their families is supposed to confirm the generosity and good character of the shopper, in their own eyes and in the eyes of family members. Yet as they select goods for their families, shoppers may actively imagine the intended recipient, to the extent of seeking to shape the eventual recipients’ bodies, appearance, status, and emotions—and even their futures. When the proffered purchases are presented to the recipient, they may therefore continue to represent the purchaser’s intentions, so much so that shoppers may vicariously experience consumption and feel that some part of them lives on within the recipient. Consequently, when shoppers cannot afford desirable goods to offer to their families, they might suffer.

Miller’s (1998) theoretical reworking of shopping as a set of prosaic sacrifices does not distinguish goods remaining on the outside of people’s bodies from those that enter into people’s bodies. In this chapter, however, I suggest that consumption of things that remain visibly external to bodies is different in important respects from things that are literally incorporated. I take incorporation to be integral to Kraft Dinner’s social lives, and when Canadians donate Kraft Dinner, they certainly intend for their gift to be consumed as food. I have come to believe that individuals who donate Kraft Dinner are engaged in a prosaic form of sacrifice that, to varying extents among donors, could be consciously oriented toward sharing substance with and exerting influence over the lives of recipients. The intended influence could very well stem from compassion. At the same time, media coverage surrounding donations of Kraft Dinner strongly suggests that donors benefit emotionally. Donors may hope or even believe that their little sacrifices are enough, but no matter how generous the donors and how well managed the redistribution system, food charity cannot dissolve the emotional and physical ramifications of food insecurity.

Unboxing Kraft Dinner for the purposes of cultural critique and out of concern for population health and equity directs attention toward milk.
This ingredient is not included within the box, yet its availability is often crucial in both nutritional and emotional terms for food-insecure consumers. When Kraft Dinner is literally unboxed for consumption in a context wherein milk is readily affordable, a very different social life or trajectory for the product is expressed than is the case when the ultimate consumers are bereft of milk owing to a lack of money. Similar to people in other industrialized countries (Nimmo 2011), Canadians tend to take their access to cow’s milk for granted, to the extent that milk scarcity among those living with food insecurity did not prompt or guide my initial interest in tracing the social lives of Kraft Dinner. The fact that the social life of a Kraft Dinner box comes to a crossroads depending on whether milk (or, more to the point, money to buy milk) is on hand at the point of consumption escaped my notice for some time, as I focused intently on the material contained within the box, on the packaging and publicity, and on histories and lore surrounding Kraft Dinner.

The simultaneous association of Kraft Dinner with poverty and with comfort is fascinating in itself, but over time, I have become increasingly concerned with the lack of discussion or apparent regard for the extent to which Canadian experiences of poverty entail milk scarcity. Secure access to milk is beyond the reach of low-income people throughout Canada. Public policies that influence people’s income status are largely responsible for this situation, including policies in the areas of social assistance, minimum wages, taxation, and pensions. Furthermore, the price of milk is set through public policy (Williams, McIntyre, and Glanville 2010), and “surplus” milk may literally be thrown away once quotas have been reached, as a matter of public policy (McIntyre, Glanville, and Hilchie-Pye 2011). Efforts to attenuate food insecurity by subsidizing milk purchases for low-income households have so far come to naught (McIntyre, Glanville, and Hilchie-Pye 2011). By comparing interview transcripts and media coverage with scholarly research and by speaking to experts on food insecurity in Canada, milk scarcity became conspicuous in its absence. Put bluntly, milk is rarely represented when food-secure Canadians deploy Kraft Dinner in reflecting on and reacting to food insecurity. The widespread acceptability of donating Kraft Dinner for charitable redistribution, yet with no guarantee whatsoever that milk will be accessible at the point of consumption, is an action that speaks louder than words. This donation practice strongly suggests that misinformation about the emotional and material depths
of poverty in Canada helps to direct the social lives of the boxes of Kraft Dinner that end up being distributed as food charity.

Disquiet with apparent unpredictability in money’s social lives might help account for the propensity of Canadians to respond to messages about food insecurity by donating Kraft Dinner rather than by giving money to food banks or, better still, by supporting public policies to alleviate income insecurity. Might donors want to know that the very packages of Kraft Dinner that they have handled, and often purchased initially with themselves and their families in mind, will meld with the bodies of anonymous people? Might charitable redistribution then allow the social lives of donors’ sacrificial choices to continue, in the experience and bodies of other people, in ways that promise to affirm the donors’ own morality and good fortune? To the extent that food charity constitutes a form of sacrifice, might donors sometimes anticipate a secular form of transubstantiation—that is, a material extension of themselves within someone else’s body? And might other donors respond perfunctorily to food drives out of a sense of obligation or feel less preoccupied with where their gift ultimately ends up than with displaying generosity? Inquiring into how Canadians communicate vis-à-vis Kraft Dinner has thus raised multiple questions without definitive answers, yet the rich anthropological literature on sacrifice in the social life of things is consistent with all these possibilities.

While the questions raised by more than a decade of inquiry into Kraft Dinner’s social lives are necessarily speculative, it is important to recall that the social lives of Kraft Dinner will always comprise more than the sum of the parts contained within the box. Examinations of food insecurity in Canada will remain incomplete and perhaps ineffective, when it comes to policy and social change, unless concerted efforts are made to attend to the symbolism of different foods and of money. The nutritional properties of food are important, but there is more to food than basic materiality.

NOTES

1 If anything, existing data may underestimate the magnitude of the problem because women appear more likely than men living in similar circumstances to report food insecurity when responding on behalf of the household unit (Matheson and McIntyre 2014).
3 A similar product that is sold throughout the United States as Kraft Mac
and Cheese® also connotes comfort and poverty among Americans (Locher
et al. 2005; Sheldon 2004).
infopresse.com/archive/index/42185.
5 Direct quotations from interviews originally appeared in Rock, McIntyre,
and Rondeau (2009). Direct quotations from the collected and analyzed
media coverage also appeared previously in Rock, McIntyre, and Rondeau
(2009) whereas direct quotations from readers’ or listeners’ responses to
media coverage that resulted from the advocacy that I initiated appeared
previously in Rock et al. (2011).
6 “C’est parce que j’ai l’impression que ça correspond à un produit simple,
qui est connu.”
7 “On a vraiment la perception que c’est aimé dans les couches populaires,
en fait, je pense que c’est une perception que c’est aimé, le Kraft Dinner,
malgré tout.”
8 “Tu peux en servir à tes enfants, à ta famille, ou même t’en servir pour toi-
même, c’est que dans le fonds, tu le prépares toi-même.”
9 “C’est facile à préparer et on présume, je suppose qu’on présume que tout
le monde sait comment le préparer.”
10 “Simplement, l’idée repas complet, dans le sens protéines, pâtes. Au lieu
de donner un paquet de spaghettis blancs, tu donnes le kit, qui est un
repas.”
11 “On a de l’eau! Le beurre, la margarine, t’en as!”
12 “Comme c’est pas cher, c’est rare que les gens vont acheter une boîte. Ils
vont en acheter trois à quatre, donc … faîque t’achètes une caisse. Quand
t’en as une caisse chez toi, pis que les gens passent pour le magasin partage
t’en as beaucoup fait que … pourquoi pas en donner peut-être même la
moitié, tsé?”
13 While an in-depth application of the concept of solidarity lies beyond the
scope of this chapter, the term is used advisedly here, to mark individual
and collective responses to the needs of others (Prainsack and Buyx 2012).
14 This data comes from a secondary analysis of individual interviews and
focus groups conducted for research led by Lynn McIntyre (see Rock,
McIntyre, and Rondeau 2009).
fastfacts.
16 Miller’s (1998) examination of shopping emphasizes classic
anthropological theory, supplemented by continental philosophy (Bataille
and Strauss 1990, in particular; Hubert and Mauss [1898] 1964). The starting
point for Appadurai (1986), similarly, is sacrifice (following Simmel [1900] 1978), which foregrounds the apparition of value through actual, imagined, and proscribed exchanges of one thing or person against another.  

17 This line of argument builds on insights from scholarship on organ transplantation, pharmaceuticals, illegal drugs, and smoking. While a large body of literature exists on these topics, several works have been especially inspirational: see Bell (2011, 2013); Bourgois and Schonberg (2009); Dennis (2011, 2013); Frohlich et al. (2012); Lundin (1999); Lock (2001); and Mykhalovskiy (2008).  

18 For further discussion surrounding moral trepidation regarding monetary exchange, see Simmel ([1900] 1978) and Bloch and Parry (1989).
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