JYX JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Harjunen, Hannele

Title: Fatness and Consequences of Neoliberalism

Year: 2021

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2021 selection and editorial matter, Cat Pausé and Sonya Renee Taylor; individu

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en

Please cite the original version:

Harjunen, H. (2021). Fatness and Consequences of Neoliberalism. In C. Pausé, & S. R. Taylor (Eds.), The Routledge International Handbook of Fat Studies (pp. 68-77). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003049401-11

Fatness and Consequences of Neoliberalism

Hannele Harjunen, PhD

Introduction

My aim in this chapter is to inspect how neoliberal economic policy and rationale are enmeshed with conceptions of body and health in contemporary (primarily Western) cultural sphere and how they have been addressed in research literature particularly concerning fatness and the fat body. The relationship between neoliberalism, fatness and the fat body will be examined in the light of feminist and fat studies scholarship (e.g., Guthman, 2009a; Guthman, 2009b; Harjunen, 2017; LeBesco, 2011; Rothblum & Solovay, 2009).

Neoliberalism, a mode of economic liberalism and free market capitalism, has been the dominant economic policy since the 1980s, the logic, discourse and practices of which have been adopted globally (Harvey, 2007; Ventura, 2012). Neoliberal economic thinking underlines the free market, privatisation of the public domain, cost-effectiveness, productivity, and profit. As has been reported in recent years, social structures, institutions, and policies have been transformed by neoliberal policies around the world (e.g. Wrede et al, 2008).

However, neoliberalism does not only shape general structures, it influences our private lives and embodiment too (e.g Guthman, 2009a; Harjunen, 2017). Patricia Ventura (2012) has suggested that the values and norms that are followed today are shaped by a neoliberal logic: people's everyday lives, including bodies, become organized and regulated according to its needs, values, and priorities[1]. Ventura refers to this organisation of social realities according to the neoliberal economic rationale as "neoliberal culture". My intention here is to discuss how fatness and fat bodies are understood and dealt with in neoliberal culture. My starting point here is that neoliberally attuned social institutions such as health care policies; or

[1] Ventura focuses on the United States of America. However, neoliberalism and its effects are not limited to North America alone.

structures, such as health care systems; not to mention social, moral, and political orders of the day all contribute to the shaping of acceptable bodies conceptually as well as physically.

In neoliberal culture the body is understood as an individualistic project one can choose and shape as one wishes. However, neither all choices concerning the body nor all bodies are seen as possible or legitimate as others. The embodied subject of neoliberal culture is supposed to replicate the core neoliberal values of freedom and choice. Neoliberal culture has got its normative or a "preferred" body, the norms of which are based on self-control, productivity, and individual morals. In order to become a successful neoliberal subject, ability to perform this ideal or preferred body is crucial. Achieving the preferred body requires self-monitoring or -disciplinary behavior and apparent failing in self-governing is interpreted as a social and moral failing that results in social sanctions[2]. In neoliberal culture, individuals are expected to constantly work on the body in order to prove themselves as responsible, productive and effective (e.g. Dworkin & Wachs, 2009; Gill, 2007; Gill, 2008; Heywood, 2007). Guthman (2009a, p. 193) has proposed that neoliberalism creates individuals who, through contradictory impulses of free choice and responsibility, become "hyper-vigilant of control and self-discipline". Brown (2003, p. 7) for their part has noted that in the neoliberal era people are "controlled through their freedom".

Although fatness has been regarded as an undesirable and stigmatised characteristic and the fat body has been perceived as the unruly and excessive body for a long time (Braziel & LeBesco, 2000; Farrell, 2011; Huff, 2000; LeBesco, 2004), in neoliberal culture, fatness and fat bodies have become especially feared and reviled. The moral panic or the "fat panic" of the past two decades (e.g. Boero, 2012; Gard & Wright, 2005; LeBesco, 2010; Saguay, 2013) seems to suggest that the fat body has become emblematic of failure in the embodied performance of control and responsibility in today's society. Furthermore, in a society/culture that is organized by neoliberal ethos, the fat body is interpreted as a sign of (ir)responsibility in a broader context than an individual's personal life, it becomes a sign of whether or not one is a proper, deserving, and productive (neoliberal) citizen. It is almost as if the fat body is constructed as a kind of "anti-neoliberal" body.

[2] Discrimination based on fatness is prevalent in such central fields of life as health care, labour market, and education (E.g. Härkönen & Räsänen, 2007; Owen, 2012; Puhl & Brownell, 2001; Sarlio-Lähteenkorva, 2004).

Fatness and fat bodies have become a target of intensifying biopolitical control and neoliberal governing in the 2000s. This is illustrated in the way the need to "manage" or "govern" fatness is more and more justified by economic reasons. Fat people as a group are singled out as expensive. This costliness is constructed, for example through the stereotype of fat people as ill, over-consuming, unproductive, and morally wanting. Fat people are seen as unproductive, ineffective and as a (public) expense. In public discourse the fat body is regularly used as a representation as well as a metaphor to represent and as a culprit of a 'bloated' public economy, which is in need of cuts. Interventions that aim at changing the fat body are treated as analogous to interventions that are needed to fix the ailing public economy[3]. Even the terms used to discuss fatness come from the economic sphere such as a "risk", "surplus", "excess", "waste", and "burden".

While aiming to produce a certain type of controlled embodied subject, neoliberal rationale has added a new discursive layer to the theorisation of the body and fatness that focuses on productivity, individual responsibility, and morals. This not only has an effect on the way we think about bodies and how the body is experienced, but also on how certain bodies are selected to represent this culture while others are excluded or vilified (e.g., Wingard, 2013).

The Obesity Epidemic, Healthism and Governmentality

As is well known, the so called obesity epidemic discourse has dominated reporting, research, and debate on fatness since the early 2000s. The obesity epidemic discourse relies on the biomedical understanding of fatness as a curable disease-like condition that spreads uncontrollably and in epidemic proportions (e.g., Campos et al, 2006; Gard & Wright, 2005; Oliver, 2006). Besides constructing "obesity" as a pandemic, the obesity epidemic discourse has also promoted fatness as a social problem (LeBesco, 2011), a moral threat (Gard & Wright, 2005; Jutel, 2005), and an economic issue. Links between the obesity epidemic

[3] In turn, the language of dieting has been adopted in economic rhetoric. For example, then Finance Minister of Finland, Jyrki Katainen noted in a speech in 2010 that "the public economy needs to go on a diet" (YLE,2010). Finnish EU Commissioner Olli Rehn for his part stated that the "overgrown public sector needs to be slimmed down to a size that the economy can maintain" (Hölttä, 2013), while citizens are encouraged to "tighten [their] belt[s]" (Elonin, 2014), and negotiations concerning cuts to be made in the social and health sector are referred to in terms of training and exercise (YLE 20.5.2015).

discourse and neoliberal economic policy have been observed in a number of studies (e.g., Ayo, 2012; Guthman & DuPuis, 2006; Harrison, 2012; LeBesco, 2011).

Governmentality, a term introduced first by Michel Foucault, refers to a regulatory form of power by which people are governed. Governmentality can take a number of forms and it can allude to a wide range of practices from political government, and biopolitical control to self-regulating practices (Foucault, 1991). According to Foucault, the purpose of governmentality is to increase the welfare of the population by "the improvement of its condition, the increase of its wealth, longevity, health" (Foucault as cited in Faubion, 1994, p. 217). Fatness is a target of intensive biopolitical governing, and in recent decades especially, repeated attempts to control and normalize the fat body have been made by public health officials and medical professionals in Finland, the UK, the USA, and Australia to name a few (Boero, 2012; Harjunen, 2017; Wright & Harwood 2008).

While governmentality refers to the manner in which the welfare of the population is governed by the state, neoliberal governmentality refers to a style of governing that orientates itself to the market (e.g., Foucault, 1991; Lemke, 2001). This means for example that the tasks previously considered the responsibility of the state have been privatized or outsourced to the market. Neoliberal governmentality relies on the market to set the tone and to provide services, while at the same time emphasising the individual's own responsibility and control; i.e., the individual must be self-governing in this market environment (e.g., Guthman, 2009a). When governing becomes enmeshed with neoliberal capitalism, the individual's role becomes increasingly perceived as one of consumer and entrepreneur.

Thus, in the age of neoliberalism, biopolitical control too is neoliberal (Lemke, 2001). An illustrating example of this is that health is increasingly understood and discussed in terms of the economy whether we are talking about its structural, institutional, cultural, or individual aspects. Health has become economized and commercialized. Ideological kinship of healthism, tendency to understand health as one's primary task and individual's responsibility, and neoliberalism in particular have been observed (e.g., Ayo, 2012; Crawford, 2006; Cheek, 2008). The obesity epidemic discourse can be interpreted as a mode of neoliberal governmentality, which draws from healthism, "the ideology of individual responsibility" (Crawford, 2006, p. 409), and economization and commercialization of health and health care, all of which have been linked to neoliberal thought and policy.

In the context of healthism, health is understood as one's own responsibility and controllable. One is required to constantly "do" health. The latter demand would seem to fit particularly well with a neoliberal rationale in which the body is a target of intense self-discipline and self-governance and its value is measured by how effective and productive it appears. Via healthist thought and demands it puts on the body, behaviour, and morals of the individual, neoliberal ideas can be transferred to the everyday personal management of the body. It could be said that the obesity epidemic discourse has been used to introduce neoliberal governmentality into thinking, living and experiencing the body (Guthman & DuPuis, 2006). This means all bodies, not just the fat body. By demonizing fatness, the obesity epidemic discourse has promoted fear and disgust of fatness and has thus promoted its stigmatization further (e.g. Rail et al, 2010). At the same time people have become increasingly responsibilized over their health, despite many of the constituents of health such as social and economic factors are often beyond individual's control (e.g. Sutton, 2010).

Fat, Health, Morals, and Neoliberal Economy

It could be argued that fatness and the fat body may be in the focus of such intense attention globally, because the effects of neoliberal culture become particularly visible and exploitable in the fat body (C.f., Guthman & DuPuis, 2007; Mäkelä & Niva, 2009) and in particular in its biomedical incarnation of "obesity", the diseased fat body. Markula (2008) claims that the roots of the obesity epidemic were economic. Guthman and DuPuis (2006) have put forth that neoliberalism is partly responsible for rising body weight of populations (widening income differences, cheap food low in nutrition, but high in calories etc.) and at the same time it produces it as a problem that needs to be dealt with. This would suggest that obesity as a problem is internal to the logic of neoliberalism. The neoliberal economic logic would encourage people consume more, but at the same time it rewards those who are able to avoid what is interpreted as its physical signs. Paradoxically, the disciplining process would require further consumption (of health foods, exercise club memberships, diet plans etc.) Harrison (2012, p. 331) has observed aptly that that the diet industry turns "bodies into economic units from which profits can be reaped, despite its persistent failure to change bodies in the ways promised".

In the neoliberal economy, health care, social care, education, welfare are all commodities that can be marketed, bought, or sold (Guthman & DuPuis, 2006). Consumption and one's role as a consumer are increasingly underlined even in the relationship between the citizen and the state. One becomes part of society first and foremost by being a good consumer and adopting an entrepreneurial approach to work, relationships and the body, and one's value to society increasingly depends on an individual's ability to produce and consume. If individuals are not capable of being productive enough (in market terms), or performing consistently as a consumer, their limited value and role in society is somehow justified.

In a society that is organised according to neoliberal principles, individuals need to adopt the logic of the market when they think about their health. Health is a value in itself, but it is also valuable in other ways. Health increases (both symbolic and material) value of the body, which in itself is a product that can be created, sold, and optimised (c.f. Ventura, 2012). In neoliberal culture, health is therefore more than just about being healthy, it is considered to be an integral part of a highly performing individual. A healthy body is a condition for optimal productivity and cost-effectiveness. Certain bodies (whether they are deemed unhealthy, fat, aged, depressed, disabled or something else) prevent a person from achieving the optimal results that neoliberal citizenship requires, for example staying in the workforce for as long as possible, working as effectively (and as much) as possible, staying healthy through vigorous exercise and eating nutritiously, and needing as little social or publicly funded assistance as possible.

In effect, the value of an individual is based on an analysis of cost in which the logic of reverse thinking applies. The body is expected to be productive, cost-effective, and dynamic. The less the individual needs public services the more cost-effective and productive/profitable the individual appears from the state's point of view. However, the goal of neoliberal governmentality is not an individual who does not need or use any health care services. The goal is to create individuals who take responsibility over their health to such a point that they no longer feel the state has a duty to care for them. In this way, the entrepreneurial subject of neoliberal governmentality feels a moral obligation to manage one's own health.

Brown (2003) has observed that neoliberalism removes the barrier between morals and economics and creates a world wherein moral decisions are made through a cost-benefit

analysis of what will affect the self. This relationship between economics and morals is embodied in the discussion concerning fatness, health and the economy. Bodies are evaluated as 'good' or 'bad' based on their apparent value (productivity) and/or their cost to society, which is based on their assumed health. Those bodies that are perceived as unhealthy are viewed as unproductive, expensive, and a burden to society, for their assumed costs to public health care. When people are categorised as expensive based on their personal characteristics, we are in effect evaluating people's social acceptability citizenship status according to their cost to society.

Health has turned into a merit and a sign of moral and fiscal solvency. Responsibility is evaluated, not only as certain type of behaviour in moral terms, but also by one's estimated costliness to society that is read off the surface of the body. One's worthiness can be proven by morally virtuous behaviour. Those individuals/groups of people who are believed (or assumed) to take risks "willingly" or are seen as somehow "choosing" to make themselves ill by their irresponsible behavior, do not get much sympathy.

Costs and Investment

The need to battle the obesity epidemic is justified with the alleged financial cost that fat people cause in the form of public health expenses. Fatness features in neoliberal economics, not only via public sector health care expenses, however, but also via the consumption of a wide variety of commercial products and services. The catch in neoliberal health care is that whereas public spending on the care of individuals is calculated in terms of cost, their own spending on care and health is seen as an investment. The amount of money fat people spend in order to lose weight are one example of this kind of investment that individuals are supposed to make out of their own pocket. Harrison (2012, p. 321) notes that this construct of fat bodies as costly allows for corporations and governments to "exploit some for the enrichment of others while reaping economic benefit from activities that harm human health to do so in relative impunity".

Costliness and cost-effectiveness readily become moral terms when talked about in the neoliberal context of using public funds. Costing money to the state and "making other people pay for your allegedly bad choices" through taxation becomes a moral question. Consumption is the key here and the fact that health has become about consumption. When

people buy health foods, diet supplements, diet meals, fitness, and health services from the private market, they are good consumers who *invest* in their own health. This is one of the paradoxes of the neoliberal logics when applied to bodies and health; there is a pressure that one appears to be in control and responsible, yet at the same time one should continue to consume as much as possible (Guthman & DuPuis, 2006).

The very same fat bodies that are labelled as immoral and costly in the public sector somehow become very profitable and perhaps even moral (for generating revenue in the market) when they relocate to the private sector as consumers. In a sense, the ideal neoliberal body and health subject is thus not so much the person that abstains from using health services, but one that 'consumes' (and therefore pays for) as many health services as possible and for as long as possible.

Enforcing the idea of fatness as always unhealthy and as a "curable" disease, normalising the thin body, stigmatising fatness and connecting it to individual moral failing, guarantees that the market stays profitable. Engaging in the possibly never-ending project of weight loss makes fat people the best consumers.

Sustaining the problem status of fatness is beneficial to a number of actors. The obesity epidemic discourse has promoted fatness as a business opportunity for the dietary, pharmaceutical, fitness, biotechnology, food, news, and entertainment industries among others. The diet industry is an emblematic of some of the contradictions inherent in the present day economised and commercialised neoliberal health and body culture. By insisting that it is possible to both stay healthy, shorthand for thin, and thus fulfil the moral imperative of control and continue to consume, if not food, its services and products.

In the end, it seems that, paradoxically, fatness is in demand in the neoliberal marketplace. Not only does it provide an easy target and scapegoat for the ailing public health care sector, but it creates economic opportunities in the private sector. Guthman & DuPuis's (2006) claim that the neoliberal economy both creates fatness while at the same time condemns it seems to ring true here.

Intersecting gender, class and fatness in neoliberal culture

The effects of the economy on the body are varied and multilayered. The body is an effect of economic, social, and political power conditions that constitute it. It is at the same time a consequence of the material conditions and resources available to it, as well as a symbol of them. Bodies are not only shaped by their local circumstances; in the global neoliberal economy bodies are also locally affected by global flows in the economy, as demonstrated for instance by Brown (2003) and Sutton (2010).

The economy affects different bodies in a variety of ways. Fatness is commonly associated to other hierarchical intersections of power, such as gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. The neoliberal discourse's emphasis on individual responsibility for the appearance of health means that socioeconomic effects are ignored, as do those of class and gender[4].

It has been well documented that the stigma of fatness and normative body ideals are gendered (e.g., Harjunen, 2009; LeBesco, 2004). Furthermore, social class is gendered and embodied (LeBesco, 2007). The combined stigmas of fatness, being female, and being poor have been observed, for example, by LeBesco (2007).

Thinness is seen as a marker and prerequisite for high-class status (Guthman & DuPuis 2006). Skeggs (2005) has noted that the fat female body has begun to signify the deviant, the ignorant, and the body of an underclass that represents the 'moral opposite' of the middle class body and the 'normal' middle-class values attached to it. Herndon (2005) has observed how fatness often works as an exacerbating additional stigma for people who are already being marginalised for some other reason. Thus, attempts to control fatness often target people who are already being controlled anyway. Power relations embedded in these social statuses are all part of the issue of fatness; not only how fat is presented, constructed, and experienced, but ultimately also how fat people are treated.

[4] Dworkin & Wachs (2009) observed in their analysis of women's health and fitness magazines that health and fitness are often used to express normative feminine beauty and body ideals, rather than physical fitness, endurance, and strength per se. This normative understanding of femininity, for its part, draws from middle class aesthetics and values (Skeggs, 2005), as the white middle class female body is considered to represent the 'normal' body that other bodies are compared to and what they should strive to be like.

Because of the intersectional effect of gender and fatness, fat women, for example, are frequently discriminated against in the labour market. Body size is in itself an economic question for women, and a body size that is deemed "wrong" poses an economic risk for women in particular. A fat body may thus automatically assign a woman to a lower class status in spite of her qualifications (e.g., Kauppinen & Antila, 2005). At the same time, fatness and socioeconomic status are also intertwined in a vicious circle so that fatness produces lower socioeconomic status and likewise lower socioeconomic status produces fatness (e.g., Stunkard & Sobal, 1993). In this respect, fat women are often paid lower salaries, their career paths are rockier, and they are more frequently unemployed than their thin counterparts (Härkönen & Räsänen, 2007; Kauppinen & Anttila, 2005). In fact, a Finnish study found that especially highly educated fat women were discriminated against in working life, and that there was actually a significant wage gap between fat women and their normative sized counterparts (Sarlio-Lähteenkorva et al, 2004).

Gendered Body Norms: Fitness, Fatness and Neoliberal Surveillance and Control

The obesity epidemic discourse, healthism and neoliberalism are also gendering and gendered discourses of power. Women, and women's bodies in particular, are targeted and governed through the healthist, fat phobic, and commercialised health discourse (e.g., Dworkin & Wachs, 2009; Heywood, 2011; Markula, 2008). In case of women, health is often equated with physical attractiveness and a normative looking body, especially in the context of commercialised and neoliberally charged discourses on health.

The neoliberal rationale behind the construction of femininity and female bodies in popular culture has been observed in women's magazines, television shows and wider popular culture by researchers (e.g., Gill, 2007, 2008; Kauppinen & Anttila, 2012). Dworkin and Wachs (2009) have examined the fitness media and Heywood (2007) the image of the female athlete as an endorsement to neoliberalism.

Gill (2007) claims that neoliberalism is gendered and women are constructed as its ideal subjects. Shel has examined what is known as postfeminism as a sensibility and claims that it is aligned with neoliberal values of individual responsibility, self-regulation and free choice. Dworkin and Wachs (2009) and Heywood (2007), in their respective works, have observed how the neoliberal rationale has an effect on the way gendered bodies are represented in the

media, how they are interpreted, and the demands they set on the female embodied subject. In the neoliberal era monitoring and surveillance of the female body has intensified. Gill (2007) agrees and lists three ways by which this takes place. Firstly, there has been an increase in self-surveillance by women, accompanied by a denial of such regulation. Secondly, surveillance is extended over new spheres of life and even regards intimate conduct. Thirdly, there is a focus on the psychological, with a need to transform oneself and "remodel one's interior life" (p. 155).

Heywood for their part notes that the marketing of women's sports' programmes seems to unite feminism and neoliberalism by "presenting sport as a space where girls learn to become the ideal subjects of a new global economy that relies on individuals with flexibility who are trained to blame their inevitable failures on themselves rather than the system their lives are structured within" (Heywood, 2007, p. 113). The fitness of the body becomes a code for equality that depends on the individual's effort. Dworkin and Wachs note that the body's appearance and thinness is an important goal especially in women's fitness (2009). They say that in women's fitness magazines, the emphasis is more on achieving the thin body than toning it. Their conclusion is that the notion of a fit and healthy subject in women's fitness magazines depends more on how the body looks than on actually being healthy.

The ideal female body is expected to be healthy and fit, but most importantly because these two criteria will also ensure thinness. Controlling body weight is, in itself, a way to discipline the female body, but demanding that the body looks fit in a certain way at all times adds yet another level of control, and connects body control to neoliberal politics even more tightly, as fitness adds a moral element to a body that might already be thin anyway. In this respect, it would seem that neoliberal rationale has been either incorporated into feminist thinking concerning the female body and/or feminist thought is being appropriated by neoliberal culture.

Conclusion

It seems evident that the neoliberal body is being constructed in a number of connected spheres at the same time. Regarding the fat body, neoliberal governmentality seems to fuse the interests of several actors in, for example, public policy, the market, the patriarchy, and

the individual. The medicalisation and stigmatisation of fat bodies via the obesity epidemic discourse certainly benefits the market, but it also acts as a vehicle for neoliberal biopolitical governance, as the commercialisation of health services increases the need for the population to self-manage these aspects of their life.

Indeed, the notion of fatness and the fat body as something diseased, costly, immoral, ugly, and above all, a symbol of individual failure, would probably not have such an impact were it not produced and maintained, at the same time, in so many spheres - discursive and otherwise. This is the power of neoliberal governmentality. The fat body, or perhaps in this case the pathologised obese body, seems to be a particularly susceptible target for the different modes of neoliberal governmentality that I have presented in this book.

In a culture where neoliberal governmentality reigns, there is no need to coerce or discipline people, because people discipline themselves. While people make it their duty to become a self-governing subject, the act of doing so is often misinterpreted as a sign of superior morals and deservingness. In this way, this class of people not only differentiates itself from the 'others', but also helps to dismiss them as being somehow in the 'wrong' too. As individual body management and economic success within society become conflated, success in body management becomes the sign of a well-adjusted neoliberal citizen who has taken responsibility over their health and therefore society. Fatness then is interpreted not just a sign of an individual's immorality, but also of not being a proper neoliberal subject.

References

Ayo, N. (2012). Understanding health promotion in a neoliberal climate and the making of health conscious citizens. *Critical Public Health*, *22*(1), 99-105.

Boero, N. (2012). *Killer fat: Media, medicine and morals in the American obesity epidemic.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Braziel Evans, J. & LeBesco K. (2001). *Bodies out of bounds: Fatness and transgression*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brown, W. (2003). Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy, *Theory & Event, 7*(1) [online] https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.1brown.html

Campos, P., Saguy, A., Ernsberger, P., Oliver, E., & Gaesser, G. (2006). The epidemiology of overweight and obesity: public health crisis or moral panic? *International Journal of Epidemiology 35*, 55–60.

Cheek, J. (2008). Healthism: A new conservatism? *Qualitative Health Research*, *18*(7), 974–982.

Crawford, R. (1980). Healthism and the medicalization of everyday life. *International Journal of Health Services*, *10*(3), 365–388.

Crawford, R. (2006). Health as a meaningful social practice. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine*. *10*(4), 401–420.

Dworkin, S., & Wachs F. (2009). *Body panic: Gender, health, and the selling of fitness*. NYC: New York University Press.

Elonin, P. (2014, 4 April). Hallitus kirii maaliin myöhässä – vyön kiristys jatkuu vuosia. Valtiontalous on kohtuullisessa kunnossa vasta vuonna 2018. *Helsingin Sanomat* [Online]. https://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/art-2000002721672.html

Farrell, A.E. (2011). *Fat shame: Stigma and the fat body in American culture*. New York: NYU Press.

Faubion, J. D. ed., (1994). 4 Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1991) [1978]. Governmentality (Lecture at the Collège de France, Feb. 1, 1978). In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, P. & Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Not in textGard, M., & Wright, J. (2005). *The obesity epidemic: Science, morality and ideology*. New York: Routledge.

Gill, R. (2007). Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *10*(147), 147-166.

Gill, R. (2008). Culture and subjectivity in neoliberal and postfeminist times. *Subjectivity*, *25,* 432-445.

Guthman, J, (2009a) Neoliberalism and the constitution of contemporary bodies. In E. Rothblum, & S. Solovay (Eds.). *The Fat Studies Reader* (pp. 187-196). NYC, New York University Press.

Guthman, J. (2009b). Teaching the politics of obesity: Insights into neoliberal embodiment and contemporary biopolitics. *Antipode 41*(5), 1110-1133.

Guthman, J., & DuPuis, M. (2006). Embodying neoliberalism: Economy, culture, and the politics of fat. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space*, 24, 427–448.

Harjunen, H. (2009). *Women and fat: Approaches to the social study of fatness*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research no: 379, 2009. The University of Jyväskylä.

Harjunen, H. (2017) *Neoliberal bodies and the gendered fat body*. London: Routledge.

Harrison, E. (2012). The body economic: the case of 'childhood obesity'. *Feminism & Psychology, 22*(3), 324-343.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: The Oxford University Press.

Herndon, A., 2005. Collateral damage from friendly fire? race, nation, class, and the "war against obesity". *Social Semiotics*, 15 (82), pp. 127-141.

Heywood, L. (2007). Producing girls: Empire, sport, and the neoliberal body. In, J. Hargreaves, & P. Vertinsky (Eds.), *Physical culture, power, and the body* (pp. 101-120). New York: Routledge.

Huff, J., (2001). A horror of corpulence: interrogating bantingism and mid-nineteenth-century fat-phobia. In Braziel Evans, J. and K. LeBesco K. eds., Bodies out of bounds. Fatness and transgression. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 39–59

Härkönen, J. & Räsänen, P. (2008). Liikalihavuus, työttömyys ja ansiotaso. *Työelämäntutkimus – Arbetslivsforskning 6*(1), 3-16.

Hölttä, K. (2013, 19 July). Puheenaihe: Komissaari Rehn uskoo yhä talouskuriin. Aamulehti [Online]. http://m.aamulehti.fi/juttuarkisto/?cid=1194827113902

Jutel, A-M. (2005). Weighing health: The moral burden of obesity. *Social Semiotics*, *15*(2), 113–125.

Kauppinen, K., & Anttila, E. (2005). "Onko painolla väliä: hoikat, lihavat ja normaalipainoiset naiset työelämän murroksessa?" *Työ ja perhe aikakauskirja 2, Työ,*

perhe ja elämän moninaisuus II. Työterveyslaitoksen julkaisuja.

LeBesco, K. (2004). *Revolting bodies: The struggle to redefine fat identity.* Amherst &Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

LeBesco, K. (2007). Fatness as the embodiment of working class rhetoric. In W. DeGenero (Ed.) *Who says? Working-class rhetoric, class consciousness, and community* (pp. 238-255). University of Pittsburgh Press.

LeBesco, K. (2010). Fat panic and the new morality. In J. Metzl & A. Kirkland (Eds.) *Against health: How health became the new morality* (pp. 72-82). New York: New York University Press.

LeBesco, K. (2011). Neoliberalism, public health and the moral perils of fatness. *Critical Public Health, 21*(2), 153-164.

Lemke, T. (2001). The birth of bio-politics – Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society, 30*(2). 1-17.

Markula, P. (2008). Governing obese bodies in a control society. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue*, 11, 53–66.

Mäkelä, J. & Niva, M. (2009). Muuttuva syöminen – yksilön vastuu ja yhteiskunta. *Kuluttajatutkimuskeskuksen vuosikirja.* Helsinki: Kuluttajatutkimuskeskus. 45-60.

Oliver, E.J., (2006). *Fat politics: the real story behind America's obesity epidemic*. New York; Oxford University Press.

Owen, L. (2012). Living fat in a thin-centric world: Effects of spatial discrimination on fat bodies and selves. *Feminism & Psychology*. *22*(3), 290-306.

Puhl, R. & Brownell, K. (2001). Bias, discrimination, and obesity. *Obesity Research,* 9, 778-805.

Rail, G., Holmes, D. & Murray, S. (2010). The politics of evidence on "domestic terrorists": Obesity discourse and their effects. *Social Theory & Health 8*(3), 259–279.

Rothblum, E. & Solovay, S. (2009). *The Fat Studies reader*. NYC, New York University Press.

Saguy, A. (2013). *What's wrong with fat?* NYC: Oxford University Press.

Sarlio-Lähteenkorva, S., Silventoinen, K. and Lahelma, E., (2004). Relative weight and income at different levels of socioeconomic status. American Journal of Public Health, 94(3), pp. 468–472.

Skeggs, B. (2005). The making of class and gender through visualizing moral subject formation. *Sociology, 39*(5), 965-982.

Stunkard, A.J. and Sorensen, T.I.A., (1993). Obesity and socioeconomic status. A complex relation. New England Journal of Medicine, 32914, pp. 1036-1037.

Sutton, B. (2010). *Bodies in crisis: Culture, violence and women's resistance in neoliberal Argentina*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Ventura, P. (2012). *Neoliberal culture: Living with American neoliberalism*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Wingrad, J. (2013). *Branded bodies, rhetoric, and the neoliberal nation-state.* Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Wrede S., Henriksson, L., Host, H., Johansson, S. & Dybbroe, B. (2008). *Care work in crisis: Reclaiming the Nordic ethos of care*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Wright, J.&. & Harwood, V. (Eds.). (2008). *Biopolitics and the 'obesity epidemic': Governing bodies*. London: Routledge.

YLE. (2010, 9 February). Katainen tekisi keskustan uudesta johtajasta myös pääministerin *YLE* [online]. http://yle.fi/uutiset/katainen_tekisi_keskustan_uudesta_johtajasta_myos_paaministerin/5506350

YLE, (2015, 20 May) Sote-mallista ei vielä päätöstä – "Jumppa jatkuu". YLE [online] http://yle.fi/uutiset/sote-mallista_ei_viela_paatosta__jumppa_jatkuu/8005798