

Neoliberal Welfare Reforms and Emergency Food Aid in the UK

Dave Beck¹

(1)School of Health and Society, The University of Salford, Salford, Greater Manchester, UK*

*Accepted final.

Dave Beck

Email: d.j.beck@salford.ac.uk

Abstract

Driven by an intensification of neoliberalism within the UK political system over the last 45 years, crucial reforms to social security have had a compounding effect on the poorest. In more recent neoliberal times, ideological austerity has progressed hand in hand with political welfare conditionality, as the poorest suffer further demonstrable hardship. Acting as a residual welfare safety net, emergency food aid has become normalized within the UK and recognized as an accepted part of necessary welfare reforms. However, hidden beneath the wave of rising food bank use lies an opaque deepness, obscuring the true extent of UK hunger evident on multiple political and social levels.

Introduction

In Britain, we like to think that food poverty is something that happens in far off places. (Lang [2001](#): viii)

It is Professor Tim Lang's foreword in *Poverty Bites* by Dowler, Turner, and Dobson ([2001](#)) which encapsulates the once held belief that hunger would not be something readily associated with a developed nation such as the UK. This statement was made writing for the Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) almost 20 years ago ([2001](#)); however, what we now see is that hunger is undoubtedly of growing concern throughout the UK today. Despite acknowledgement of its presence by the UK government, and acquiescence to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, growing numbers of individuals and their families face the prospect of not being able to source a daily amount of adequate food.

The purpose of this entry is to examine the concept of hidden hunger in the UK. In doing so, this entry will evidence the levels of which hunger has become hidden across multiple layers of national and international institutions spread across the political and societal divide. Central to understanding the true level of hidden hunger is to first appreciate how, as one of the wealthiest countries in the world, we arrived at our current position. First, the entry will show that for a developed nation such as the UK, hunger is a revived issue, entrenched in the rise of neoliberal politics extending back over 40 years and one which transcends political colors. Situating this within increasing poverty, the identities of the hidden hungry are argued to be the casualty of a media-driven demonization, greasing the path for public acceptance of austerity as a political ideology. Politically, hunger becomes hidden through this vilification, as the pursuit of neoliberalism is completed. As the entry will show, temporary relief

for those experiencing hunger is provided in the form of emergency food aid forming a prescient vision of a neoliberal charitable Big Society.

This entry will thus argue that hunger becomes hidden on three levels, internationally, nationally, and individually, within the home. Each of these will be discussed separately; however, relationships across each authenticate the insidious nature of this as a politically motivated ideology. The rising levels of hunger have become a source of political embarrassment and shame for the government, as it perpetrates the hideous impact of welfare reform and austerity on its own people. Vociferous policies aimed at rolling back the state have left a void in provision which is forcing the hand of reluctant charitable supplies. Deceptively, this is being used as a political mask on both the international and national stage, to show that any rise in hunger is being resolved by the political inclusion and societal acceptance of downstream food aid. Yet there is no political will from the government to confront upstream causes.

Rise of the Hidden Hungry in “Big Society” Britain

The hidden hungry of the UK is not a totally new phenomenon; they are an inherited product of neoliberal policies pursued over the last 45 years. To fully appreciate what “hunger” is in the UK, and why they are (or become) hidden, steps need to be traced back to the introduction of neoliberalism adopted by the 1974–1979 New Labour Government. The encouragement of a laissez-faire free-market philosophy was further enriched under the Conservatives (1979–1997) and New Labour Governments which followed with the aim of encouraging people to be able to stand on their own two feet and take responsibility over their (in)actions. Renowned for policies aimed at rolling back the welfare state, the language of “social security” during the neoliberal era also changed. As Lister (2013) evidences, the language of “social security” during the period of rising neoliberal policies was quickly replaced by promoting the use of the term “welfare” instead. Moreover, this meant that as neoliberalism and individual accountability gained traction, claiming “welfare” was seen to be deficient of moral responsibility, and welfare became used within a pejorative concept. This was particularly so when spoken in context with provision and the word “state,” as in the “welfare state.” Lister (2013) furthers that the idea of a “welfare state” began to suggest a dependence on the state as a provider, which was seen very much to be unwelcome within the neoliberal mantra.

In conserving the neoliberal idea of welfare (un)deservedness, to be “welfare dependent” has now become disparagingly synonymous with “welfare benefits,” creating a sea change in the way social security is observed from a public viewpoint, emboldening a profound impact on how we judge the worthiness of social security recipients today (Lister 2013). Fraser (2009) has linked changes in attitudes toward the poor over time along lines of a moralistic diagnosis, describing those who “deserve” state help with the relief of poverty, from those who don’t. For Fraser (ibid), this is driven by the individual personal abilities and attributes, something that Lister (2004) identifies as a conversation about “them” and “us,” the “deserving” and the “undeserving.” However, what we see within the backdrop of neoliberalism is that the need to hide poverty becomes pervasive. What more recent academic research has shown (Shildrick et al. 2012; Lister 2013; Shildrick and MacDonald 2013) is that there still exists a social stigma around poverty and that people are working more diligently to hide this label from their peers. Because of neoliberalism, in hiding the label of poverty, people act to eliminate individual identity or suggestion of poverty from themselves and their family and, in doing so, are at risk of becoming even further hidden as they can resort to unsustainable financial strategies.

The Big Society: Modernizing the Hidden Poor

Following 13 years of the New Labour Government, the Conservative Liberal Democrat coalition government (2010–2015) decided to instigate major transformations to the social security system of the UK, making the case to cut public spending throughout the next parliament (Shildrick et al. [2012](#)). In maintaining a position of less eligibility, following the financial crisis and resultant Great Recession of 2008, the coalition government proposed amendments to the way social security is delivered, emphasizing the need to tackle “welfare dependency and making work pay” (Shildrick et al. [2012](#): 216). The intention was to cut welfare expenditure by £15 billion, not just generating reforms to the amount of welfare that is paid out but also making structural changes to the ways in which it is paid. Shildrick et al. argue that these changes were intended as an ideological justification aimed at tackling welfare dependency as a matter of lifestyle choice, conveniently packaged as “savings” necessary to service the national deficit ([2012](#): 217).

The idea of rolling back the state continued at a pace during the leadership of Conservative David Cameron ([2010](#)–2016). However, delivering £15 billion “savings” ultimately meant less money for the statutory provision of social security, resulting in on-the-ground cuts and, effectively, a further retreat of the government as statutory provider. Acknowledging that this would create gaps in statutory provision, Cameron proposed that many services would be delivered instead through localized voluntary providers (Cameron [2010](#)). The inclusion of community voluntary organizations, set up to provide support for the most vulnerable within local communities, dubbed the “Big Society” was David Cameron’s offering to sure up the gaps that would be left in statutory provision. What services would be provided could be either tendered out to private suppliers or picked up by the “Big Society” as a form of collective action operating within a post-bureaucratic society. Politically, the Big Society relies on a conventional conservative way of thinking about welfare being offered by an “organic civil society” of voluntary organizations, doing-good within their community, substituting the state as a supplier (Beck [2018](#)).

Poverty Porn: The creation of an identity

By drawing attention to the question of who then are the hidden hungry, Garthwaite ([2016](#)) has argued that that you will know them when you see them, as they reflect the modern-day tabloid image of an undeserving poor. This supposes that the problem of “poverty” is bound up with “problems of the behavior of the poor” and that focus is directed upon the conduct of those who are dependent on social security. This divisive attitude results in a societal framing of welfare deservedness and leads to questioning the morality of recipients within a state-funded system (Beck [2018](#)). Correspondingly, the public demonization of those in receipt of benefits to any extent became conditional as a matter of tackling of benefit dependency writ large. Simultaneously, and associated with a substantially intensified political media, was the emergence of a new genre of TV programs dubbed “Poverty Porn” (Jensen [2014](#)). Encouraging a mode of “poverty voyeurism,” this form of highly intrusive “light entertainment” pointed the finger at working-class communities and chastised the poor, promptly giving rise to a public legitimation of disparaging identities toward the struggling working-class. Television programs such as “Benefits Street” and “Benefits Britain,” with their belittling titles, sought to damage the image of people in poverty through a degrading and selective lens. However, behind this lens is a politico-media-driven ideology aimed at intensifying ignominy toward people in receipt of benefits (*née* social security) and adjusting public attitudes. In doing so, this type of programming

suggests that all those in receipt of benefits are villains, unworthy of public sympathy (welfare) due to their own agency (Beck [2018](#)).

In agreement with Lister ([2004](#)), the modern face of hardship, therefore, has a profile that has become subject to a continued demonization through classification and categorization into a deserving and undeserving identity. This dichotomy provides a dualistic differentiation and demarcation between the competing “powerful and the powerless” and is the foundation on which social attitudes develop. Relationships of power such as this allow negative judgments, constructing an identity *of the poor, for the poor*, representative of the “benefit recipient” or the “food poor.” This identity demarcation becomes instilled with thoughts of “moral contamination, a threat, an ‘undeserving’ economic burden, an object of pity” (Lister [2004](#)). It is little surprise, then, that those suffering from poverty feel an oppressive sense of shame, stigma, and embarrassment at their condition and become hidden from their peers (Beck [2018](#)). It is with this, then, that Lister ([2004](#)) indicates any bifurcation of the poor into distinct categories of “deserving” and “undeserving” results in a discrepancy of how they are received and treated by society.

The Hidden Hungry: The Big Society and Poverty Identities

Shoring up the holes left in the welfare safety net, following heightened conditionality and the rollback of state involvement, has been the rise of emergency food aid providers. Considered the embodiment of a “Big Society” at large, emergency food aid providers are now functioning where the government has lessened its responsibility to its most vulnerable citizens. In doing so, it becomes clear to see that the idea of the “Big Society” only serves to allow the government to hide the reality of poverty. It refuses to acknowledge that poverty exists by encouraging voluntary groups to do the work that the government should be doing.

Acknowledging that emergency food aid providers, such as food banks, are feeding a rising tide of hungry people must, however, be examined within the broader context of the structural changes to the UK’s economic climate – caused by the Great Recession and neoliberal ideology. According to Cooper, Purcell, and Jackson ([2014](#)), the cost of food and fuel rose by 43.5% between 2005 and 2013, forcing people on lower incomes to spend more, yet end up having less. These underlying causes of poverty, combined with significant other structural reasons, precarious working practices, the rise in zero-hours contracts, welfare conditionality, and the cuts to social security above, have worked to ensure that the least able to cope became victims of austerity. Lambie-Mumford and Dowler ([2015](#)), in agreement with Cooper et al. ([2014](#)), have rendered this to a transformative phase over the last decade, whereby the combination of austerity-driven policies with rising food and fuel prices has forced people into seeking charitable food aid.

Consistent with the evidence above, Hirsch ([2013](#)) furthers the structural reasons for rising hunger, social inequality, and poverty. The Poverty Premium Thesis identifies structural methods by which people who are poor inevitably pay more for necessary services, just to make ends meet. Within the Poverty Premium, those in poverty inescapably pay more for services comparable to their wealthier, better positioned counterparts, a figure estimated to be in the region of £490 per annum for lower-income households (Davies et al. [2014](#)). For Hirsch ([2013](#)) the poverty premium serves to further compound the poor’s ability to be able to break free from the cycle of deprivation. The consequence of the poverty premium is also a reflection of how the poor work to hide their poverty and as such resist the label of “the poor,” through the delivery of equivalent normalized services, albeit at an

extortionate rate (Beck [2018](#)). In a vitriolic confrontation of the preconceptions of society, specifically that people who are poor make poor choices, Tirado ([2014](#)) supports the work of the poverty premium, as she disputes several poverty misconceptions head-on. Maintaining that most “decisions” are not, in fact, choices which people in poverty make, Tirado affirms that people living in poverty are only able to make the residual choices that are available to them and, for many people, there really is no choice. The processes by which people survive, Tirado argues, are not therefore associated with flaws of the individual agent; they are structural manifestations which they are left to deal with.

Food Banks: The Big Society and the Hidden Hungry

Relatively new in the UK, emergency food aid providers such as food banks are, however, manifest within other countries, especially ones that have a developed capitalist system; most notable of these are the USA and Canada. Acknowledging the establishment of the North American structure of food banks, Poppendieck ([1998](#)) declares that there is a direct association between governmental changes in welfare and the intensification of food banks. Highlighting the political intent, Poppendieck furthers that neoliberalism is a process used to undermine the nation’s social security safety net, hailed as “the end of welfare as we know it” ([1998](#)).

Ronson and Caraher ([2016](#)) have likened the emergence of UK food banks as part of the voluntary provision within a Big Society context to the theoretical position offered by Wolfgang Seibel ([1989](#)). In discussing the role of the voluntary sector, Seibel ([1989](#)) identifies that there exists an inherent failure within nonprofit organizations, especially where they are performing a role once occupied by a statutory body. Labeling them as “shunting yards,” Seibel ([1989](#)) furthers that charities (in our case food banks) enable the statutory bodies to off-load their responsibilities onto the nonprofit sector during austere times. Serving as a political hiding place, confidence is then placed in the public conscious that something is being done to solve the crisis (Seibel [1989](#)) of hunger as the nonprofit charities are required to act (and then maintain) their position as a replacement (Beck [2018](#)). Yet, this begs the question whether at all a wholly voluntary system of support could ever be a substantial substitute for a well-funded statutory provision, supported through the collective action of a national social security system?

This means that food banks become the answer to what is rightly a political crisis of poverty (Beck [2018](#)), causing renowned food poverty expert Professor Graham Riches ([2014](#)) to criticize the UK government for allowing a legitimization of food banks. Seibel ([1989](#)) argues that this swinging of public concern from the statutory authorities to the charitable sector distracts public attention and muddies the water of responsibility. Signaling the illusion that help is at hand, the rising participation of food as aid highlights that the government has become self-discharged from any political responsibility of guaranteeing that people have enough financial resources to buy their own food. Unfortunately for the food banks, they now occupy a position whereby they cannot step back from providing food as aid, and they increasingly become recognized providers within a mixed economy of welfare (Beck [2018](#)).

Emergency food aid is not simply attributable only to capitalist countries, however. Silvasti ([2015](#)) acknowledges that in social-democratic Finland, the deep recession of the mid-1990s became a precursor to the carving and freezing of social security, causing lasting reforms to welfare. It was during this period that Finland also saw the development of their food banks as a response to mounting poverty. Criticizing this as a “normalizing of the abnormal,” and consistent with the argument

presented above by Seibel, Silvasti (2015) argues that by 2013, many people in Finland were still “totally dependent on food charity” (ibid.).

The UK Food Bank Model

Characterized by either stagnated or actual decline in real incomes for the poorest, the Great Recession (2007–2009) and the subsequent removal of key welfare provisioning have been influential in the rise in UK food bank use (Perry et al. 2014). Supplying a now much needed provision, food aid providers have been forced to step-in to fill the void as a less generous welfare offering becomes the norm. This new normal is arguably being met principally through the food bank, as their corresponding numbers have risen as welfare has declined (Beck 2018). So, who are the food banks; how are they filling this void; and what does it say about hidden hungry in the UK?

Lambie-Mumford et al. (2014) clarify that UK food aid operates both large-scale national activities and small-scale, local activities. Here, large-scale activities are indicative of the national network of “Foodbanks” provided by the Christian charity the Trussell Trust. The small-scale activities are, therefore, indicative of other charitable organizations that also operate “food banks” (and other emergence food aid provisions), autonomously of the Trussell Trust. The “small-scale” food banks recognized by Lambie-Mumford (2014) are both independent of the Trussell Trust Network but are also independent of each other, working as local unconnected emergency food aid initiatives. The structures of both provider types are detailed below:

- Trussell Trust Foodbanks – Originating in Salisbury, England, in 2004, the Trussell Trust is a Christian organization providing administration to a nationwide network of franchised “Foodbanks.” Organized through churches and community centres, the Foodbank model operates within a defined locality, typically bounded within each UK Local Authority which has at least one Trussell Trust Foodbank. The aid which is given is normally 3-day worth of nonperishable goods, usually consisting of tinned produce, pasta, rice, tea/coffee, and toiletries. Operating like a “Hub-and-Spoke,” a Trussell Trust Foodbank (hub) may also have several associated Foodbank Centers (spokes) geographically distributed across the same Local Authority boundary helping to deliver food aid to various parts of the region.

Combined, the Trussell Trust, therefore, operates a vast network of over 1,000 Foodbanks (Goodwin 2018) which are geographically spread across the whole of the UK. As part of the management structure within the national Trussell Trust, each Foodbank within this network is required to submit regular statistical records, allowing the Trussell Trust to create a national representation of how many people are using Trussell Trust Foodbanks (Trussell Trust *n.d.*).

- Separate to the Trussell Trust are a number of food banks that chose to operate outside of this network and are understood to be “independent food banks.” IFAN (2019b) Like the Trussell Trust, these food banks are also normally housed within a church or community center and provide equivalent food working within corresponding communities. However, as independent food banks are not networked within the same Trussell Trust administrative collective, any data which they may (or may not) collect on usages is not fed into the Trussell Trust structure, therefore forming no part of the nationally disseminated food bank usage figures. Independent within their own right, independent food banks also do not share data with each other – forming no independent collective either. However, the recent work of the

Independent Food Aid Network (IFAN) has recently been aiming to bring together a collective voice for the independent sector of food banks across the UK (IFAN [2019a](#)).

The difference in food bank types above is important to note, however, as media reporting of the numbers of people in the UK using food banks comes from the collective evidence of Trussell Trust Foodbank network only. For instance, recent annual figures released through the media highlight the rising incidence of food poverty in the UK, showing that 1.6 million people received help from a Foodbank between April 2018 and March 2019, a figure which is representative of an 19% increase from the previous year (Butler [2019c](#)). However, the Trussell Trust is estimated to only account for potentially two-thirds of all UK food banks (Goodwin [2018](#); Beck [2019](#)). Therefore, it is necessary that, if a real representation of the number of people using food banks is to emerge, that it needs to include data collected from all of those outside of the Trussell Trust network too. The disjuncture between reported use of food banks and the actual number is therefore obscured, conceivably ignoring one-third of food bank users and adding another level of opacity over the UK's hidden hungry.

A More Holistic Approach: Counting the Hungry

Decisively, the structure of media discourse associated with the food bank user stifles the true picture of food poverty as many millions in the UK are still hidden. In approaching a representative figure of people experiencing hunger, it also must be borne in mind that any figure, even if derived from combined food bank statistical data, will still not be truly representative. In examining the extent to which food poverty has now become more prevalent and commonplace across the UK, consideration also needs to be given to the doubtless millions of genuinely hidden hungry who are not accounted for from the Trussell Trust. This will include, but also not limited to, those who have been fed by other emergency food aid providers such as Pay As You Feel Café's, night shelters, and social supermarkets to name but a few.

However, not to diminish the impact of these providers, US-based food poverty academic Jan Poppendieck ([1998](#)) argues the extent to which hunger *is* hidden really starts within the home. As income and outgoings are fixed, it is the money reserved for food which becomes the buffer for people during times of hardship. An unexpected bill, the annual costs of school uniform, a child's birthday/Christmas presents, and the costs of the school holiday period are all known times when income and outgoings change. Yet with some of these bills being fixed, it is the amount which is spent on food which is the *easiest* to reduce. Poppendieck ([1998](#)) recognizes this as the beginning of capable agency in difficult times stating that "food is often the most flexible item in the family budget, the place where you can economize, and the easiest kind of help to get."

The deployment of these family income management strategies further highlights the uncertainty of how many people are actually hungry in the UK. Lambie-Mumford and Dowler ([2015](#)) indicate that people will change shopping habits, eat less nutritionally good food, visit family members, shop little and often, or focus on feeding their children first and that food bank use is usually the last resort of the food poor. These strategies that are deployed by people are, with the utmost respect, because people do not wish to lose part of their valued self. Unfortunately, food bank use due to hunger is highly stigmatizing and embarrassing and is something which may stifle feelings of self-worth (Beck [2018](#)).

What is true, however, is that there are clearly many more people working tirelessly to hide their hunger, making use of several strategies to navigate away from needing to use a food bank, albeit, maybe only temporarily. Research by Taylor and Loopstra (2016) find that through analyzing United Nations data provided via the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), an estimated 8.4 million people in the UK reported levels of insufficient access to food in 2014. Of this figure, 3.7 million were living in moderate food insecure homes, while 4.7 million indicated that they were living in severely food insecure homes (Taylor and Loopstra 2016). In creating an image of what food insecurity looks like, and identifying its severity, The Food Foundation have shown that food insecurity rises along a scale of severity (see Fig. 1). Along this scale, practices of hiding food poverty seep into every stage and are mainly done within the home until, finally, the individual may resort to accessing an emergency provider.



Fig. 1
Stages and severity of food insecurity. (Courtesy of Taylor and Loopstra 2016)

This recent acknowledgment of the extent of potential hidden hunger in the UK has been pursued by academic and civil society campaigns and the inclusion of political influence in recognizing the importance of this missing data. Further to this, Labour MP Emma Lewell-Buck recently introduced a private member's bill requesting that the UK government make a conscious effort to measure levels of food insecurity. Aligning the UK with measurements undertaken in North America, this measurement will be undertaken by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) through their Family Resources Survey in April, with data to be made available by the following March (Butler 2019a). Furthermore, not to let the hidden hungry seep through political cracks, numerous charities, civil society actors, academics, and policymakers have also called for the appointment of a dedicated UK minister with political accountability for tackling hunger (Butler 2019b).

Giving Voice to the Hidden Hungry

French (2017) finds that even with the affluence of the UK, there are pockets of immense poverty which are inevitably hidden from view. Appointed by the Human Rights Council, Professor Philip Alston, the current United Nations Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights, made an official visit to the UK at the invitation of the British Government. This fact-finding visit took place between November 5 and 16, 2018, producing several startling conclusions about the levels of UK

poverty, destitution, and hunger. What it also did was to highlight the depth to which hunger in the UK is also hidden internationally. The report highlighted that one-fifth of the UK population, roughly 14 million people, are currently living in poverty and that of this number, 1.5 million people are classed as destitute (Alston [2018](#)).

Concurring with findings from other poverty-focused organizations, the UN Special Rapporteur declared that poverty is presenting itself as a major challenge in the UK. Taking this further, he emphasized that the current staggering rates of child poverty, argued by CPAG to be 1 in 4 children, is only made worse by the fact that this number is set to rise over the next few years (IFS [2017](#)). Exposing a repugnant level of political ignorance to austerity, the Special Rapporteur stressed that politicians were generally in a state of denial that poverty was an issue in the UK and that, in their view, austerity measures were necessary and working well (Alston [2018](#)). Given that the origins of UK food banks have been shown to have been embedded within austerity policies wedded to the Great Recession, this form of political ignorance exposes the disconnect between policymakers and those with the lived experience of austerity. As the experience of hunger is embarrassing, such a political reflection also serves to both hide and then subsequently reject the voices of those most affected by this punitive ideology.

Conclusion

Argued across this entry has been the disconnect between policymakers and the public and how this has been influential in the rise of hunger in the UK. Fueling an attitude of unavoidable austerity, this political ideology became entrenched in the malevolent dogma of neoliberalism, inflicting the punishment of welfare reform to be meted out to those considered less deserving. This entry has shown that the impact of austerity policies and subsequent removal of statutory provisions has pushed both hunger and poverty alleviation into the arms of charitable delivery, initiating a shame and stigma for recipients. This embarrassment has been shown to be the consequence of a long-standing erosion of social security at the hands of neoliberalism, but also, one which has been pursued violently across recent media. The demonization of working-class communities worked hand in hand with the vilification of social security, making for a smooth transition from a system of support to a system much maligned as an undeserved *benefit*. In more recent times, this made for the introduction of austerity-driven welfare reform a far easier pill for the public to swallow.

Reforming welfare with such pace and cruelty has been eased by a vociferous media discourse aimed at demonizing the working-class and pointing a finger at the supposed feckless lifestyles of the poor. This type of media was designed to manipulate rather than inform social policy debates, causing a hardening of attitudes toward people in receipt of social security and pushing them to hide their poverty. To this end, emergency food aid providers and charitable organizations such as food banks, social supermarkets, and soup kitchens are catching those who fall through the welfare safety net, with ever-increasing networks growing exponentially since 2010 (Beck [2018](#)).

Yet as evidenced, emergency food aid providers are only one side of the assistance coin when estimating the proportion of people being helped. As the entry has argued, currently the only nationally representative estimates of official hunger relief have come from the Trussell Trust, but this is an organization that represents potentially only two-thirds of all food banks. Moreover, to appreciate the quandary of hidden hunger in the UK, it is important to understand that Trussell Trust data is simply

that. It is just the numbers of hungry people using Trussell Trust Foodbanks. Trustworthy as this information may be, it is simply a gauge, an opaque evaluation. Consideration therefore should also be given to the many millions of people deploying strategies in their homes aimed at both challenging and hiding hunger, steps that are taken before finally resorting to help from a food bank. However, as this entry has also argued, official and political movements toward legislating the monitoring of hunger will eventually go some way to showing the crisis for what it really is.

Cross-References

- . [Addressing Food Security Issues: Understanding and Anticipating the Future](#)
- . [Food Poverty: Zero Hunger and the Right to Food](#)
- . [Food Security](#)

References

Alston P (2018) UN special rapporteur's preliminary findings on the UK. [YouTube]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5XeV_CTlh3c. Accessed 19 July 2019

Beck D (2018) The changing face of food poverty with special reference to wales. PhD thesis. Bangor University. https://research.bangor.ac.uk/portal/files/22198649/2018_Beck_D_PhD.pdf. Accessed 18 Aug 2019

Beck D (2019) Food banks are becoming institutionalised in the UK. The Conversation [Online]. <https://theconversation.com/food-banks-are-becoming-institutionalised-in-the-uk-114325>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

Butler P (2019a) UK hunger survey to measure food insecurity. The Guardian Online. 27 February. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/feb/27/government-to-launch-uk-food-insecurity-index>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

Butler P (2019b) Appoint minister for hunger to tackle UK food insecurity, MPs urge. The Guardian Online. 10 January. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/jan/10/appoint-minister-for-hunger-to-tackle-uk-food-insecurity-mps-urge>. Accessed 29 Aug 2019

Butler P (2019c) Food bank network hands out record 1.6m food parcels in a year. The Guardian Online. 25 April 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/apr/25/food-bank-network-hands-out-record-16m-food-parcels-in-a-year>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

Cameron D (2010) Big society speech: transcript of a speech by the Prime Minister on the Big Society, 19 July 2010. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/big-society-speech>. Accessed 23 Aug 2019

Cooper N, Purcell S, Jackson R (2014) Below the breadline: the relentless rise of food poverty in Britain. <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/below-the-breadline-the-relentless-rise-of-food-poverty-in-britain-317730>. Accessed 30 Aug 2019

Davies S, Finney A, Hartfree Y (2014) The poverty premium when low-income households pay more for essential goods and services. The University of Bristol Personal Finance Research Centre. <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/geography/pfrc/pfrc1614-poverty-premium-key-findings.pdf>. Accessed 5 Aug 2019

Dowler E, Turner S, Dobson B (2001) Poverty bites: food health and poor families. CPAG, London

Fraser D (2009) The evolution of the British welfare state, 4th edn. Palgrave-Macmillan, Basingstoke [CrossRef](#)

French F (2017) The hidden pockets of poverty from Cornwall to Northumberland. The Guardian Online. <https://www.theguardian.com/voluntary-sector-network/2017/oct/05/poverty-austerity-england-charity-support>. Accessed 5 Aug 2019

Garthwaite KA (2016) Hunger pains. Life inside foodbank Britain. Policy Press, Bristol [CrossRef](#)

Goodwin S (2018) Mapping the UK's independent food banks. <http://www.foodaidnetwork.org.uk/independent-food-banks-map>. Accessed 5 Aug 2019

Hirsch D (2013) Addressing the poverty premium: approaches to regulation. Consumer Futures, London, 61pp. <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/16999/1/Addressing-the-poverty-premium.pdf>. Accessed 19 July 2019

IFAN (2019a) Mapping the UK's independent food banks. <http://www.foodaidnetwork.org.uk/independent-food-banks-map>. Accessed 5 Aug 2019

IFAN (2019b) About us. <http://www.foodaidnetwork.org.uk/about-us>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

IFS (2017) Living standards, poverty and inequality in the UK: 2017–18 to 2021–22. <https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/comms/R136.pdf>. Accessed 22 July 2019

Jensen T (2014) Welfare commonsense, poverty porn and doxosophy. *Sociol Res Online* 19(3):3. <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/19/3/3.html>. Accessed 19 July 2019
CrossRef

Lambie-Mumford H, Dowler E (2015) How can households eat in austerity? Challenges for social policy in the UK. *Soc Policy Soc* 14(3):417–428. Cambridge University Press 2015. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/S1474746415000032>. Accessed 3 Aug 2019

Lambie-Mumford H, Crossley D, Jensen E, Verbeke M, Dowler E (2014) Household food security in the UK: a review of food aid. <https://www.foodethicscouncil.org/uploads/publications/2014%20Household%20food%20insecurity%20in%20the%20UK.pdf>. Accessed 1 Aug 2019

Lang T (2001) A foreword in Dowler, E, Turner, S, and Dobson, B., 2001. In: *Poverty bites: food health and poor families*. CPAG, London

Lister R (2004) *Poverty*. Polity Press, Cambridge

Lister R (2013) Benefit cuts: how the language of welfare poisoned our social security. *The Guardian*. 1 April 2013. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/apr/01/language-welfare-social-security>. Accessed 17 Aug 2019

Perry J, Williams M, Sefton T, Haddad M (2014) *Emergency use only. Understanding and reducing the use of food banks in the UK*. Oxfam UK, London

Poppendieck J (1998) *Sweet charity*. Viking Penguin, New York

Riches G (2014) Food banks don't solve food poverty. The UK must not institutionalise them. *The Guardian Online*. 8 December 2014. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/dec/08/food-banks-poverty-uk-canada-right-to-food>. Accessed 18 Aug 2019

Ronson D, Caraher M (2016) Food banks: big society or shunting yards? Successful failures. A chapter. In: Caraher M, Coveney J (eds) (2015) Food poverty and insecurity: international food inequalities. Springer, London

Seibel W (1989) The function of mellow weakness: nonprofit organizations as problem nonsolvers in Germany. A chapter. In: James E (ed) The nonprofit sector in international perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Shildrick T, MacDonald R (2013) Poverty talk: how people experiencing poverty deny their poverty and why they blame ‘the poor’. 61(2):285–303. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-954X.12018?journalCode=sora>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

Shildrick T, MacDonald R, Webster C, Garthwaite K (2012) Poverty and insecurity: life in low-pay, no-pay Britain. The Policy Press, Bristol
[CrossRef](#)

Silvasti T (2015). Food aid – normalising the abnormal in finland. Soc Policy Soc 14(3):471–482. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/DED572C83A071AC22E18DE8443F50D3F/S1474746415000123a.pdf/food_aid_normalising_the_abnormal_in_finland.pdf. Accessed 2 Oct 2019

Taylor A, Loopstra R (2016) Too poor to eat food insecurity in the UK. The Food Foundation [Online]. <https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/FoodInsecurityBriefing-May-2016-FINAL.pdf>. Accessed 8 Aug 2019

Tirado L (2014) Hand to mouth. The truth about being poor in a wealthy world. Virago, London

Trussell Trust (n.d.) Our story. <https://www.trusselltrust.org/about/our-story/>. Accessed 21 July 2019