Sites of Sovereignty:

Exploring Convergence and Competition in the Global Construction of Food Sovereignty

A Research Paper presented by:

Antonio Roman-Alcalá

(USA)

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:

Agrarian and Environmental Studies

(AES)

Members of the Examining Committee:

Dr. Saturnino M. 'Jun' Borras, Jr.
Dr. Murat Arsel

The Hague, The Netherlands
December 2014

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Contents

Acknowledgements

List of Acronyms

CFS	United Nations Committee on World Food Security
CSM	Civil Society Mechanism (of the CFS)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FS	Food Sovereignty
FSMs	Food Sovereignty Movements
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISS	Institute of Social Studies
LVC	La Vía Campesina
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
TGs	FAO's Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security
TNC	Transnational Corporation
UN	United Nations
WTO	World Trade Organization

Abstract

This study develops and presents a conceptual framework to help clarify the dynamics of the 'multiple sovereignties' that exist in the construction of food sovereignty. By deploying the concept of 'sites of sovereignty'—which operate at local, national, and supranational levels, and across state, market, and civil societal sectors—the paper illuminates how competition and convergence between these sites constrains, constructs, and redefines food sovereignty. Although the paper leans heavily on social movement literature, and features food sovereignty movements themselves as key players in this process, it also emphasizes the important roles of state and market actors. In particular, the role of the state has become more central as national governments begin to adopt food sovereignty policies. The paper unpacks the components and conditions of *actually existing* sovereignty, the *aspirational* sovereignty that movements indicate as necessary to achieve food sovereignty, and the *tactical* sovereignties that are pursued in search of these aspirations. In conclusion, the paper argues what this analysis means for movement strategies, state policy, and future research on the trajectory and attainability of food sovereignty.

Relevance to Development Studies

'Food sovereignty' is no longer just a concept or rallying cry for food producers asserting their right to produce on a local basis, ecologically, and under just circumstances. It has become government policy, and as such has an important current and potentially greater future role in determining the development of food production, distribution, and consumption systems in so-called 'developing' countries. In addition, transnational food sovereignty movements have much to say about the capacity of non-elite global civil society to affect policy in both agrarian and industrialized countries. Critical agrarian studies have long been concerned with the effects of social class on agricultural development, and vice versa. Food sovereignty—as a political movement and force that potentially restructures conditions of production and consumption—must be addressed in such studies. Thus, it is hoped this study will provide scholars from many traditions and orientations (including rural sociology, food regime theory, public policy analysis, political economy and political ecology) tools for their work, whether their work intersects with food sovereignty and rural social movements more specifically or food systems more broadly. Finally, it is also hoped that this work might be of use to activists, scholars, and scholar-activists thinking and working through the difficult ambiguities contained within the concept of 'sovereignty'.

Chapter 1 : Introduction

'Food sovereignty' (FS) has been defined as the "right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems" (Nyéléni, 2007). Food sovereignty studies have expanded with the growth in influence of La Via Campesina (LVC), the transnational agrarian movement that brought the FS concept into prominence (Edelman, 2014). FS was LVC's alternative policy paradigm; a response to the increasing dispossession of rural communities in an increasingly global food system dominated by transnational corporations (TNCs). Since its emergence in the 1990s, the FS concept has broadened to include issues of "social justice, gender and ethnic equality, economic equity and environmental sustainability" (Desmarais, 2002: 91). This has paralleled LVC's growing membership and political analysis, developed through international meetings and encounters, and the internal political work of its constituent members. Scholars, critical but also often sympathetic to the FS vision, have analyzed a range of features of food sovereignty movements (FSMs) including their strategies and campaigns, frames and discourses, internal workings, and their intersections with states, international organizations, TNCs, and global markets (Borras et al, 2008; Wittman et al, 2010; Holt-Giménez & Shattuck, 2011).[1]

In recent years, the very idea of 'sovereignty' itself, embedded within the FS concept, has become a key analytical question. Conventionally, sovereignty has referred to nation-state power over its delineated territory, made real through its laws and administrative apparatuses. FS seems to necessitate such power: for example, developing world governments must be able to respond to the 'dumping' of cheap foods from rich industrialized countries into their territories (which has lowered farm incomes and increased food dependency). Nonetheless, relying on nation-state sovereignty is problematic, as states have historically neglected peasant interests and 'globalization' has seemingly relocated power outside the state. Perhaps because FSMs have been framed by a multivalent history of agrarian policies globally—which have at times protected and empowered but at others dispossessed and ignored rural communities—they remain ambivalently oriented towards nation-states and their policies while discursively committed to local communities and their rights. While FSMs have leaned upon states (and, implicitly, their sovereign powers), they at the same

---

[1] It is important to recognize the dual nature of FSMs; they are a unitary 'movement' (with a unified discourse and program) *and* an internally varied composite of many movements, classes, and types of people with potentially conflicting ideas and goals. Though many FS activists may see themselves as part of a united whole, and scholars reflect this framing in their work (giving 'the FSM' one valence), other scholars have reminded of this latter aspect. Any inconsistencies in this paper regarding 'FSM'/'FSMs' should be seen as unavoidably reflecting this dual nature.

time have *de-centered* states by demanding the rights of 'peoples' and 'communities' to control their own food production systems (Patel, 2009).[2]

Patel (2009) and McMichael (2009) were among the first authors to pick up on FSMs' recognition of the incompleteness of a state-centered sovereignty. Based on the multiplicity of jurisdictions for "rights to be exercised", there are equally multiple sovereignties implicit in FS (Patel, 2009: 668). At the very least, sovereignty must be expanded from nation-states to local communities or peoples—those referenced in most LVC proclamations as requiring improved, expanded democratic power over food systems. The existence of 'multiple sovereignties' necessitates that FSMs ask: if global food systems must be changed, who should decide how to change them, and how and where should these decisions be made? Should states or local communities exercise sovereignty, or both? How?

In addition to local and national levels of sovereignty, the historical conjuncture has likewise entailed the strategic engagement of supranational organizations like the United Nations (UN) and its Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and opposition to organizations considered antagonistic to FS, like the World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO). In part, FSMs strategies have followed opportunistic social movement patterns described by scholars as "venue shifting" (Edelman, 2008: 250) or the "boomerang" pattern (Keck & Sikkink, 1998: 12); strategies that seek international spaces to influence domestic policy. In fact, much of LVC's organizing throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s was oriented towards this supranational level, to get WTO and 'free trade' agreements (FTAs) out of agriculture (Rosset, 2006). The UN's human rights instruments and rights-creation processes have also been a focus, with LVC pushing beyond existing deployment of the 'right to food' to demand official recognition of the 'rights of peasants' and the 'right to food sovereignty' (Edelman & James, 2011; Claeys, 2013). LVC has also expressed commitment to transform patriarchal gender relations, incorporate the concerns of indigenous peoples, and unify multiple classes within one common movement (Desmarais, 2004; Rosset, 2013; Desmarais & Nicholson, 2013). These commitments entailed multi-level, multi-sector approaches to change making, through which FSMs have contested the notion that nation-states are the only sites where sovereignty needs to be exerted to achieve FS.[3] All of these organizational spaces and processes have both discursive and material effects on the construction of FS, and thus indicate 'sites of sovereignty' relevant to FS.

---

[2] Critics of FS (e.g. Bernstein, 2014) find 'peoples' too vague to be of use: who are 'peoples'? Here, 'peoples' can be taken to mean non-elites: people who have less influence on politics and economics, as individuals and as classes, due to their positions in existing political and class structures.

[3] By levels I refer to physical and political scales; by sectors I refer typologically to state, market, and civil society. The typical distinction of three 'sectors' in society is a handy one that—despite obvious problems with conceiving of sectors as completely separate—I will use.

Schiavoni (2013) further unpacked sovereignty by arguing that not only are there multiple sovereignties, but also that these sovereignties actually *compete* in the construction of FS. For example, state-level efforts to increase agricultural production for export may run counter to local-level efforts that desire to produce locally suited foods or to maintain biodiversity in seed stock. 'Competing sovereignties' between sovereigns located at local, national, and supranational levels are accompanied by contradictions that exist *at* each level—challenging prescriptions for vesting sovereignty at any one level. For instance, how can local 'communities' and 'peoples' be defined and delineated as erstwhile food sovereign deciders, especially considering the intra-community inequalities that exist? How to deal with the ambiguous nature of nation-states and their tendency to support industrial and export agriculture? How to contend with the universal aspirations of juridical notions of 'rights' when pluralism reigns as reality and ideal for FSMs? And how to intervene in often-undemocratic supranational venues on often-unequal terms with other actors involved, and yet maintain a vision for a democratic FS? Tensions within FS as a political project are thus brought out by investigations into the multiple and competing sovereignties involved in FS. Considering competing sovereignties within and between levels, is there a way that FSMs can maintain ideological and pragmatically political cohesion?

Moreover, other critical scholars have pointed to important gaps in this cohesion, including potential downfalls due to FSMs being "remarkably vague about who or what is 'the sovereign' in food sovereignty … shifting over time between pointing to the nation-state, a region, a locality or 'the people'" (Edelman, 2014: 16). Agarwal (2014) points to how the undefined location of sovereignty within the definition of FS results in pulls in contradictory directions, for example the farmer's right to choose her crops and markets against FS's prioritization of locally produced crops for local food security. Bernstein (2014: 22-23, 25-26) points out that FS lacks a global political strategy or an approach to the challenges of coordinating food circulation and consumption (being until recently mainly a 'producers' movement). Because of these lacks, governance to enact FS—including how it will "maintain democratic legitimacy" (Edelman, 2014: 16) and how it will relate to the existing state—is both under-theorized and underdeveloped.

At a colloquium on FS in January 2014, development scholar Bridget O'Laughlin argued "academics have a critical role to play as scholar-activists … to bring to the [FS] movement discussion of the ambiguities in [its] basic concepts, and of the debatable assumptions that underlie certain positions and arguments". I position myself as such an "engaged" scholar-activist (Edelman, 2009: 245), with intentions "to raise questions that are important to the FSM but not yet sufficiently discussed by the movement" (Burnett & Murphy, 2014: 1066), and to subject assumptions within the FS discourse to critical scrutiny, in order to reduce the ambiguity of 'sovereignty' in FS.

Reducing this ambiguity requires understanding the varying, contested nature of sovereignty amidst the existence of multiple sovereignties.[4] Clarity about the *who*, *what kind*, *where*, and *how* of sovereignty are needed in order to develop and vet venues and processes of governance to implement FS, maintain political cohesion among FSMs, and to address concerns raised by critics who argue that FS is failing to make substantive impacts due to this lack of clarity (e.g. Hospes, 2013). By classifying and analyzing the various levels where sovereignties play out, and examining the relationships between 'sites of sovereignty' both *at* and *between* these levels, I hope to lay a foundation for better definition of the 'sovereignty' in FS, and thus contribute to that clarity.

Central Research Question

- Where and how do multiple sovereignties interact to shape the global construction of food sovereignty?

Sub-Question #1, on the aspirational sovereignty of FSMs:[5]

- What principles define the 'sovereignty' that FSMs aspire to achieve, and how do these relate to the existing political processes that shape food systems?

Sub-Question #2, on the 'where' and 'how' of sovereignty:

- What are the locations and dynamics of sites that shape the possibilities for food sovereignty?

Sub-Question #3, on tactics towards food sovereignty:

- What are the strategic potentials of different sites to progressively realize food sovereignty?

---

[4] To avoid confusion, I use 'sovereignty' to refer to the *in toto* constellation of multiple sovereignties, while 'sovereignties' refer to the various sites of sovereignty themselves.

[5] Admittedly, there is a tension between presenting FSMs as having a unified aspiration for 'sovereignty' and having presenting FSMs as diverse and sometimes contradictory. To remain consistent with the previous note, I will refer to FSMs' 'aspirational sovereignty' in the singular, even if these aspirations might vary within FSMs and over time.

Chapter 2 : Methodology and Theoretical Framework

Data sources, collection, and methodology

The macro-level nature of the research question required 'wide' data (rather than a narrower field-based study), including cases from micro, meso, and macro levels, and conceptual insights oriented to these various levels. A variety of sources provided the needed illustrative examples, concepts, and theories with which to understand processes of food systems construction. The data set was chosen specifically to expose the *'what is'* of existing power and sovereignty dynamics, as understood by scholars, and reveal the *'what ought to be'* of FSMs' aspirational sovereignty. The primary sources included website content of FS organizations (including blogs), LVC declarations and publications, and government documents. Secondary sources included scholarly literatures and UN agency reports.

While most of my examples come from LVC as the emblematic actor of FSMs, I consider FS in its "diverse manifestations" (McMichael, 2014: 1). Based on my previous food movement experience in urban farming and policy advocacy in the United States, I know that many efforts worldwide work for food systems changes along the lines of the six principles elaborated at the 2007 Nyéléni FS forum[6], but do not necessarily take on the 'FS' mantle or participate officially in LVC. Thus, the paper relies on LVC as an authoritative voice for FS, but with the caveats (see footnote 1) that FSMs transcend LVC itself, and not all FSMs fully ascribe to LVC's rhetoric and aspirations.

I employed a qualitative methodology, based in an iterative process of data collection and analysis. This methodology relied on critical analyses of the primary sources, illustrative cases, and secondary literatures, which informed an inductive, 'grounded' theory-building process described below (Flyvbjerg, 2004; Corbin, 2005). Since "evaluation of the implications of power for flourishing and suffering are necessary for adequate description and explanation in social science" (Sayer, 2012: 179), the theories built are descriptive but do not shy away from normativity.

Analytical process

First, in order to establish a working definition of FSMs' *aspirational* sovereignty (SQ#1), I surveyed literatures on political ecology, feminist economic geography, global environmental politics, international relations and international po-

---

[6] That is, they: (1) focus on food for people (rather than as commodities), (2) value food producers, (3) localize food systems, (4) put control locally, (5) build knowledge and skills, and (6) work with nature (Nyéléni, 2007).

litical economy (e.g. Purcell & Brown, 2005; Massey, 2005; Barry & Eckersley, 2005; Sassen, 2006; Wills, 2014), in order to identify the components of sovereignty in a generic sense. I then added scholarly FS analyses and FSM discourses to reach the *sovereignty required for FS*. (These components are elaborated later in this chapter). This "concept identification" process (Corbin, 2005: 50) was concurrent with identification of the locations of sites that shape FS (SQ#2). This resulted in a complementary conceptual framework for approaching the different scales at which sovereignty operates. Based in the concept of 'levels' where sovereignty plays out, 'sites of sovereignty' were found to operate *at* and *between* local, national, and supranational 'levels'. 'Levels' and 'sites' helped to categorize and relate the diverse and divergent components of existing power relations in global food systems, what I refer to collectively as *actually existing* sovereignty. To understand *tactical* sovereignties (the potential of certain sites/levels to help progressively realize FS: SQ#3), it was necessary to go back over the aforementioned secondary literatures (and seek additional, similar sources)—this time with the conceptual frameworks developed. By looking at these sources through a more focused analytical lens on (a) the components of sovereignty, (b) the operation of sites and levels, and (c) the relation between actually existing to aspirational sovereignty, it was possible to answer SQ#3.

In this chapter, I elaborate the framework and concepts developed and the paper's limitations. Following this, I examine how sites compete and converge, level by level, with one chapter covering each level.

Sovereignty, as refined and redefined for food sovereignty

As mentioned in the introduction, sovereignty typically has referred to a quality of nation-states. Classical sovereignty has internal and external components, specifying some authority over a specific territory. Heywood (2004: 90) separates that authority into two constituent components: "legal sovereignty" as normative rules and law, and "political sovereignty" as the force to implement. More generally sovereignty requires a sovereign unit that holds internal and external *legitimacy*, makes *rules* that codify the sovereign will, and has the *capacity* to enact those rules—all within a specified *territory*. Of course, no sovereignty is complete or incontestable: legitimacy, rules, capacity, and territorial reach are always tentative. Foucauldian approaches emphasize how rules and discourses influence power in different and interacting ways, and focus attention on the actual workings of power in addition to the formalized basis upon which it rests (Foucault, 2003). A sovereign's ability to enforce rules within its territory relies in part on the obedience of its subjects and external recognition (factors shaped by economic and military might). The question of who recognized and legitimized sovereignty was until the 18th century limited to other sovereign powers, mainly monarchs. Following the European Enlightenment's promotion of democracy the ideal of sovereignty came to be fortified with the complement of democratic legitimacy or 'popular sovereignty' (Lupel, 2009), reminding us of sovereignty's contested and evolving nature.

Historically, state sovereignty has relied on power 'over' and 'against': 'over' the individuals within its territory, and 'against' the sovereignty of other sovereigns. Hence *power over* and *power against* were primary tools for maintaining territorial sovereignty.[7] Some Foucauldian theorists have similarly proposed to view "sovereignty as a tentative and always emergent form of authority grounded in violence" (Hansen & Stepputat, 2005: 295). While it is useful to envision power as process not possession, and sovereignty as premised on *power over/against* (that is, the possibility of violence to constrain or end life), this view risks overlooking the importance as well of *power to* "make live" (Li, 2009: 67). *Power to* can be thought of in terms of the ability to mobilize economic resources to sustain life: control of forests, soils, seeds, and water is crucial to the capacity (and in some cases legitimacy) of sovereign units. This points to the importance of territorial and biological resources—required for food production—for FS's sovereignty.

Yet it is also imperative to look beyond the territorial state when looking at governance of socio-ecological systems. Food systems are constructed through a complex of processes that cut across territories and sectors. Forces like capital and ideas may emanate from particular places but are less territorially bound due to the rise of network forms of economic, communicative, and political organization (Castells, 2007; Sassen, 2003). Governments have a role in constructing food systems, but so do businesses, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), individual farmers, and the cultures they shape and are shaped by. Importantly, TNCs can exert rules and/or capacity over multiple state territories, complicating the overlap between sovereignty and territories. TNCs shape food systems through economic decisions, but also through state-based trade agreements that allow them to press lawsuits against legislation that limits those decisions—yet TNCs generally make no claims to 'sovereignty'. While the nation-state's *de facto* sovereign status has been challenged by this rise of influence of capitalist entities, its *de jure* status has been challenged by supranational rulemaking, often due to pressures from global environmental issues that transcend nation-state boundaries (Litfin, 1998). To understand power in modern food systems requires paying attention to classical nation-state sovereignty as an idea and practice that has for hundreds of years been central to systems of power. But since food systems are products of more than just nation-states—and their construction, determination, and effects are less state-constrained and more trans-territorial than ever—this analysis must look beyond and 'above' state sovereignty. Hence, 'sovereignty' holds a larger meaning, describing the dynamics of decision-making and rule implementation within and among all human organizations that shape the food systems.

Theorists of 'globalization' remind us that sovereignty's deterritorialization is not the product of 'natural forces' but of specific efforts made by elite actors in local, national, and supranational contexts (Sassen, 2003; Harvey, 2003). Be-

---

[7] There is a parallel between this discussion of power types and Gaventa's 'power cube' framework (2006). While many of that framework's concepts are implicated here, I did not concretely use it in my analytical process.

cause of these efforts, FS seems to require a *power over* component, to monitor, regulate, and control capital and goods flows within certain territories. Edelman (2014: 12) argues that this *power over* component (what he calls "relatively draconian state control") is the least thought through in FS, but is clearly needed to "manage questions of firm and farm size, product and technology mixes, and long-distance and international trade". Perhaps FSMs' reticence is due to histories of states' *power over* more often constituting a threat to FSMs, and only rarely—as with forcible land expropriations for redistribution, whereby land reforms were enforced through state violence or the threat of it—operating in the service of FS goals. Though FS implies more control of non-elites over state forces of *power over*, rather than unaccountable state or economic elites, the *power over* necessary for FS is likely to be a source of incredible tensions between sites.

Iles and Montenegro (2013) tackle a different, but equally important, quality to the sovereignty needed for FS. In developing a 'relational' reading of sovereignty, these authors bring attention to the importance in FS construction of *power with*. Arguing that "sovereign units are always defined in relation to something else and are always a process rather than a 'state'" (ibid: 17), the authors outline the ways "sovereignty can be read in a far more *interdependent* and shared sense" (ibid: 18), between levels, sectors, territories, and sites. State-based and non-state-based sites thus can co-construct sovereignty. In their case study, the authors describe how the 'Potato Park' project of multiple indigenous peasant communities in the Andes mountains builds sovereign capacity (in terms of potato genetic biodiversity and productivity) and sovereign legitimacy (in terms of recognized and respected rights to manage land and genetic resources), by working across borders, sectoral boundaries, and scales, with NGOs, governments, scientists, and through alternative, values-based markets. FSMs' creation of capacity by expanding meaningful control over food productive resources can work with or against state- and market-based efforts in the same territorial space. The insights of studies focused on *power over* are crucial to understanding sovereignty, as it exists. But equal attention is needed to ways that communities and individuals create acting sovereignty from land, livelihoods, shared beliefs and projects—in escapes from, and collaborations with, actors exerting state or market power. Edelman (2014: 13) exhibits skepticism that 'confederalism' between non-state and non-market powers (as advocated by Pimbert, 2009: 6) can form a counter-power necessary to exert *power over*. But the Potato Park case shows that such power can be co-constituted, relationally, among states, market actors, *and* civil society. Even if enacted *power over* is zero-sum, its constitution can be the result of non-zero-sum *power with*.

As mentioned, FSMs contend that democratic legitimacy is central to any sovereignty to enact FS (e.g. LVC, 2011). At the same time, the sustainability and equity components of FS must emerge in the outcomes of decision-making processes. Thus, building on sovereignty's previous theorization as an always partial and contested combination of capacity, legitimacy, and rules, the sovereignty needed for FS must work in also FSMs' aspirational qualities of means (democratic inclusion) and ends (social and ecological justice). The sites to implement FS are expected to be democratically legitimate and achieve both social and ecological ends—whatever the level or location (Desmarais, 2008b;

Wittman et al, 2010; Patel, 2009: 668). In addition, relational sovereignty means that sites (and institutions) can be co-constructed across levels and sectors. Though sovereignty is ever tentative, its presence can be measured by the extent to which a sovereign site's power is legitimate, codified, and capable, in regards to specific territories, and in relation to other sites.

Sites

Expanding sovereignty beyond nation-states requires a broad unit of analysis with which to meaningfully compare actions and processes across state, market, and civil sectors. The term 'institutions', broadly in use as "both formal organizations and informal rules and procedures that structure conduct" (Thelen & Steinmo, 1992: 2) might be considered. With this definition, institutions could include patterned processes (like cultural norms), specific human organizations (like state agencies), and macro structures (like capitalism). Because of this multivalent and potentially confusing use, I reserve 'institutions' to describe macro-level forces like capitalism and abstracted social structures like norms and values that are embodied at sites and in certain practices, and the term 'sites' to describe more specifically human organizations through which sovereignty is brought about and 'institutions' of all sorts are developed and changed.[8] Sites are the more visible elements of human organization that range in reach and boundedness and are co-constitutive with institutions; they can be based in governments, market actors, civil society, and combinations thereof. Sites of interest to this paper include: LVC, its national member coalitions, the WTO, the FAO and its 'Committee on World Food Security' (CFS)[9], the UN, nation-state administrations, villages, community groups, individual households, neighborhood citizen councils. Others (not included in this analysis) could be: specific TNCs, national departments of agriculture, transnational private regulatory organizations, municipal governments, and so on.

Sites are both "actors and arenas of actions" (Borras, 2010: 795). That is, because they are composed of people with varying perspectives and interests, they are 'arenas' wherein individuals and groups may compete and/or converge; as 'actors', the individuals and groups gathered together within a site may (as a unit) compete and/or converge with other sites. Importantly, sites are arenas for these 'competing sovereignties'. Nation-state administrations, for example, are prime targets for LVC's and TNCs' competing visions for food systems; meanwhile, those administrations, LVC, and TNCs themselves are composed of constituent members. Sites are thus sovereign 'units' but also where sovereignties compete.

To distinguish sites analytically, I employ a scale heuristic, identifying sites as operating at local, national, and supranational 'levels'. The research builds from

---

[8] I prefer 'sites' to 'organizations' because sites are to varying degrees formalized, with boundaries that are not always determined by formal forms of membership.

[9] The CFS is intended to be the "foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform dealing with food security and nutrition" (see http://www.csm4cfs.org/about_us-2/what_is_the_cfs-2/).

a hunch that the complex system of sovereignties operating on food systems can better be understood by looking at these levels both separately and relationally. In selecting these three levels, I assume that each is internally, operationally cohesive and that these encompass the main sites where FS might be brought about. Though there are other levels worth considering (the farm, household, neighborhood, village, city, province), these are analytically contained within the 'local' level. More detailed elaborations of each level would be useful but is beyond the scope of this paper.[10]

Levels

Sites of sovereignty at the **local/community** level predate the nation-state itself. Tribes, city-states, and other forms of human political organization became 'sub-national' elements only with the rise of the nation-state, and some remain as existing sites. City governments, provinces, and other elements of government within nation-states can count as local sites of sovereignty, as well as community sites, for example, organized neighborhoods, farming villages, nomadic pastoralist groups, or people united around a particular parcel of land. Because food production is grounded in physical places with particular local attributes and socio-natural connections, and FS foregrounds a paradigm of 'localized' agricultural development, the local level is key to understanding FS's sovereignty.

The normative and real borders of 'nation-state'-hood create the level where **national** sites operate. Nation-state polities can be various physical sizes, and generally contain governmental agencies, legal and legislative processes, and executive structures. These are state sites of sovereignty at the national level. National sites may also include national level civil society organizations (CSOs) and national firms (but these are not discussed in this paper).

Supranational sites may be substantially different from each other but are linked by aspirations to meaningful control over territorial processes that span multiple nation-states. They include international finance organizations like the World Bank; multilateral environmental agreements; regional trade alliances and FTAs; private standards, certification, and regulatory organizations; transnational business alliances; transnational social movements; international NGOs; and UN agencies and bodies. A concern for 'human rights'—as aspirations to universally applicable norms that may constitute a sort of global sovereignty—is included at the supranational level because human rights have historically been a product of and contested through supranational sites.

---

[10] I have chosen not to address 'the individual' as a level of sovereignty mainly because the ontologies of FSMs have promoted more communal than individual conceptions of power and sovereignty. Further, such an inclusion would require addressing detailed debates over structure and agency—and how they play out in individuals—and would thus take the paper too far off course. Aside from keeping in mind that every 'site' above the single human level is composed of individuals who themselves might compete or converge within it, for this paper the individual level is put aside.

An attention to scale helps to address the global scope of my analysis, and asks how size, political level, and distance might condition food systems, including shaping the dynamics of mobilization and contention, and the effect of those same dynamics on potential rearrangements of power into a new constellation of 'sovereignty'. A challenge for this approach is that sites operate *at* but also *between* levels. Sites can be nested within each other: individuals make up communities, which make up nations and states, and so on. Yet sites' relationships are not always so unidirectionally hierarchical (see Sassen, 2003: 10), as when local communities seek a supranational 'boomerang' in order to exert their sovereign will over an uncooperative national government. Nation-states can influence local communities and supranational sites can influence nation-states, but the reverse can also be true. Sites and their operations may also be thought of as existing simultaneously at multiple levels: the WTO is a supranational site whose constituent members are representatives of nation-states, with offices and meetings that exist in physical space (rendering it subject to local/community sites). Though there may be effects of physical space and size, levels are also socially constructed and their dynamics are shifted by the action of various sites (Massey, 2005). For instance, ongoing pressure from civil society, the 2007-8 food crisis, and member governments' admission that the CFS was "weak performing" combined to precipitate a structural reform of that supranational body (CFS, 2009: 1), leading to more active inclusion of civil society in all CFS processes.[11]

Relationships between sites at different levels are intertwined, and the social construction of sovereignty is thus inherently relational, multi-level, and inter-scalar. Institutions can shape and be shaped by sites at all levels, as evidenced by the construction and influence of human rights norms. While actually existing sovereignty is relational and cannot be completely disaggregated, it can be analytically parsed out into levels that are meaningfully separate enough to benefit thoughtful analysis. Hence, my approach uses 'level' as a commonsense division of arenas of action to examine scalar dynamics of how sites operate, but maintains attention to the socially constructed nature of, and interlinkages between, levels.

The value and use of this framework

While previous scholars have identified 'multiple sovereignties', and (some) relations between them, they have not explored how these sovereignties get played out at various levels within a cohesive framework. Building on these studies, the sovereignty/sites/levels framework allows a systematic analysis of food system construction. The state's role, for example, has long been studied in Marxist takes on rural development and agrarian changes (Bernstein & Byres, 2001). Others in the 'peasant populist' school of agrarian studies have focused on the local level, often in reference to the state's negative impacts on

---

[11] Voting rights nonetheless remain limited to states.

local communities (Scott, 1998). Some studies, notably 'food regime' analyses, have looked at the multi-state and interstate nature of food systems (McMichael, 2013). Lastly, the role of human rights framings has been explored in the FS literature (Claeys, 2013), but not explicitly in relation to levels and sites of sovereignty. This complex interplay of institutions, policies, and competing sovereignties can be unpacked through attention to sites' rules, legitimacy, capacity, power with, power to, and power over. Especially since sovereignty is, like democracy or FS itself, "an always unfinished achievement" (Tsing, 2005: 7) marked by messy realities, this kind of analysis can help distinguish how social movements can and do shift the sands of actually existing sovereignty, by addressing, shaping, contesting, and linking with sites at various levels. Hence, my analysis makes links—through 'sites'—between *existing* sovereignty and *aspirational* food sovereignty, in order to gain insights about *tactical* sovereignties. I refer to these as the three 'aspects' of sovereignty.

In relating cases of sites to the levels, patterns at each level are elaborated, focusing on internal dimensions (contradictions and scalar aspects) and external relations (tensions and synergies). For example, cases illustrate how the heterogeneity of 'community' confronts FSMs as a contradiction within local level sites. Further, I build on Schiavoni's analysis of 'competing sovereignties' by analyzing competitive fault-lines that occur not only between national and local sites (as Schiavoni focused on), but also between these and supranational sites. In paying attention to converging (not just competing) sovereignties, I also identify synergistic opportunities between these sites/levels.

This line of research is crucial to the objective of understanding the present and potential future impact of FSMs, and the FS concept, on rural, environmental, and agricultural development. The study also provides insight into the ways that power and popular movements function to advance hegemonic or alternative forms of development. Sites/levels as concepts can help FSMs and policy-makers strategize their approach to making change, knowing the tensions within sites/levels and the interactions between them that may hold keys to scaling up food systems innovations that reduce poverty, hunger, and environmental degradation. Though rural and agricultural 'development' issues are typically associated with agrarian societies and not considered as relevant to urban and Northern populations, it is clear that within interpenetrating global food systems, shifts in one part of the system are linked to shifts in others. In addition, FS is increasingly influential on food movements in the North. Thus, this study contributes to holistic understanding of the possibilities of food systems transformation globally, while offering some hints to how politics, power, and sovereignty support or constrain goals of environmental sustainability and social justice.

Scope and limitations

Because of the global scope of this study, a certain level of comprehensiveness, nuance, and detail has been foregone. Detailed case analyses, expanded unpacking of the differences between sites, levels, and sectors (for instance, are

there differences between civil societal sites at supranational and national levels?), and deeper treatments of policy prescriptions had to be saved for further studies, in order to focus here on establishing the relevance and use of the sites/levels framework.

Also due to space limitations, the study is not all encompassing. Each chapter covers how *some* sites compete and converge at that level, but cannot cover every possible site or relationship. In the local chapter, I will focus mainly on the role of civil society, since local civil society sites are idealized in FS discourse—though local state and market sites also have influence. The national level is dominated by states, with civil society and market sites largely focused on influencing state sites, so in that chapter I will focus on state sites. In the supranational chapter I cover both civil society and state-based sites, but note the influence of market actors in the latter. The conclusion will synthesize what these competitions and convergences say about the aspects of and prospects for FS.

Chapter 3 : Localization Is Not Enough[12]

'Local' sites are composed of 'local communities', social groups with more overlapping links based on cultural, political, economical, and geographic factors, relative to communities (and the sites they form) at national or supranational levels. For this paper, I define any site that predominately shapes food systems within some *part* of a nation-state's boundaries as operating at the 'local' level. Though all sites within nation-states are defined as 'local', each can vary in its degree of 'localness'. Importantly, local communities themselves have many beyond-local links, via economic, communicative, and political connections. By exploring the dynamics of sites that can be seen as largely 'local', the chapter clarifies the meaning, uses, contradictions, and promises of 'the local' as a level for FS construction.

'Local' can be a scale but also a *place*, showing its supreme importance for the subject of food production. This level is key to FSMs' tactical and aspirational sovereignties, as evidenced by the Nyéléni principles, half of which are related to localization. However, the dynamics of *actually existing* relations at this level are marred by inequalities within and between food producing and consuming communities, relating to economic class, gender, age, ethnic, and other social statuses. By critically assessing FSMs' promotion of local control as pivotal to FS, and relationships of land and food access within local communities, the chapter clarifies the promises and limitations to vesting sovereignty at local sites. Particularly, the analysis finds that the actually existing power dynamics of many competing sovereignties at local sites of sovereignty do not result automatically in democratic, just, or ecologically beneficial outcomes. Furthermore, local sites are inextricably linked to non-local sites. Reconciling FSMs' emphasized local sites with their uncomfortably unequal realities and existing influences beyond them thus requires special attention to intra-community and local inequalities and the relations of local sites to others beyond them.

Agroecology, peasant production, and alternative markets

Overall, the FS literature—including declarations from international meetings and supportive scholarly analyses—treats 'local' positively (see Nyéléni, 2007; LVC, 2014a; Wittman et al, 2010). FS prioritizes food production for local consumption (rather than for for-profit export) and local community control of natural resources (Pimbert, 2009: 8; ICSP, 2013: 11). Yet FSM and scholarly perspectives are nuanced and diversified. Support for the local may acknowledge the importance of collaboration between local communities and states, and does not categorically reject international trade (e.g. Edelman 2014; LVC, 2013a). Further, gathering local constituents into transnational coalitions to seek greater self-determination can simultaneously be a self-critical process,

---

[12] Note: this chapter contains material based on Roman-Alcalá, 2014.

14

as in LVC's tackling of gender issues (Desmarais, 2004).[13] That is, FS's localist values do not automatically "propose that proximity inevitably or singularly leads to social justice and ecological sustainability" (Kloppenburg & Hassanein, 2006: 418). The discourse on the role of local in FS is thus about the relations of the local to other sites and within itself, rather than a dogmatic promotion of local sovereignty above all else.

This focus on the local makes sense, considering that local places are where experiences are felt. Sites from other levels may 'touch down' in localities, but that touch is framed by local realities (Tsing, 2005). Physical force, whether backed by state powers or capitalist forces, or precipitated by local communities, is in the end a local occurrence. Direct local-level actions are important tactics for FSMs that manifest political demands and opposition (e.g. Wright & Wolford, 2003; Kuntz, 2012; Wiebe, 2006; Roman-Alcalá, 2013). Yet when forces are 'hegemonic'—pervading and dominant—they beg confrontation not only where they touch down but also wherever they emanate. Considering FSMs as part of a larger counter-hegemonic project against harmful capitalist industrial agriculture (Weis, 2010), we might see the local as a normative counter-hegemonic frame and a place for counter-hegemonic work, neither which precludes the importance of other levels.

That said, much FS discourse reflects a normative localism (Goodman et al, 2012) that assumes that localized food systems (in terms of production, distribution, and decision making) are better for FS (e.g. LVC, 2014b, 2014c). 'La Via Campesina' literally means 'the Peasant Way', showing how progenitors of the FS frame have claimed their own unique value systems and ways of maintaining food security for their members. The underlying narrative is that communities of peasants—'people of the land'[14]—are relatively homogenous and cohesive, and can feed themselves *and the world* ecologically if left undisturbed by the influences of capitalism and neoliberal states (LVC, 2012). Such claims have also been made on behalf of peasants and their 'subsistence ethic' in much of the 'peasant populist' literature (see, for example, Scott, 1976; Ploeg, 2013). These unique 'peasant' values and logics, operating and reproducing themselves in distinct, local places, are seen as necessary to achieve development that benefits rural populations, especially in the global South (Rosset & Torres, 2012).

Informed by these logics, 'agroecology' is an essential component of peasant modes of production and FS (ICSP, 2013). As a process of improving efficient and sustainable resource use while increasing production of diverse, nutritional diets, agroecology's value for more sustainable agricultures has been confirmed

---

[13] In fact, the *Women's Working Group* of LVC made proposals that later became crucial components of the FS frame: the right of farmers to "produce our own food in our own territory" (quoted in Desmarais, 2004: 142), a move away from agrochemicals, and greater inclusion of women in rural policy development.

[14] 'Small-scale', 'family', and 'peasant' are typological farm descriptors often used interchangeably and casually.

by international scientific assessments (IAASTD, 2009). Because agroecological techniques inherently relate to particular ecologies, rather than the homogenization strategies of industrial agriculture (Altieri, 1987), some argue agroecology is oppositional to industrial and capitalist agriculture (Ploeg, 2013). Although there are indications that agroecology may be co-opted into mainstream corporate agricultural discourses of 'sustainable intensification', its association with peasant movements and orientation towards small and medium scale production modes make it a key tool of FSMs (Holt-Giménez, 2006; Altieri & Toledo, 2011). Insofar as peasant-based agroecology is grounded physically and culturally in local places, it might form *the* institutional foundation of pro-local FS.[15]

Agroecology connects with visions of food markets that are based more in face-to-face (rather than long-distance) interactions and locally specific (rather than monetarily-based) values. Ploeg (2010) insists that these local 'alternative' markets support peasant autonomy from capitalist sites and structures (influences that often stem from national and supranational levels). Locally-appropriate seed development initiatives, seed banks, land trusts, farmer-to-farmer extension services, farmer's markets, and community supported agriculture (CSA) schemes are all means and sites to pursue FS at the local level. Alternative markets and networks at the local level are central to facilitate the expansion of 'food sovereign' production and strengthen the movements themselves (Da Vià, 2012). Da Vià's case exemplifies how these local market-based efforts can create *power to* among counter-hegemonic communities and actors, and reorient food markets against capitalist structures of agricultural production and distribution. Some scholars present peasant farming, occurring at local scales and for local consumption, as capable of solving of the global food system's existing ecological and social contradictions (Ploeg, 2008). The 're-embedding' of food markets in local relationships, communities, and ecologies (unlike capitalist flows of 'food-as-commodities') is expected to result in social and ecological benefits. Going further, some argue FSMs might be a counter-hegemonic force to global capitalism (McMichael, 2014; LVC, 2012), and potentially contribute to the complete transformation of market society (Holt-Giménez & Shattuck, 2011: 137).

Yet, peasants and 'local communities' are enmeshed in larger systems of economic relations, for good and ill. Many 'peasants' ensure their families' survival by seeking supplementary waged labor opportunities—sometimes on agribusiness export farms—suggesting that peasant farms are not so independent of capitalist ones (or the non-farm economy).[16] International trade may ensure the

---

[15] Yet, agroecology is also subject to competing sovereignties: who determines what agroecology entails? Is agroecology the proper purview of peasants or scientists? Must agroecology be spread 'farmer-to-farmer', or can it involve state support, or even be adopted (co-opted?) into TNC value chains?

[16] These connections bring up the uncertain relationship of FS to modernization and modernity. To some, FS is a project of 'reconstituting modernity' that denies the ultimate appeal of replacing small scale and subsistence production with industrial and market-based economies (McMichael, 2009). While there is mainstream promotion of

viability of farmer livelihoods in places where producing for local markets cannot (Burnett & Murphy, 2014). Further, peasants are not "absent in agrarian capitalism but rather play an active part in creating it" (Jansen, 2014: 7). The reality that peasant production interpenetrates with capitalist markets and off-farm governance forces—that FSMs cannot "withdraw from capitalism" (Jansen, 2014: 16)—indicates how idealizing local farming can be a 'local trap' preventing a more holistic view of counter-hegemonic change possibilities (Purcell & Brown, 2005).

The assumption that peasant farms are spaces and sources of ecological sanity, social justice, and democratic development must be subjected to empirical verification. Foods produced for local consumption are not necessarily produced via agroecology and local control is not tantamount to ecological production. In practice, "small farmers' knowledge and practices do not necessarily fit very well into the agroecological approach", such as in peasants' traditional burning of fields, use of pesticides, and diffusion of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (Jansen, 2014: 13). Instead of treating peasants as unproblematic progenitors of agroecology, the full complex of characteristics of local production sites must be investigated to gauge whether farms cohere to the FS paradigm. Robbins (2013) argues that this demands attention not only to a farm's *scale* (in terms of farm size and distribution reach), but also its *method* of production (on a gradient from agroecology to 'conventional'), and its *character* (from peasant to industrial/capitalist). Altogether, scale, method, and character of production are predictors of farming's ecological and social impacts. By looking beyond scale as determinative of FS, Robbins' work reminds a narrow focus on 'local' itself does not account for the full complexity of the demands of FS, nor the means to achieve them.

Contradictions within the local

Class differences manifest in local sites, including producer communities and communities of non-farmer eaters.[17] FS critics like Bernstein (2014) have emphasized how the 'peasant populist' discourse might downplay or ignore eco-

value-chain-embedded smallholder production for economic growth (World Bank, 2008), this is not the central thrust of the argument for FS, which instead is based in prioritized values of ecology, egalitarianism, and democratic control. However, these ideals leave FS open to critique: Since many of FSMs' ostensible constituents appreciate access to public transportation systems, technological infrastructure, consumer products at affordable prices, and advanced health care facilities, how are these outcomes of traditionally conceived 'development' to be secured without the advance of a GDP-enhancing industrial model of economic development—a model seemingly opposed to FS?

[17] It is important to note that rural peasant communities are often buyers of food, even if they produce 70% of what humanity eats (Wolfenson, 2013). The reality that many farmers obtain sustenance at least part of the year through purchasing food must be acknowledged in considering issues of hunger, malnutrition, and rural development.

nomic and other class differences within local communities (and the larger movements they form). These differences present problems in both global North and South, though the character of these problems varies between places and over time. Based in generation/age, ethnicity, ability, and race, gender, income, wealth, and market position, class differences can affect the way labor and production relations are structured, how food is distributed within communities, and individual members' access to decision making and implementation power. In this section, I describe how class differences affect access to land, food, and decision-making, though many more axes of difference and areas of effects might be analyzed.

Patel (2009: 670) argues that egalitarianism is a crucial foundation to the truly democratic process envisioned by FSMs, because if people are unequal, they cannot access decision-making power in the same ways. Yet access to land is in many rural communities shaped by unequal social relations. In some cases, this is due to gendered traditions of patrilineal inheritance and patriarchal male dominance, reinforced by local tribal, religious, or governmental authority (Agarwal, 1996: 192). Relatedly, "customary authorities are notorious for … favoring divisive ethnic-based membership over residency-based forms of citizenship" in many rural communities (Ribot, 2002: 12). Age-based traditions can likewise prevent land access and cause intra-community and even intra-familial strife and conflict (White, 2012: 12). There are also conflicts between the working class elements of peasant communities, and local elites who control land and prevent reforms (Borras, 2007). Elites who control land sometimes overlap with or are 'customary authorities'. These authorities can play central roles in legitimizing the dispossession of rural communities from land when offered bargaining/representative positions and special concessions in the process of 'large scale land acquisitions' or 'land grabs' (Borras & Franco, 2010: 11). Such land acquisitions are often premised on creating new opportunities for waged labor on farms, which can exacerbate divisions in local communities between farm managers/owners and landless farm workers. Though exploitative capital-labor relations may evoke the stereotypical image of large scale, plantation-style, export-oriented agriculture, worker exploitation can also occur at more locally oriented farms—in both North and South (Gray, 2013; Jansen, 2014: 7).

Consumption-side class issues also challenge localist ideals in FS. Gender can play a role in differential food entitlements within households (Agarwal, 1992). *Between* households, there is varying access to sufficient, healthy, ecologically produced foods, due to economic class differences—and this goes for populations of both rural and urban areas, and in both agrarian and industrialized countries. More fundamentally, food producers and consumers—as classes whose interactions are framed by a market economy—have divergent economic interests. Farmers want adequate payment while consumer want affordable access. Because of differences between the labor productivity of industrial versus peasant agriculture—resulting generally in more expensive produce in the case of the latter—it is difficult to imagine how (within capitalism) a FS system based on small-scale, labor intensive agroecological production would resolve class tensions between producers and consumers (Woodhouse, 2010).

Local always in relation

Further complicating 'local' are connections between local and other sites, illustrated here by 'Decentralized Natural Resource Management' (DNRM) schemes. Many local rural communities have struggled for control over local resources. Pressure on states from these struggles, reductions in state funding, and ascendant 'sustainable development' discourses have elevated the role of local communities in natural resource management. "Community-based approaches to environmental management" of forests and other common property have thus become "widely adopted" (Marshall, 2008: 75). DNRM schemes are one manifestation: mostly top down state creations, they rely on populist notions of participation and social equity in decision-making, based on the principle of 'subsidiarity' that guides placement of decision-making to the lowest level (i.e. smallest scale) appropriate for the particular resource, issue, or policy in question (Marshall, 2008; Ribot, 2002). DNRM policies create additional local sites of sovereignty, ostensibly contributing to the potential for FS.

Yet "while there is an array of theoretical reasons why decentralization should be expected to improve governance, the empirical evidence has not been as supportive" (Kauneckis & Andersson, 2009: 24). These shortcomings have largely been due to intracommunity class inequalities, democratic deficits in decision making at the local level, and a lack of 'authentic' decentralization of control and resources from state governments (Ribot, 2002). These points about DNRM are matched by Agarwal's broader studies on intersections of gender with resource access and management. Agarwal (1994) shows how governmental bodies can amplify existing negative social impacts of women's disempowerment, while Agarwal (2005) shows the positive social and environment impacts of women's inclusion in 'green governance'. All these studies emphasize (in different terms) "the importance of considering local and national institutional arrangements as these co-determine the political incentives within decentralized systems" (Kauneckis & Andersson, 2009: 23).

Effective local governance requires "strategic alliances—woven horizontally and vertically" (Agarwal, 2005: 424) and between state and societal actors. Because policies of governance are "framed at many different levels", "engaging with government [retains] central importance" and civil society efforts are not enough in themselves (ibid: 400) to move towards 'green governance'. The state thus has an important role to play in ensuring that local management of resources does not reproduce existing class inequalities, and results in the 'green' outcomes desired.

Conclusions

'The local' is at the core of FS's aspirational sovereignty—a desire to increase the *quantity* of local sovereignty. The local level provides evidence—in the environmental and social benefits of agroecology, and the better outcomes for forests seen in some cases of equitable and 'authentic' DNRM—that this quantitative increase is indeed essential for FS. Yet local sites—including producer communities, DNRM schemes, and local governments—do not uniformly re-

solve issues of ecology, social justice, or democracy, and contradictions within these sites belie a simple equation of 'local=FS'. In this chapter, we saw how attention to politics as they actually play out—rather than how they might be expected to play out based on normative localism—is crucial to a realistic view of vesting FS locally. Power divisions within communities remind us that, because FS's premium on egalitarian democracy is not always matched by realities on the ground, its other goals of social and ecological justice are not guaranteed by siting sovereignty at unreformed local sites. However, this is not to say that FS's localization efforts are misguided, but rather that such aspirational sovereignty must be accompanied by strategic efforts to *improve* localism (that is, improve local sovereignty's *quality*) and pursue the full complex of tactics needed beyond localization, without which FS cannot emerge (see Mulvany, 2007).

This points to the importance of considering all levels in any effective constellation of sites and institutions to operationalize FS. FSMs' localism may be normative, but has formed only one part of a multi-scaled struggle that engages many political, economic, social, and educational opportunities (and sites thereof) to exert and extend FS. FSMs have worked in order to improve and increase local sovereignty, but also to improve and contest the capacity, legitimacy, and rules of sites at national and supranational levels. The multi-sited nature of existing sovereignty necessitates a multi-sited approach to tactical *and* aspirational sovereignty. For FSMs, it is crucial to find synergies that might amplify FS through the interactions of sites and communities operating at all levels. Promising developments, to be addressed in further chapters, include the increasing inclusion of local voices in spaces of decision-making operating at national and supranational levels, and the redistribution of legitimacy, capacity, and resources of sovereign rulemaking. Working past debates on whether or not FS can be vested locally entails asking: what would improve the vesting of sovereignty locally and how would that sovereignty relate to sites at other levels? To begin to answer this question, we now turn to the central role of national sites of sovereignty.

20

Chapter 4 : The Challenges and Promises of National Sovereignty

Because of their historic and key roles in disputes over land, wealth, governmental investment, and labor, states are the objects of struggle for many social movements, and continue to be important for FS. FSMs have demanded from states (among others): 'integral agrarian reform' (including redistributive land reforms); an end to participation in bilateral and multilateral FTAs; opposition to GMOs and intellectual property rights regimes that accompany biotechnological development; and support for agroecology through research, extension, and material provisioning. Indeed, actors within national sites *can* support FS materially and discursively, advance peasant and consumer interests, and promote FS in interstate policy-making venues.[18]

This chapter surveys pertinent state histories and theories, and what these suggest for both the tactics and aspirational sovereignty of FSMs. States' diverse composition and behaviors complicate a simple analysis of their potential as a site for vesting FS. As arenas of action, state sites of sovereignty are characterized by tensions between the promotion of economic growth and the maintenance of internal (popular) legitimacy. FSMs often compete at a disadvantage with capitalist interests at national sites, where peasant producer concerns are sidelined in favor of more economically lucrative extractive industry and export-focused agriculture. Looking at cases of state involvement in rural development, and states' recent incorporations of FS into policy, this chapter proposes that because of their 'actually existing' sovereign importance, states as a whole will remain crucial to FSMs' tactical approaches, even if they rarely meet the FSM ideal of redistributing sovereignty more locally or advancing FS policy. While the aforementioned diversity of states makes across-the-board prescriptions for vesting sovereignty inappropriate, recent experiences in Latin America provide hints to how relational sovereignty approaches between state and local sites might be advanced.

Between a rock and a hard place; or, the (un)likelihood of food sovereignty given variable contexts

States have an imperative to sustain capital accumulation, stemming in part from their need to maintain revenue and economic growth (Foster & Magdoff, 2011; Block, 1977). In agrarian countries (Bolivia and Brazil for example), this imperative can manifest in a drive to make agriculture more 'productive' in terms of yields but also monetary terms. Large-scale monoculture and export has generally been more suited to this than peasant production. The necessity of maintaining political legitimacy, however, can shape lead states to place con-

---

[18] This chapter focuses on domestic policy, but it is important to note that FSM advocacy at supranational venues like the CFS benefits from support from progressive state actors (Wills, 2014: 249).

straints upon accumulation, shaping patterns of business, law-making, and policy implementation (Poulantzas, 1978).[19] The level of legitimacy required varies over time and in regard to specific topics, and relates to mass social pressure (from changing discourses, norms, and political action), divisions within elite classes, and the particular inclinations of state actors. Because they have evolved as institutions alongside both capitalism and ideas of popular (or democratic) legitimacy, most (but not all) states exhibit this tension between accumulation and legitimacy. Situational incentives for state actors to push reforms and the presence of pressure from societal actors are important factors in whether legitimating, reformist policy currents are formed or not (Fox, 1993). The positions of particular states in the interstate system can also influence those states' behavior. Taken together, conditions of state and society form unique 'state-society' relations, which shape the possibilities for transformation in the state's policy (rules), legitimacy, and capacity.

Before the discourse of 'popular sovereignty', governments generally lacked the norm of democratic legitimacy. Autocratic states have persisted through the modern era, and FSMs have been subjected to these. Coups against elected state leaders who promised pro-peasant reforms have occurred throughout the 20th century (as recently as 2009 in Honduras; see Boyer, 2010). The impunity surrounding assassinations of peasant and rural labor activists in Honduras, Colombia, Philippines, and Brazil shows how unresponsive and unaccountable states can be. Years of policies dedicated to dismantling the peasantry are also exemplified in less directly oppressive ways (McMichael, 2008). One example is the rise of GMOs in Argentina, and the near-impossibility of reversing this trend via the state (described by Newell, 2008).

Clearly, FSMs face challenges securing state support for FS. Even when states *have* taken on 'FS' policies, results can reflect the continued influence of accumulation imperatives. Studying Bolivia and Ecuador, McKay and Nehring (2013: 7) express concern for FS's co-optation into policies that continue to be "based on market-led solutions integrated within the corporate-controlled global food system". In Ecuador, a "reduction in the capacity for mobilization of peasant organizations and the more general shift of power relations in favor of agroindustry" created limitations on the implementation of constitutionalized FS rhetoric, as new policies could not counter class power and ideological momentum towards continued support of "traditional monoculture" (Giunta, 2014: 2, 19). These examples show that accumulation imperatives and class

---

[19] Poulantzas' work owed much to Gramsci (1971), who argued that political power relies on the consent of the governed, and that ideology and discourse work in the service of this. By this rationale, discourse can reduce or improve consent to (and thus the legitimacy of) a sovereign's rule. Harvey (2005: 39-63) shows how consent was constructed for neoliberal policy in the United States, but elsewhere he shows that consent is not always required for states to act (Harvey, 2003: 183-212).

power continue to challenge FSMs at national level state sites, even in moments of apparent policy wins.[20]

However, some cases show that national sites *can* advance FS through policy. Under Venezuela's FS policies, state-sanctioned and supported citizen-run organizations composed of many small scale producers (called '*comunas*') have increased local control over production in some ways, while distribution decisions are largely determined by the state (Schiavoni, 2013: 18). Venezuela's *comunas,* inasmuch as they contribute to the national government's goals of decreasing food import dependency, provide an example of how FS policy initiatives can bolster components of state sovereignty (namely, legitimacy and capacity) while appealing to FSM demands and supporting local communities' sovereign capacity. Brazil's 'Fome Zero' institutional purchasing program, which supports local small scale farmers by purchasing their foods for the state's schools, hospitals, and other institutional buyers likewise shows how policy might support state and local sovereignties, simultaneously (Oxfam, 2010). McKay and Nehring (2014: 1196) argue that Venezuela's example, by "transforming relations of access and control, while simultaneously opening up space for participatory democratic decision-making … presents the most promising trajectory" for state policy towards FS. Such spaces for participatory democracy and civil societal involvement in policy implementation have also been positively assessed in Nicaragua's FS policy-making process (Araújo & Godek, 2014).

These examples show that outcomes of state-society relations, embodied into FS policies, are not singular. Policies can increase or decrease the legitimacy and capacity (independently, or together) of both states and FSMs involved, depending on how they are formed and implemented. Contra Edelman (2014: 16), FSMs do not necessarily bolster state sovereignty by engaging it, nor do they always lose out from this engagement. FSMs have tended to influence the legitimacy and rules of states more than they have undermined states' capacity, but evidence shows that such influence is also possible when movements are substantial. Sundar (2014) describes how a Maoist counter-state borne from social movements contends with the Indian state's *power over* and authority. Some such movements are framed as intensely anti-state, yet efforts to transform state policy which amplify communities' *power to* (like Venezuela's support of *comunas*) might be just as likely over the long term to contribute to greater local sovereignty vis-à-vis the state. A relational, disaggregated analysis disputes the zero-sum nature of classical sovereignty.

---

[20] Some might argue a more dynamic reading of these policies. Perhaps state leaders prioritize economic development in the short term, as a necessary step towards greater capacity and international autonomy—laying foundation for future FS? Further, FSMs are wrapped up in the contradictions of these policies, being opposed to but also beneficiaries of this 'developmentalist' income, through state programs, which sometimes support their very political organizing (see Tarlau, 2014 on FSMs in Brazil).

States: tactically indispensible?

FSM demands on states seem sensible considering the legitimation imperative within ostensibly democratic contexts: if states are nominally beholden to popular sovereignty, they ostensibly make good targets for political advocacy. Yet, considering histories of state support for capitalist accumulation over FS demands, FSMs cannot rely on states to make changes in their favor. States can be leveraged for pro-FS changes, as they can be implicated in preventing FS. This 'Janus-faced' nature of the state is the foundational tension facing FSMs in implementing FS via the nation-state site (Swyngedouw, 2005).[21] Although the accumulation/legitimacy tension may link them, the distinctive attributes of states and the societies they operate within have real effects on how this tension is negotiated.

Reflecting this multifarious nature, FSMs vary in how they approach state policy formation and implementation. Some parts of FSMs have an historical overlap with state-oriented movements, often inspired by communist and social democratic political projects. At the same time, autonomist movement trends have sought to make changes parallel to or in spite of the state, partially in reaction to past failures of state socialism. Latin America in particular has seen a rise in indigenous politics, which differ from European tradition of social change via the nation-state (Zibechi, 2012). Such movements have focused on maintaining and increasing their political, physical, and ideological autonomy, and are composed of individuals and organizations that sometimes overlap with FSMs, including some important early members that shaped the structure and trajectory of LVC, like the *Latin American Coordination of Countryside Organizations* (Torres & Rosset, 2010; Edelman & James, 2011: 90).

There are other tactical differences in agrarian and food movements, beyond the autonomism/state dichotomy, which result from state and societal factors and relations. For instance, in particularly authoritarian states where oppositional, rights-talk activism is rigidly suppressed, and "where there is no movement", societal actors may seek only to bolster community resilience and escape state influence (Malseed, 2008). In other cases, like China, where national level state actors are more likely to intervene in favor of local communities than local government officials, peasant-favoring reforms (most often land access or compensation for dispossession) are sought through 'rightful resistance' that invests sovereignty, tactically and discursively, in the nation state (O'Brien, 2013). In countries where agrifood capital is deeply entrenched in national government (like the United States), movements tend to foreground subnational policy, education, and consumption-side solutions. In countries where internal actors have limited political purchase, yet state actors are sensitive to external international pressure, a 'boomerang' strategy might be adopted (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). Other FSM participants leverage the increasingly global lan-

---

[21] Of course, the state is more than 'Janus-faced' in that it is oversimplifying to indicate only two sides of the state. With regards to particular food systems issues, there are likely a multitude of positions state actors take that influence both policies and implementation.

24

guage of human rights to pressure their state actors to push reforms (Suárez, 2013).

More recent analyses of former Soviet states show that peasant actors confronting loss of land may not match the LVC vision in terms of prioritizing local communities or maintaining autonomy from the state (Mamonova & Visser, 2014; Mamonova, 2013). These cases point to how peasant interests vary with political circumstances, and are likely to increasingly deviate into the future, as more diverse state spaces become enmeshed in the FS project. These differences raise tactical and aspirational considerations: which site should movements confront to achieve FS aims? At which level should movements focus work towards the operationalization of FS? Paying attention to the disaggregated, situated constituents of FSMs (and *potential* FSMs) complicates *any* simple prescription for a singular 'correct' FS, whether policy, movement organizational form, or approach to the state. Additionally, as states increasingly take on FS policy, they amplify their own role in shaping FS discourse, institutions, and FSM tactics.

Considering these confusions, FSMs' involvement with state-based politics remains tactically indispensible, since "state intervention is a necessary function to confront the global food system, dismantle unequal agrarian structures, and recognize the autonomy of people and communities in defining and controlling their food and agricultural systems" (McKay & Nehring, 2013: 1). The particular need to counter neoliberal policy pasts has prompted a "return to the state" (Clark, 2013: 2), even considering autonomist misgivings. To a certain degree, FSMs have found no problem combining discourses and actions which 'name and shame' governments for their complicity in anti-peasant and anti-worker developments, while petitioning and engaging them for progressive realization of pro-peasant and pro-worker rights and entitlements. Though it has yet to form a tension that threatens the overall political cohesion of FSMs themselves, potential divisions between FSM participants based on their assumptions, attitudes, and approaches towards states may in discrete times and places challenge the unity and thus political efficacy of FSMs.[22]

One example of this tension is with regards to issues of state incorporation or co-optation of movements (Arsel & Angel, 2012; Clark, 2013; Godek, 2013). Members of social movements sometimes enter into state positions, where their ideas and energy are appropriated—often in ways that movements do not approve of. Sometimes, these individuals are seen as 'selling out' to various interests, watering down progressive policy efforts, and capitalizing on their new positions of power. The tension of FSMs securing discursive support amongst state actors, but finding policies lacking, has been observed in Brazil,

---

[22] One could argue that an 'inside/outside' movement strategy, with large and disruptive oppositional autonomous components and reformist state-accommodating components, might be more effective than either in isolation. It is likely however that the 'optimal' configuration of efforts varies, according to divergent societal and state factors.

Ecuador, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and other countries that have incorporated FSM actors into positions of government and policy formation processes (Beauregard, 2009; Clark, 2013; Godek & Aruájo, 2014; Cockburn, 2013; McKay & Nehring, 2014). Some of these studies note that incorporation of movement leaders into state roles can monopolize these leaders' time, reducing the capacity of 'outside' movements to provide the required pressure to sustain policy changes.

The question for FSMs remains: can the sovereignty of local communities be actualized through states, in a way that prioritizes FS over accumulation? I would argue that answers are by no means definitive. On one side, critical scholars like Davidson (2009) have argued against ecological governance innovations being limited to institutions like nation-states.[23] On another, Eckersley (2005: 1) has argued that a "critical realist" politics must work through the nation-state form, while alternatives are developed which distribute political authority more widely. Venezuela and Nicaragua would seem to match this, to some extent. Without doubt, an increase in FS legitimacy and capacity through state action is an improvement from unaccountable, unrepresentative, opaque, harmful state behavior. And such shifts are possible, even if fraught and difficult.

How to reach aspirational national sovereignty?

To create such shifts requires renewed and deepened democratic processes. Various models for deepened democracy have been developed, including those described by Eckersley (2005, 2005b) as 'deliberative' and by Mouffe (2011) as 'agonistic'. *Deliberative* models propose that rules are better when developed through "unconstrained egalitarian deliberation over questions of value and common purpose in the public sphere" than by elected officials (Eckersley, 2005: 115). *Agonistic* democracy is contrasted with deliberative approaches that pursue 'rational' consensus, instead promoting that differences should be respected even while greater inter-position understanding is pursued. These models are different when examined in detail, but linked by a shared commitment to pluralist and participatory ideals, and taking democracy to mean more than political representation and classical liberalism.

Eckersley (2005b) has also suggested a move from 'exclusive' to 'inclusive' forms of sovereignty, by including extra-territorial populations into state-based decision-making. This inclusivity would break the classical equation of sovereignty and territory, allowing citizenship rights to transcend borders between sovereign states when issues likewise transcend borders. The concept of 'inclusive' reordering of sovereignty matches more general FSM demands for better quality decision-making at all levels. Local sites require more equality of inclusion among non-elites, for instance regarding gender. Nation-states require bet-

---

[23] The 'ecoanarchist' alternatives that Davidson defends, 'bioregionalism' and 'social ecology', have much overlap with food sovereignty, including focuses on place-based livelihoods and localized democracy. See Biehl (1997) and Kohr (1978) for elaborations.

ter inclusion of non-elites vis-à-vis elites. FS also requires ways for local sites to affect decisions made outside their own polities, in the boardrooms and governments of other states, and in interstate rulemaking arenas. Luckily, deeper democracy to increase the quality of sovereign rulemaking is not just theoretical, and can be incipiently seen in various food systems governance processes. LVC's organizational structures and procedures, for example, have shown that "participatory democracy in a transnational context is not 'unrealistic'" (Menser, 2008: 21). Democratic FS models-in-practice have been discussed limitedly thus far, but will be featured more in the next chapter, as supranational sites offer the greatest lessons about the challenges of accommodating competing sovereignties through these processes—between both previously allied sovereignties within FSMs, and in the more antagonistic situations FSMs face engaging state and market actors at supranational sites.

Chapter 5 : The Difficulty of Supranational Legitimacy

The 'frictions' between global sovereignty and legitimacy

There is no global government, and it is difficult to imagine a rule regime with full capacity and legitimacy experienced at a truly global level. The greater the physical ambit of governance rules, the more we might expect what Tsing (2005) has described as 'friction'. 'Friction' occurs when particular place-based norms and cultures encounter universal or alternative logics. Universality is perpetually "an aspiration, an always unfinished achievement" (ibid: 7), and the changes that occur on both 'sides' of this friction are never predetermined. A fully democratic process of rule constitution and implementation within a global sovereign encompassing diverse constituents would no doubt be characterized by much friction. Yet norms can underpin 'global' sovereignty insofar as they affect the legitimacy of *all* sovereign sites—which can at times influence those sites' rules. Global sovereignty thus exists only as aspirationally global norms, such as are found in 'human rights'. Because human rights can theoretically influence the legitimacy of all sites, they are "social conquests" (Saragih, 2013: 279), and sites that set rights norms and operationalize them are key arenas of contestation to construct FS.

'Friction' shows the incompleteness of any global sovereignty, and sites that intend to implement norms and policies globally are more accurately described as supranational. Human rights are aspirationally global but developed within supranational UN bodies and implemented differentially by various non-global governments. The 'World' Trade Organization only includes 160 countries as members (though its arbitrations may influence non-members). LVC may at times claim a 'global' representation of peasant communities, but crucial geographic regions (like China) are not represented among its members (Borras et al, 2008: 11).

This chapter uses three cases (LVC, the WTO/FTAs, and the CFS) to illuminate how FS is currently constructed at the supranational level. Because of the immense social and ecological complexity entailed in supranationality, it is difficult to draw simple conclusions. However, what is clear is the challenge of supranational construction of 'universal' anything—norms, rights, or FS—and the fraught process of converting norms into rules (or policies), and implementing them. This process is fraught as a result of competing sovereignties within and across levels. Internal tensions found at this level relate to issues of legitimacy, capacity, and rule making, and are likely unavoidable. The chapter focuses particularly on the democratic legitimacy components of supranational sites, but not in disregard of supranational capacity and rules. Because these rules and capacities 'touch down' at local and national levels, I have referred more to them in previous chapters. Another reason for this focus is that many capable, rulemaking supranational sites are lacking in both "input" (i.e. process) and "output" (i.e. outcome) legitimacies (Dingwerth, 2004: 11).

LVC itself well illustrates sovereignty's components at the supranational level. LVC's internal dialogues and engagement of human rights show how inclusive, relational, deliberative forms of norm development might underpin legitimate supranational construction of FS *rules*. Tensions within even this most ostensibly pro-FS supranational site, however, show that such processes are not without problems. The challenge is not merely building greater consensus on norms through *power with*, but also translating such norms into concrete policies and effective, accountable *power over* implementation. LVC's members' have confronted internal differences through the aforementioned dialogues, but the 'rules' that have emerged (which LVC intends to have external influence) seem to result in at best normative influence, and not so much implementable policies. LVC's *internal legitimacy* is marked by other tensions: as 'arena of action', its members sometimes differ in opinions about tactics, organization, and norms (Desmarais, 2007). For instance, FSMs are not unified about whether to pursue human rights-based or more bottom-up strategies (Claeys, 2014). The network has also had to respond to issues of male dominance within its organization and membership (Desmarais, 2004), bringing up tensions between inward and outward focused work (Desmarais, 2008). LVC's *external legitimacy* varies with the perspectives and compositions of the sites it engages, but in general the legitimacy of civil society has been increasing with the ascent of inclusive, participatory, and deliberative norms for transnational governance (e.g. Dryzek & Stevenson, 2011; De Schutter, 2013: 3). Yet as an actor at the supranational level, LVC lacks resources in comparison to states and TNCs, resulting in lesser *capacity* to influence supranational sites.

The case of the WTO illustrates how supranational sites that prioritize global food markets as the ideal form of agricultural development are contested by FSMs, due to their perceived neglect of democratic, ecological, and justice concerns—in process/input legitimacy and outcome/output legitimacy terms. This case shows that FS cannot be constructed through sites that exclude or marginalize the voices of non-elites, nor can relational FS be constructed between sites with fundamentally different values, interests, and structural goals. The CFS and its Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) offer a contrasting case of how interstate, multi-sectoral sites can include affected non-elite constituencies in the workings of supranational governance. Considering its state-based composition and incorporation of powerful market 'stakeholders', the CFS is prone to the same accumulation/legitimation tensions seen at the national level, and is engaged cautiously by FSMs. Yet, by moving towards inclusive, relational, deliberative rule construction, the CFS hints at the possibility of leveraging supranational sites that involve state and market actors towards FS. The next section will detail the three supranational cases introduced here, starting with LVC.

Land and human rights: deliberative dialogue as legitimate norm construction

In a simplified sense, peasant agricultural producers have tended to think about land in terms of its ability to produce foods, and their own access to land in

these terms.[24] This often has meant an emphasis on land reform and land tenure as important policy goals, in order to enhance peasant access to land. Indigenous communities in many cases, however, maintain relationships to land that are rooted in cosmologies with a different conceptualization of land that may include production but is not necessarily centered on it. Another group within FSMs are the nomadic pastoralists, whose relationships to land are by nature shifting, encompassing lands shared with other social groups. This diversity challenges a simple land reform platform, as titling of lands along migratory routes, and titling of entire territories filled with spiritually and culturally meaningful elements, is difficult and potentially problematic. There is the likelihood that with land reforms, agricultural peasant needs could be prioritized over the others'. Within LVC, these issues were deliberated upon and a consensus emerged that all these groups' rights to land and territory must be upheld simultaneously (Rosset & Torres, 2014). International declarations speaking of land issues now emphasize each group's unique position and needs, and the need for these groups to work together (Nyéléni, 2007a). Through these dialogues, LVC improved its own land politics understandings and solidarity, while preparing the movement to engage in external rule making processes, like the CFS's 2012 'Tenure Guidelines' (TGs), created with civil society input to guide governments in their treatment of land issues and responses to land grabbing. The goal of FSMs (in such dialogues) seems to be not uniform policies to implement worldwide, but the elaboration of globally applicable principles and governance norms to prioritize non-elite needs at local and national levels (Clark, 2013: 4). Though these dialogues may not have eliminated LVC's internally competing sovereignties, they can be seen as examples of the deepened democracy introduced earlier.

This process is mirrored in FSMs' wider campaign for a new 'Declaration on the Rights of Peasants-Women and Men'. The idea of UN-sanctioned rights for peasants was first proposed by Indonesian members of LVC. Through LVC's global encounters and executive process, and in dialogue with NGO allies, drafts of a declaration were introduced and debated in various arenas. In LVC, discord has been brought out into the open, and the norms and rights that emerged in this discourse have been treated as perspectives—not self-evident truths. In LVC, European-originated Marxist ideas exist on an equal plane with indigenous cosmologies (Rosset & Torres, 2014: 12), and liberal traditions of human rights are taken as but one belief system, subject to other systems—and with potential to be reconceptualized or hybridized. LVC prefigures novel forms of rights and citizenship through these inclusive forms of norm-setting, driven by those affected most by the issues at hand (Menser, 2008), and a dialogue among sites and cultures that seeks not complete consensus but a workable overlap of values transformable into guiding principles (Mouffe's 'agonistic deliberation'). In this way, FSMs have belied predictions of an eventual global convergence of cultures—united through capitalist democracy and underpinned by individual rights (de Sousa Santos, 2007). Instead, more participatory processes of rights construction—and the more collectively oriented, pro-poor, and democratic rights norms that emerge therefrom—hint

---

[24] This paragraph draws on Rosset, 2013.

at potential progress towards supranational forms of FS. LVC's deliberatively developed reconceptualization of rights has promoted new rights for peasants *as groups* (not only as individuals), and to 'food sovereignty' (essentially, the right to participation in policy formation) as prerequisites to achieve the widely accepted right to food (Claeys, 2013).

The 20th century process for crafting human rights was not democratic or globally representative, and resulted in weak enforcement mechanisms (see Edelman & James, 2011: 83-85). The possibilities and universality of human rights continue to be debated and the flaws in their state-led development raise obvious concerns for their limitations, particularly in the realm of enforcement. The UN and human rights instruments are partially legitimate, but to more fully match FSMs' aspirational sovereignty they would need to be democratically re-constituted, and strengthened with effective means of enforcement. Yet—even in the absence of effective enforcement—current human rights discourses shape perceptions of the obligations of governing bodies to populations, so they remain tactically important to FS.

Human rights can aid FS multiple ways. Rights can potentially prioritize state action towards the most vulnerable communities of a society (Franco, 2006: 13). If pro-poor normative values underpin rights, shape policy formation, and effectively direct means for enforcement, competing sovereignties between economic classes might better be mediated towards achieving FS. The rights of peasants emphasizes control over land/resources and state obligations, while rights to FS emphasize more effective inclusion of non-elites in rule making spaces, normatively supporting (respectively) FS's localism and its articulation of a relatively novel sense of democratic process legitimacy: the idea that 'the people' themselves can make law.[25] LVC's rights work benefits it internally by helping LVC participants learn of rights mechanisms that exist, and by developing ways to accord diverse positions within LVC to bolster and utilize these mechanisms. At the same time, rights-based campaigns can cause internal tensions, and in fact, LVC's peasant rights campaign has been largely sidelined in recent years (Claeys, 2014).

Primarily, these tensions are between tactical sovereignty ideals. Not all LVC members have wanted to pursue human rights, and some have complained about the forcing of diverse FSM perspectives into the rights frame (Claeys, 2014: 42). Do LVC's plurality of struggles suffer from this forcing? Are human rights (and their associated sites) the best venue for making change? Is social movement participation in supranational sites (more generally) necessary—or

---

[25] In June 2014, the UN Human Rights Council adopted a resolution to develop a 'legally binding instrument' for holding TNCs and other businesses accountable to human rights requirements (HRC, 2014: 3). Meanwhile, a global campaign to create and implement an "International Peoples Treaty" to defend "peoples' rights from corporate power" was launched. Importantly, the campaign includes participants from FSMs and defines the treaty process as "international law from below" and not purely premised on state-signed documents. <http://www.stopcorporateimpunity.org/>

sufficient—to change state actions? Perhaps local or national level social movement action is more important in particular circumstances? These tensions emerge as well in FSM engagement with the CFS. Furthermore, even the idealistic vision of pro-poor human rights does not resolve competing needs between groups of non-elites. The social conquest of rights by FSMs may have discursive effects, and lead over the long term to more just policy priorities, but rights and principles do not themselves resolve competing sovereignties between urban and rural poor, or producers and consumers (see Schiavoni, 2013; Woodhouse, 2010). This points to the difficulty of moving from principles (e.g. 'pro-poor') to policies that can embody them.

Principles from below, but policy from where, and implementation how?

That LVC's land analysis and human rights campaigns have evolved to encompass many types of rural people is promising, successfully accommodating multiple, potentially conflicting constituent members. Yet, this merely replaces an internal problem with an external one: what policies does LVC support to enact the rights of the rights holders it seeks to represent and defend? For example, what policies—especially supranational ones—can ensure the rights of these diverse rural residents to land, considering conflicts in land use among 'peasants' and situations of intra-group tension? Elaborating the details of issues (like land) through deliberation amongst constituents challenges simple policy solutions. Unfortunately, simple statements and prescriptions are often preferred to nuanced positions in both advocacy and policymaking. States operate on simplifying complex social relations (Scott, 1998), and social movements tend to have to frame issues in simplified ways in order to gain support and traction (Patel, 2009: 666). Agreements on simplified discourse are easier to achieve than agreements on policy.

To implement principles, the outcomes of deliberative dialogue must be concrete enough to be converted into policies. FSMs and governments need to address how to accommodate complexity into principles, but also those principles into concrete rules/policy. While 'relational' sovereignty and 'agonistic' democracy might suggest that multiple sovereignties can coexist in time and space, co-constructing and restructuring each other through political dialogue, and that rules in these cases would not be predetermined, universal, or constant, this seems an unsatisfying answer to critics of the implementability of FS. Moving from principles to policies, and policies to implementation, raises multiple challenges of 'institutionalizing dissent' when it comes to human rights (Claeys, 2012).

Typically, human rights instruments suggest the nation-state as the primary guarantor of rights, and FSMs have indeed pushed states to fulfill this role. Yet, simultaneously, they deploy the idea of decentralized rights enforcement, promoting new forms of citizenship wherein non-state actors and sites are also called upon to define, defend, and enforce FS-related rights (Wittman, 2009). But who implements FS rights, and how would this implementation incorpo-

rate or resolve competing sovereignties? If a diversity of peasants have rights, what happens when these rights conflict? In some cases, the non-state sites that FSMs assume should enforce rights may in actuality oppose their implementation (for instance, an 'empowered' community site with patriarchal customary tenure). Ultimately, since rule enforcement (*power over*) entails the exertion of some sovereign's sovereignty over another's, rights enforcement requires the internalization/resolution of competing sovereignties within policies and enforcement mechanisms themselves.

If and when the idea of decentered rule enforcement gathers support, it will face age-old questions of how to accord the individual with the group, or the group with society, making it difficult to imagine how non-state enforcement of rules might work. Stepping back to consider 'rules' more broadly (including but not exclusively 'policy'), we might consider that tensions in enforcement will perpetually stem from prioritization issues. Agarwal (2014) points out how tensions in FS can exist between goals (ecological production, production for local markets, farmer empowerment and choice) that are already agreed upon in principle. How to reach these goals in particular contexts, and with what prioritization (especially when goals conflict) is not settled by principles: principles do not translate automatically into priorities or rules.

The above discussion raises two points (relevant for all three levels). First, inclusively developed norms and principles—built on a foundation of concern for the most economically and politically marginalized non-elites—can *guide* FS policy and implementation without predetermining its details. Yet, frustrating this, it is difficult to predict if, how, or when such principles will be translated into effective sovereignty (i.e. backed by social legitimacy, codified rules, and enforcement capacity), especially considering competing sovereignties (including among non-elites). Effective guidelines for turning FS principles into rules and actualizing these rules remain unclear.

Does trade dominate at the supranational level?

Though the WTO is a multilateral agency premised on national sovereignties, the democratic legitimacy of its governance structure is debated (Scholte, 2002: 291). Activists and scholars argue that the WTO serves primarily the needs of TNCs and powerful states rather than goals of social or environmental justice, and that its dominant position amongst state-based supranational efforts overpowers environmentalist and social justice efforts of other multilateral agreements (Eckersley, 2004; Suárez, 2013). A similar case is made against the FTAs that follow WTO's promotion of liberalized trade policy, but are crafted with even less public transparency than the WTO's rulings. The WTO and FTAs prioritize a growth oriented, export focused, capitalist model of agriculture and thus constrain signatory states' adoption of FS, because FS's fundamental premises are incompatible with this export-growth-development paradigm (Godek & Aráujo, 2014). LVC was originally conceived as a strategic way to strengthen local and national peasant movements by combatting such supranational sites (Torres & Rosset, 2010); it approaches the WTO and FTAs as ele-

ments of anti-peasant neoliberalism, and vociferously opposes their existence or adoption (LVC, 2014, 2013b). This opposition makes sense if one sees the WTO/FTAs as elite "class projects" that delegate policy decisions "to unaccountable agencies", thus reducing "the number of potential sites of resistance" (Watson, 2005: 180). Edelman (2008: 251) points out that FSMs have "yet to achieve similar levels of credibility as critics of macroeconomic and financial policies" as they have vis-à-vis "development and cooperation policies". If these sites *are* 'class projects' of elites—and dominated by their influence—FSMs' lack of 'credibility' in them is no surprise, and unlikely to change (Desmarais, 2007: 104-134).

Yet while the North Atlantic bloc retains incredible sway in trade policy formation (Carroll & Sapinksi, 2010), the increasingly multipolar nature of the global economic system may offer greater opportunities for emerging economies to advance counter-hegemonic reforms. Some FS advocates argue that FSMs should reconsider their rejection of the WTO considering these shifts (Burnett and Murphy, 2014). Judging from the cases discussed in Chapter 4, where FSM-supported leaders of 'progressive' governments in South America maintained domestic policies for export-based corporate agriculture systems, there are reasons for skepticism about this possibility. Following the earlier discussion of the pro-accumulation nation-state, it is uncertain how developing country state actors will balance trade-based growth with protecting peasant agriculture in international venues, and whether such venues are therefore likely to be reformed so as to advance FS. Though it is too early to tell whether nation-state actors within supranational venues of trade policy formation might buck accumulation in favor of social and ecological considerations, it is clear that FS faces an uphill battle if such venues are premised on market primacy and prioritize the voices of economic and political elites over those of non-elites.[26]

Inclusive sovereignty through hybrid governance? Civil society in the CFS

Supranational sites have increasingly included non-state 'stakeholders'. Some of these sites are rejected by FSMs outright, because they are seen as illegitimate, dedicated myopically to accumulation, or dominated by elite actors. Examples include the World Bank and 'sustainable roundtables' on soy and oil palm pro-

---

[26] Some proponents of FS envision progressive state governments adopting mutually supportive supranational policies to protect from "food dumping" and "guarantee fair and stable prices to marginalized small-scale producers" (Pimbert, 2009: 11; Aponte-García, 2011). Should more countries adopt FS as policy and should those countries attempt such regional collaboration we might expect additional tensions. Because regional policy constitutes a form of federalism, the question arises: how do states negotiate the sovereign powers (capacity or rule making) shifted when they participate in supranational alliances? Hence, even 'food sovereign' supranational governance based on popular sovereignty endowed in nation-states will have to face difficult constitutional questions about delineations of sovereignty.

duction. FSMs *have* engaged other sites with greater process legitimacy, but FSMs are not unified on whether participation at any of these sites is helpful compared with other forms of action, especially at the local level (Claeys, 2014).[27] Though the inclusion of non-elite civil society into interstate venues has increased the process legitimacy of such supranational sites (e.g. CFS), these are still subject to accumulation/legitimacy tensions. Because these sites are difficult for non-elites to access, and because they are composed of actors (state representatives, TNCs, elites) often predisposed towards accumulation, these are not sites within which FSMs can easily win truly counter-hegemonic concessions (Wills, 2014: 245). Still, inclusive supranational governance sites are tactically important to gain discourse traction, leverage these discourses against various governance bodies (as they become tools for 'rightful resistance'), and increase unity of frames in FSMs themselves—much like the human rights process described earlier (Claeys, 2014). FSMs are hopeful, but not naive, in their engagement of the CFS.

To support the ability of civil society groups (including prominent members of FSMs) to participate in its reform process, the CFS organized the CSM. This support for civil society actors to organize themselves and have their voice included has had real effects on the CFS's rules. While the TGs did not incorporate every demand of FSMs (e.g. they make no mention of 'food sovereignty'), they do reflect various perspectives and concerns of FSMs (Mulvaney & Schiavoni, 2014: 11-12). Because transnational consensus building among civil society groups requires coordinative resources that such groups often lack, the CSM is an example of how supranational state sites (like national ones) can redistribute sovereign resources of rule making, consensus building (internal legitimacy) and capacity. The CSM shows the potential of building relational sovereignty through interstate venues and potential pathways towards building FS supranationally.

Yet challenges remain. Class, language, and culture can limit the ability to represent or be represented in supranational sites. Large-scale processes are hard to access and sustain influence within, because of basic physical issues of distance and cost. Although the technological easing of communication has reduced such distances to some degree, it is ultimately easier for those with greater social, economic, and technological resources to act transnationally than those with less. The challenge for these processes is to ensure the involvement of those on the ground, specifically the most marginalized members of non-elite communities affected by the policies to be deliberated—which sounds appealing but is in practice very difficult. The fact that community and

---

[27] One area of particular confusion is how to address supranational sites of 'Fair Trade' organization. Fairbairn (2012) claims that FS is too political for such 'ethical' markets, since they do not fundamentally challenge the corporate food regime, but examining more closely the overlaps between peasant producer/FSM communities and Fair Trade networks might challenge this dismissal. Insofar as such sites are based in global food markets, they seem opposed to FS; yet insofar as they prioritize non-economic goals, incorporate the voices and needs of producers into their rules, and offer support for local capacities, they can potentially support FSMs.

movement leaders are not usually paid for their work at these supranational sites (which they do in addition to their other organizing work), or that internet access for rural residents (especially women) is often lacking, means that assuring participation remains a central and ongoing challenge (Mulvaney & Schiavoni, 2014: 23-26).

Furthermore, there are concerns for how democratically representative the 'civil society' included in such venues actually is (Bernauer & Betzold, 2012). How do we know that the CSOs/NGOs central to CSM processes are truly representative of the most marginalized communities the world over—those they seek to represent? The general potential of international justice, environment, and human rights NGOs to represent global societal interests has been scrutinized, as this potential is tempered by questions about accountability and democratic representation (Scholte, 2004: 230-232). While international finance and trade sites like WTO and World Bank have been dismissed by FSMs as irredeemably corrupt and incapable of advancing FS, and UN initiatives have been approached as imperfect yet capable of meaningful reform, even ostensibly 'progressive' sites like LVC may be more or less legitimate depending on who is asked. While peasants formed LVC out of frustration with an over-abundance of NGOs claiming to represent the peasant voice (Desmarais, 2007: 90-103), LVC has itself encountered frustrations and limitations in its efforts to democratically and effectively represent global constituents and to subsume diverse constituents into a cohesive political project of FS (Borras, 2010), as evidenced by our earlier discussion of differences in approaches to state sites.

Additionally, whether policies developed and adopted through these sites make a difference on the ground remains to be seen. Like human rights—and most CFS discourses relate to human rights norms—the TGs may provide a basis for demands on powerful state and private actors, but whether such demands are met is not guaranteed by their existence (Guffens et al, 2013; Edelman & James, 2011). The TGs may result in pro-FS developments in some places, while not at all in others. To construct FS via 'friction' entails acknowledging this uncertainty and the tensions that will emerge with it along the way. Just as state mandates look different when implemented on the ground, supranational forces will never *simply translate* into desired local/national developments.

Conclusions

In this chapter we saw how supranational sovereignty is marked by distance, social complexity, and the 'friction' that occurs when extraterritorial rules and sovereign capacities 'touch down' in specific territories and cultures. Such issues problematize the supranational as an aspirational level for vesting FS, because of rule making and implementation challenges. Yet because of the opportunities that existing supranational sites offer to affect norms and actions, FSMs have not ignored this level. In both internal relations and external engagements, supranationally FSMs put a premium on democratic legitimacy. Newer inclusive processes and pro-poor norm and rule outcomes show promise that state-based supranational sites *may* contribute to FS. Still, legitimacy at

the supranational level cannot simply be turned 'on', but exists perpetually as contested and uncertain. LVC's organizational process of dialogues and alliances has helped it build internal legitimacy and co-construct relational *power with* sovereignty with other sites. The WTO currently has little of either process or outcome legitimacy (vis-à-vis FS). The CFS, through the CSM, has more process legitimacy, but the effects of its rules remain uncertain. A site's legitimacy responds to external demands and internal reforms, and varies at any moment, being legitimate to some societal actors but not to others (O'Brien et al, 2000). In sum, supranational sites are challenged to bring about FS in a manner that could be appreciated as fully democratic and legitimate.

However, we saw indications of how supranational FS might be crafted in emerging inclusive, participatory, and deliberative models, by examining FSMs' internal deliberations, crafting and engagement of 'human rights', and engagement of supranational sites with varying degrees of legitimacy. While these trends offer a rebuttal to utopian liberal capitalist perspectives on the future of global democracy (like Fukayama, 1992), they remain limited in being able to predict or promote an answer to the specific and difficult questions of implementation that will face any attempt to institute supranational FS rules—especially policy based in the multilevel democracy demanded by FS. The FS project, in sum, is uncertain and must retain its hopes for change in spite of this uncertainty.

Chapter 6 : Concluding Discussion

Existing Sovereignty

This paper has attempted to build towards a more comprehensive understanding of the multiple sovereignties that shape FS, and their interactions. *Where* these sovereignties interact may not be that surprising: they interact everywhere in their struggles to shape the global food system, *at* local, national, and supranational levels, but also *between* them, and even *on* them, shaping the ways these levels are perceived and addressed. *How* these sovereignties interact varies widely. In general, the paper found that these sovereignties variously compete and converge as 'sites of sovereignty', manifesting *power to, power with,* and/or *power over*. In the process of competing and converging and through their own internal dynamics, these sites create and recreate norms, discourses, and institutions. These interactions can cause shifts in each site's capacity, legitimacy, rules, and territorial reach, and are themselves shaped by existing but contingent norms and conditions.

Tensions mark sites themselves and their interactions, and emerge in the resolution of competing sovereignties into relational sovereignties. Social class conflicts can occur *within* sites (such as the influences of gender on land access we saw in Chapter 3), and tensions *between* class interests pursued by competing sites of sovereignty manifest at many governmental sites, resulting in the accumulation/legitimation tension (which we saw most prominently in Chapter 4, but can potentially manifest at any level of government). Lastly, even in situations that exhibit transition towards the aspirational sovereignty of FSMs, wherein greater deliberation and inclusivity underpin more democratically legitimate rule making processes, the necessity of implementation raises tensions in converting principles into codified policies, and those policies into concrete actions.

The fact that a site's position at a certain level does not predict its actions has repercussions on existing, tactical, and aspirational sovereignties. Local movements that might articulate with FSMs do not automatically ascribe to the aspirational vision and tactical framework of FSMs: they do not always seek local democratic control, may not prioritize environmental issues except insofar as they interfere with one's ability to produce, and may not even begin to address gender issues. As more territories and cultures intersect with FS discourse, and as states increasingly incorporate and implement FS policies, these diverse localized conditions and aspirations will experience 'friction' with the constituents, tenets, and aspirations of FSMs. The results will shape FSMs just as they shape these territories and cultures.

Aspirational Sovereignty

The aspirational constellation of sovereignty entailed by FS and indicated by FSMs involves changes in both the *quantity* and *quality* of sovereignty. It de-

mands an increase in the quantity of sovereignty exerted by local sites, vis-à-vis national and supranational ones (especially sovereign capacity and rule making within local territories), and an increase of sovereign legitimacy for non-elite peoples and the sites they compose. The paper also indicates that for sites to better match FSMs' aspirational sovereignty, democratic legitimacy (especially difficult for supranational sites) needs to be increased by increasing the quality of rule making, through inclusivity, pro-poor norms, and more deliberative democratic processes. These tools for increasing (democratic) process and (just/ecological) outcome legitimacy could be integrated at all levels, and across sectors. Essentially, FS demands an increase in the *quality* of sovereignty at all levels, and that the territorial reach of sites be limited to those with such process and outcome legitimacy. More generally, to be capable of implementing the FS vision, sites must syncretize the three components of sovereignty at and across various levels and in specific contexts of territoriality. Sovereignty must be democratic, guided by social and ecological principles, and aspire (insofar as is possible) to be internally and externally legitimate, codified in constitutional, policy, and legal frameworks, and capable of being enforced and implemented.

Furthermore, it is also important to recognize FS as an idea in motion. Considering FS's general logic of building change from the ground up, it is unrealistic to expect a categorical aspirational sovereignty for FS, because that 'ground' is always changing—along with those who work it. It would be inappropriate to expect FSMs' aspirational sovereignty to be static, determinate, or singular.

Tactical Sovereignties

While it is difficult to make an assessment of overall strategies towards these aspirations, the tactical possibilities can be assessed in a limited way, in relation to the levels. The local level—partly *because it is a physically accessible place*—is essential for increasing FS and challenging forces arrayed against FS, materially and discursively. With additional support from national governmental sites and supportive normative shifts emerging from supranational rule making, local sites of sovereignty can better increase their external and internal legitimacy, their capacity, and the quality of their rule making. National (state) sites of sovereignty vary widely; tactically, their aptness similarly varies. Insofar as such sites are amenable to include and support local sites (in sovereign quantity and quality terms), they form essential sites for transition to FS. Supranational sites of sovereignty are useful to pressure national governments (and other local, national, and supranational sites), but require constant efforts to democratize them, and maintain their legitimacy. Importantly, sites linking and converging across levels through more inclusive, deliberative, and pro-poor forms of democratic procedures improve the possibility of tempering some of the aforementioned tensions (at least partially).

No level alone, not even the idealized local, can be relied on to construct FS. With existing political circumstances, siting sovereignty locally is in some case likely no more helpful than pushes for greater popular sovereignty within nation-state sites, or deference—a la 'rightful resistance'—to the nation-state as

is. Democratizing influence on supranational sites may be more or less effective than expanding human rights instruments or focusing on state implementation thereof. FSMs may learn from specific deployments of action centered on certain levels and their sites, whether and how they work under particular circumstances, and if they can be effectively spread as successes. However, tactics cannot be assumed to be transferable across contexts (Baletti et al, 2008). Thus, it is impossible to determine in advance what levels/tactics will yield the most or best results of change for any particular situation, and FSMs will no doubt continue to exhibit internal tensions regarding tactical and strategic disagreements.

Policy implications

These findings have some practical policy implications. First, *'power with'* democratic procedures require additional support, experimentation, and refining (especially to match diverse contexts)—for example, 'citizen juries' on GMOs could be funded by governments and counseled by scientists and experts. Second, *'power over'* government policies need to be given more attention, by policy-makers and FSMs, and result in new and renewed mechanisms for control over capital's forms and flows. Third, national policies should be directed towards increasing local communities' *'power to'*—for instance, through support for local agroecology and its integration with scientific resources. Lastly, recognizing that sovereignties can compete but also converge towards FS, progressive national governments can seek greater opportunities for convergence at the supranational level, through strategic alliances of rulemaking, capacity building, and by influencing sovereign legitimacy through pro-FS discourses.

Future research implications

Future analyses can compare FS's aspirational sovereignty to existing processes of food systems construction in all sectors, from determination of decision-making communities to rules making and implementation. Hopefully, the lenses developed here—including sovereignty's *aspects*, its *components*, and the *levels/sites* at which they play out—are useful to such analyses, and have left us better prepared to examine the workings of FS's sovereignties in detail and in specific cases. Helpful future research may include more detailed explorations of how the relational processes of ever-shifting capacity, policy, legitimacy, and territorial reach play out within and between specific state, societal, and market sites. For instance, studies might look at how sectors relate at a particular level (and what incentives influence this relation), the dynamics of capacity between national state and local state sites, or the legitimacy of ethical trade labeling initiatives in relation to local civil societies. Such studies will no doubt offer greater clarity on many important details than I have here.

References

Agarwal, B. (2014) 'Food Sovereignty, Food Security and Democratic Choice: Critical Contradictions, Difficult Conciliations', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.876996

Agarwal, B. (2005) *Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women's Presence Within and Beyond Community Forestry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Agarwal, B. (1994) *A Field of One's Own: Gender and Land Rights in South Asia. Cambridge.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

Agarwal, B. (1992) 'Gender Relations and Food Security: Coping with Seasonality, Drought, and Famine in South Asia'. In L. Beneria and Shelley Feldman, (eds), *Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work.* Harper Collins/Westview.

Altieri, M.A. and V.M. Toledo (2011) 'The Agroecological Revolution In Latin America: Rescuing Nature, Ensuring Food Sovereignty And Empowering Peasants', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38 (3): 587-612.

Altieri, M.A. (1987) *Agroecology: the scientific basis of alternative agriculture.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Aponte-García, M. (2011) 'Regional Trade, Grandnational Enterprises and Food Sovereignty in the ALBA-TCP: Strategic Regionalism for 21st Century Socialism', paper presented at 'ALBA-TCP and the Future of Regional Integration Conference', London Metropolitan University (29 January).

Arsel, M. and N.A. Angel (2012) '"Stating" Nature's Role in Ecuadorian Development: Civil Society and the Yasuní-ITT Initiative', *Journal of Developing Societies*, 28: 203-227.

Baletti, B., Johnson, T., and W. Wolford (2008) '"Late Mobilization": Transnational Peasant Networks and Grassroots Organizing in Brazil and South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3): 290-314.

Barry J. and R. Eckersley (2005) *The State and the Global Ecological Crisis.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Biehl, J. (1997) *The Politics of Social Ecology: Libertarian Municipalism.* Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Bernauer, T., and C. Betzold (2012) 'Civil Society in Global Environmental Governance', *The Journal of Environment and Development*, 21: 62-66.

Bernstein, H. and T. Byres (2001) 'From Peasant Studies to Agrarian Change', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 1(1): pp. 1-56.

Bernstein, H. (2014) 'Food Sovereignty Via the "Peasant Way": A Sceptical View', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.852082

Block, F. (1977) 'The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State', *Socialist Revolution*, 33: 6-28.

Borras, S.M. and J. Franco (2010) 'Towards a Broader View of the Politics of Global Land Grab: Rethinking Land Issues, Reframing Resistance'. *ICAS Working Paper Series No. 001*. TNI/ICAS/LDPI.

Borras, S.M., Edelman, M. and C. Kay (2008) 'Transnational Agrarian Movements: Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impact', in Borras, S.M., M. Edelman, and C. Kay (eds), *Transnational Agrarian Movements Confronting Globalization*, pp. 1-36. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Borras, S.M. (2010) 'The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements', *Development and Change*, 41(5): 771-803.

Borras, S. (2007) *Pro-Poor Land Reform: A Critique*. Ottowa, CA: Ottowa University Press.

Bouregard, S. (2009) 'Food Policy for People: Incorporating Food Sovereignty Principles into State Governance', Senior Comprehensive Report. Los Angeles: Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, Occidental College.

Boyer, J. (2010) Food Security, Food Sovereignty, and Local Challenges for Transnational Agrarian Movements: the Honduras Case', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(2): 319-351.

Burnett, K. and S. Murphy (2014) 'What Place for International Trade in Food Soveriegnty?, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(6): 1065-1084.

Campbell, H. (2009) 'Breaking New Ground in Food Regime Theory: Corporate Environmentalism, Ecological Feedbacks and the "Food from Somewhere" Regime?', *Agriculture and Human Values*, 26: 309-319.

Carroll, W.K. and J.P. Sapinksi (2010) 'The Global Corporate Elite and the Transnational Policy-Planning Network, 1996–2006: A Structural Analysis', *International Sociology*, 25: 501-538.

Castells, M. (2007) 'Communication, Power and Counter-power in Network Society', *International Journal of Communication*, 1: 238-266.

CFS (Committee on World Food Security) (2009) 'Reform of the Committee on World Food Security', Accessed November 12, 2014 from <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/018/k7197e.pdf>

Claeys, P. (2014) 'Via Campesina's Struggle for the Right to Food Sovereignty: From Above or from Below?' In Lambek, N., P. Claeys, A. Wong, and L. Brilmayer (eds) (2014) *Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies, and the Law*, pp. 29-52. New York/London: Springer.

Claeys, P. (2013) 'Claiming Rights and Reclaiming Control: The Creation of New Human Rights by the Transnational Agrarian Movement Vía Campesina and the Transformation of the Right to Food'. PhD Thesis. Louvain, Belgium: University of Louvain.

Claeys, P. (2012) 'The Creation of New Rights by the Food Sovereignty Movement: The Challenge of Institutionalizing Subversion', *Sociology*, 46: 844-858.

Clark, P. (2013) 'Food Sovereignty, Post-Neoliberalism, Campesino Organizations, and the State in Ecuador' paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

Cockburn, J. (2013) 'Bolivia's Food Sovereignty & Agrobiodiversity: Undermining the Local to Strengthen the State?' paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

Corbin, J. (2005) 'Grounded Theory', in Somekh, B. and C. Lewin (eds), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, pp. 49-55. London: Sage.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2007) *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon (Reinventing Social Emancipation)*. London: Verso.

Da Vià, E. (2012) 'Seed diversity, farmers' rights, and the politics of repeasantization', *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 19(2): 229-242.

Davidson, D. (2009) 'Ecoanarchism: A Critical Defence', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 14(1) 47-67, DOI: 10.1080/13569310802636489

De Schutter, O. (2013) *The Reform of the Committee on World Food Security: The Quest for Coherence in Global Governance*. CRIDHO Working Paper 2013/8, UCL.

Desmarais, A. A. and P. Nicholson (2013) *La Via Campesina: An Historical and Political Analysis*. La Via Campesina's Open Book: Celebrating 20 Years of Struggle and Hope. Accessed November 10, 2014 at <http://viacampesina.org/downloads/pdf/openbooks/EN-10.pdf>

Desmarais, A. A. (2008) 'The Power of Peasants: Reflections on the Meanings of La Vía Campesina', *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24: 138–149.

Desmarais, A. A. (2008b) 'Peasant Resistance to Neoliberalism: La Vía Campesina and Food Sovereignty', *Human Geography*, 1(1): 74-80.

Desmarais, A. A. (2007) *Globalization and the Power of Peasants: La Vía Campesina*. Halifax/London: Fernwood/Pluto Press.

Desmarais, A. A. (2004) 'The Vía Campesina: Peasant Women on the Frontiers of Food Sovereignty', *Canadian Woman Studies*, 23(1): 140–145.

Desmarais, A.A. (2002) 'Peasants Speak - The Vía Campesina: Consolidating an International Peasant and Farm Movement', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 29(2): 91-124.

Dingwerth, K. (2004) *Democratic Governance beyond the State: Operationalizing an Idea*. Global Governance Working Paper No 14. Amsterdam, Berlin, Oldenburg, Potsdam: The Global Governance Project. Accessed November 10, 2014 at <glogov.org>

Dryzek, J. and H. Stevenson (2011) 'Global Democracy and Earth System Governance', *Ecological Economics*, 70: 1865-1874.

Eckersley, R. (2004) 'The Big Chill: The WTO and Multilateral Environmental Agreements', *Global Environmental Politics*, 4(2): 24-50.

Eckersley, R. (2005) *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty. Cambridge*, MA: MIT Press.

Eckersley, R. (2005b) 'Greening the Nation-State: From Exclusive to Inclusive Sovereignty', in Barry, J. and R. Eckersley (eds) *The State and Global Ecological Crisis*, pp.159-180. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edelman, M., and James, C. (2011) 'Peasants' Rights and the UN System: Quixotic Struggle? Or Emancipatory Idea Whose Time Has Come?', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(1): 81-108.

Edelman, M. (2014) 'Food Sovereignty: Forgotten Genealogies and Future Regulatory Challenges', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.876998

Edelman, M. (2009) 'Synergies And Tensions Between Rural Social Movements And Professional Researchers', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1): 245-265.

Edelman, M. (2008) 'Transnational Organizing in Agrarian Central America: Histories, Challenges, Prospects', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3): 229–257.

Fairbairn, M. (2012) 'Framing Transformation: The Counter-Hegemonic Potential of Food Sovereignty in The US Context', *Agriculture and Human Values*, 29: 217–230. DOI 10.1007/s10460-011-9334-x

Flyvbjerg, B. (2004) 'Five Misunderstandings About Case Study Research', in Seale, C., G. Gobo, J. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, pp. 390-404. London: Sage.

Foster J. and F. Magdoff (2011) *What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must Be Defended.* New York: Picador.

Fox, J. (1993) *The Politics of Food in Mexico: State Power and Social Mobilization.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Franco, J. (2006) 'Making Land Rights Accessible: Potentials and Challenges of a Human Rights Approach to Land Issues'. Amsterdam: TNI. Accessed November 11, 2014 <http://landwise.landesa.org/records/2195>

Fukayama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York: Free Press.

Gaventa, J. (2006) 'Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis', *IDS Bulletin*, 37(6): 23-33.

Giunta, I. (2014) 'Food Sovereignty in Ecuador: Peasant Struggles and the Challenge of Institutionalization', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(6): 1201-1224.

Godek, W. and S. Aruájo (2014) 'Opportunities and Challenges for Food Sovereignty Policies in Latin America: The Case of Nicaragua', In Lambek, N., P. Claeys, A. Wong, and L. Brilmayer (eds) (2014) *Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies, and the Law*, pp. 53-74. New York/London: Springer.

Godek, W. (2013) 'The Complexity of Food Sovereignty Policymaking: The Case of Nicaragua's Law 693', paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

Goodman, D., DuPuis, E.M., and M. Goodman (2012) 'Coming Home to Eat? Reflexive Localism and Just Food', In Goodman, DuPuis, and Goodman (eds) *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice, and Politics*, pp. 11-32. London: Routledge.

Guffens, C., F. Kroff, and P. Seufert (2013) 'The Myth of Good Land and Natural Resource Governance in Europe: What the Case Studies Reveal and How the CFS Tenure Guidelines on Land, Fisheries, and Forests Provide Guidance to Revise European Land Policies', in Lanf, M. and D. Mokrani (eds) *Beyond Development: Alternative Visions from Latin America*, pp. 5-14. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and trans. Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Gray, M. (2013) *Labor and the Locavore: The Making of a Comprehensive Food Ethic*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hansen T.B. and F. Stepputat (2005) 'Sovereignty Revisited', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35: 295-315.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. London: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The new imperialism*. London: Oxford University Press.

Heywood, A. (2004) *Political Theory: An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holt-Giménez, E. and A. Shattuck (2011) 'Food Crises, Food Regimes and Food Movements: Rumblings of Reform or Tides of Transformation?', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(1): 109-144.

Holt-Giménez, E. (2006) *Campesino A Campesino: Voices From Latin America's Farmer To Farmer Movement For Sustainable Agriculture*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.

Hospes, O. (2013) 'Food Sovereignty: The Debate, the Deadlock, and a Suggested Detour', *Agriculture and Human Values*, DOI 10.1007/s10460-013-9449-3

HRC (UN Human Rights Council) (2014) 'Human Rights And Transnational Corporations And Other Business Enterprises', Resolution A/HRC/26/L.1. Accessed November 10 2014 <http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_e.aspx?si=A/HRC/RES/26/22>

IAASTD (2009) *Agriculture at a crossroads. The global report of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science, and Technology*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

ICSP (International Commission on Sustainable Peasant Agriculture) (2013) *From Maputo to Jakarta: 5 Years of Agroecology in La Vía Campesina*. Jakarta, Indonesia: La Via Campesina.

Iles, A. and M. Montenegro de Wit (2013) 'Building Relational Food Sovereignty across Scales: An Example from the Peruvian Andes' paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

Iles, A. and M. Montenegro de Wit (2014) 'Sovereignty at what scale? An inquiry into multiple dimensions of food sovereignty', *Globalizations*, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2014.957587

Jansen, K. (2014) 'The Debate on Food Sovereignty Theory: Agrarian Capitalism, Dispossession, and Agroecology', *The Journal of Peasant Studies,* DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2014.945166

Kauneckis, D., and K. Andersson (2009) 'Making Decentralization Work: A Cross-national Examination of Local Governments and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America', *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 44: 23–46.

Keck, M. and K. Sikkink (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithica/London: Cornell University Press.

Kloppenburg, J., and N. Hassanein (2006) 'From Old School to Reform School?' *Agriculture and Human Values*, 23: 417-421.

Kohr, L. (1978) *The Breakdown of Nations*. Accessed November 11, 2014 <http://www.ditext.com/kohr/kohr.html>

Kuntz, M. (2012) 'Destruction of public and governmental experiments of GMO in Europe', *GM Crops and Food: Biotechnology in Agriculture and the Food Chain*, (3)4: 258-264.

Li, T.M. (2009) 'To Make Live or Let Die? Rural Dispossession and the Protection of Surplus Populations', *Antipode*, 41(S1): 66–93.

Litfin, K. (1998) *The Greening of Sovereignty in World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Lupel, A. (2009) *Globalization and Popular Sovereignty*. London: Routledge.

LVC (La Vía Campesina) (2014) 'Rome: STOP TTIP, CETA and Other Destructive Trade Policies'. Accessed November 10, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/actions-and-events-mainmenu-26/stop-free-trade-agreements-mainmenu-61/1683-stop-ttip-ceta-and-other-destructive-trade-policies>

LVC (2014a) 'In the Year of Family Farming: Food Sovereignty is the Framework for Family Farm Resilience'. Accessed June 30, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/sustainable-peasants-agriculture-mainmenu-42/1625-la-via-campesina-s-position-on-the-international-year-of-family-farming-2014>

LVC (2014b) 'Mozambique: The Nampula Declaration'. Accessed June 30, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/news-from-the-regions-mainmenu-29/1609-the-nampula-declaration>

LVC (2014c) 'Evenstad Declaration'. Accessed June 30, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/sustainable-peasants-agriculture-mainmenu-42/1567-evenstad-declaration>

LVC (2013) 'November 25th: End Violence Against Women'. Accessed June 30, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/women-mainmenu-39/1524-november-25th-end-violence-against-women>

LVC (2013a) 'Deal a Decisive Blow to Neoliberalism: Call to Action'. Accessed November 10, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/actions-and-events-mainmenu-26/10-years-of-wto-is-enough-mainmenu-35/1526-deal-a-decisive-blow-to-neoliberalism>

LVC (2013b) 'La Via Campesina Demands an End to the WTO; Peasants Believe that the WTO Cannot be Reformed or Turned Around'. Accessed November 10, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/actions-and-events-mainmenu-26/10-years-of-wto-is-enough-mainmenu-35/1538-la-via-campesina-demands-an-end-to-the-wto-peasants-believe-that-the-wto-cannot-be-reformed-or-turned-around>

LVC (2012) 'The People of the World Confront the Advance of Capitalism: Rio+20 and Beyond'. Accessed November 10, 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/actions-and-events-mainmenu-26/-climate-change-and-agrofuels-mainmenu-75/1248-the-people-of-the-world-confront-the-advance-of-capitalism-rio-20-and-beyond>

LVC (2012a) 'International Conference of Peasants and Farmers: Stop Land Grabbing!' Accessed 29 June 2014 from <http://viacampesina.org/downloads/pdf/en/mali-report-2012-en1.pdf>

LVC (2011) 'The G20: An Illegitimate Club Incapable of Resolving World Crises'. Accessed November 1st 2014 <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/food-sovereignty-and-trade-mainmenu-38/1114-the-g20-an-illegitimate-club-incapable-of-resolving-world-crises>

Malseed, K. (2008) 'Where There is No Movement: Local Resistance and the Potential for Solidarity', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8 (2/3): 489-514.

Mamonova, N.V. and O. Visser (2014) 'State Marionettes, Phantom Organisations or Genuine Movements? The Paradoxical Emergence of Rural Social Movement in Post-Socialist Russia', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(4): 491-516.

Mamonova, N.V. (2013) 'Challenging the Dominant Assumptions About Peasants' Responses to Land Grabbing. "Politics from below" in Ukraine'. (LDPI Working Papers 39). The Hague: Land Deals Politics Initiative (LDPI).

Marshall, G. (2008) 'Nesting, Subsidiarity, and Community-based Environmental Governance Beyond the Local Level', *International Journal of the Commons*, 2(1): 75-97.

Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*. London: Sage.

McKay B. and R. Nehring (2014) 'The "State" of Food Sovereignty in Latin America: Political Projects and Alternative Pathways in Venezuela, Ecuador And Bolivia', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(6): 1175-1200.

McKay, B. and R. Nehring (2013) 'The 'State' of Food Sovereignty in Latin America: Political Projects and Alternative Pathways in Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia' paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

McMichael, P. (2014) 'Historicizing Food Sovereignty', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(6): 933-957.

McMichael, P. (2013) *Food Regimes and Agrarian Questions*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

McMichael, P. (2009) 'Global Citizenship and Multiple Sovereignties: Reconstituting Modernity', in Yildiz Atasoy (ed.) *Hegemonic Transitions, the State and Crisis in Neoliberal Capitalism. Routledge Studies in Governance and Change in the Global Era*, pp. 23-42. London: Routledge.

McMichael, P. (2008) 'The Peasant as "Canary"? Not Too Early Warnings of Global Catastrophe', *Development*, 51(4): 504-511.

Menser, M. (2008) 'Transnational Participatory Democracy in Action: The Case of La Via Campesina', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 39(1): 20-41.

Mouffe, C. (2011) 'Civil Society, Democratic Values and Human Rights', in Carver, T. and J. Barteson (eds) *Globality, Democracy, and Civil Society*, pp. 95-111. London: Routledge.

Mulvaney, P. and C. Schiavoni (2014) 'Evaluation of the CSM'. Accessed November 11 2014 <http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/120/draftexternalreportcsm evaluation_02june.pdf>

Mulvany, P. (2007) 'Food Sovereignty Comes of Age', *Food Ethics Council*, 2(3): 19-20. Accessed June 30, 2014 <http://l-ikel.org/food-sov_fec-nyeleni.pdf>

Newell, P. (2008) 'Trade and Biotechnology in Latin America: Democratization, Contestation and the Politics of Mobilization', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3): 345-376.

Nyéléni (2007) 'Declaration of Nyéléni'. Accessed June 30, 2014 from <http://www.nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290>

Nyéléni (2007a) 'Theme 4: Sharing Territories and Land, Water, Fishing Rights, Aquaculture and Forest Use, Between Sectors', from *Declaration of Nyéléni*. Accessed June 30 2014 <http://www.nyeleni.org/spip.php?article116>

O'Brien, R., Goetz, A.M., Scholte, J.A., and M. Williams (2000) *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

O'Brien, K. (2013) 'Rightful Resistance Revisited', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(6): 1051-1062.

O'Laughlin, B. (2014) Presentation Given at 'Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue' colloquium held at the International Institute of Social Studies, 24 January, 2014. Accessed November 10, 2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S-cbum8ASqg>

Oxfam (2010) 'Fighting Hunger in Brazil: Much Achieved, More to Do'. Accessed 10 November 2014. <http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/cs-fighting-hunger-brazil-090611-en.pdf>

Patel, R. (2009) 'Grassroots Voices'. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(3): 663-706.

Pimbert, M. (2009) 'Towards Food Sovereignty: Reclaiming autonomous food systems', *IIED*. Accessed June 30, 2014 from http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G02374.pdf

Ploeg, J.D. van der (2013) *Peasants and the Art of Farming: A Chayanovian Manifesto*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Ploeg, J.D. van der (2010) 'The Peasantries of the Twenty-First Century: The Commoditisation Debate Revisited', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37: 1-30.

Ploeg, J.D. van der (2008) *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. London: Routledge.

Purcell, M. and J. C. Brown (2005) 'Against the Local Trap: Scale and the Study of Environment and Development', *Progress in Development Studies*, 5(4): 279–297.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism*. London: New Left Books.

Raynolds, L.T. (2000) 'Re-Embedding Global Agriculture: The International Organic and Fair Trade Movements', *Agriculture and Human Values*, 17: 297–309.

Ribot, J.C. (2002) *Democratic Decentralization Of Natural Resources: Institutionalizing Popular Participation*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Robbins, M.J. (2013) 'Locating Food Sovereignty: Geographical and Sectoral Distance in the Global Food System', ISS Working Paper No.557. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

Roman-Alcalá, A. (2014) '"The Local" as Site for Food Sovereignty: An Examination of Evolving Institutions for Democratic Control of the Global Food System', paper for 'Political Economy of Hunger and the Global Food System' course, Institute of Social Studies.

Roman-Alcalá, A. (2013) 'Occupy the Farm: A Study of Civil Society Tactics to Cultivate Commons and Construct Food Sovereignty in the United States', paper for Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale, CT (14-15 September).

Rosset, P.M. and M.E. Martínez-Torres (2014) 'Diálogo de Saberes in La Vía Campesina: Food Sovereignty and Agroecology', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.872632

Rosset, P.M. and M.E. Martínez-Torres (2012) 'Rural Social Movements And Agroecology: Context, Theory, And Process', *Ecology and Society*, 17(3): 17.

Rosset, P. (2013) 'Rethinking Agrarian Reform, Land and Territory in La Via Campesina', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(4): 721-775.

Rosset, P. (2006) 'Moving Forward: Agrarian Reform as Part of Food Sovereignty', in Rosset, P., Patel, R. and M. Courville (eds), *Promised Land: Competing Visions of Agrarian Reform*, pp. 301-321.

Saragih, H. (2013) 'Interview with Henry Saragih, International Coordinator of La Via Campesina', in Suárez, S.M. (2013) The Human Rights Framework in Contemporary Agrarian Struggles, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(1), pp. 276-280.

Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S. (2003) 'Globalization or Denationalization?', *Review of International Political Economy*, 10(1): 1-22.

Sayer, A. (2012) 'Power, Causality, and Normativity: A Critical Realist Critique of Foucault', *Journal of Political Power*, 5(2): 179-194.

Schiavoni, C. (2013) 'Competing Sovereignties, Contested Processes', ISS Working Paper No. 583. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

Scholte, J.A. (2004) 'Civil Society and Democratically Accountable Global Governance', *Government and Opposition*, 39(2): 211-233.

Scholte, J.A. (2002) 'Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance', *Global Governance*, 8: 281-304.

Scott, J. (1998) *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. (1976) *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Suárez, S.M. (2013) 'The Human Rights Framework in Contemporary Agrarian Struggles', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(1): 239-290.

Sundar, N. (2014) 'Mimetic Sovereignties, Precarious Citizenship: State Effects in a Looking-Glass World', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(4): 469-490.

Swyngedouw, E. (2005) 'Governance Innovation and the Citizen: The Janus Face of Governance-beyond-the-State', *Urban Studies*, 42(11): 1991–2006.

Tarlau, R. (2014) 'Thirty Years of Landless Workers Demanding State Power', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 58, Accessed November 8, 2014 <http://berkeleyjournal.org/2014/10/thirty-years-of-landless-workers-demanding-state-power/>

Thelen, K. and S. Steinmo (1992) 'Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics', in S. Steinmo, K. Thelen and F. Longstreth (eds) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, pp. 1-32. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Torres, M. and P. Rosset (2010) 'La Vía Campesina: The Birth and Evolution of a Transnational Social Movement', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(1): 149-175.

Tsing, A. (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Watson, M. (2005) *Foundations of International Political Economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weis, T. (2010) 'The Accelerating Biophysical Contradictions of Industrial Capitalist Agriculture', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 10(3), 315-341.

White, B. (2012) 'Agriculture and the Generation Problem: Rural Youth, Employment and the Future of Farming', *IDS Bulletin*, 43: 9–19. DOI: 10.1111/j.1759-5436.2012.00375.x

Wiebe, N. (2006) 'Women Reversing Desertification: Via Campesina Takes on Aracruz Corporation in Brazil', *Canadian Woman Studies*, 25(3-4): 167-172.

Wills, J. (2014) *The World Turned Upside Down? A Critical Enquiry into the Counter-Hegemonic Potential of Socioeconomic Rights Praxis in Global Civil Society*. Doctoral Thesis: University of Leicester School of Law.

Wittman, H., A.A. Desmarais, and N. Wiebe (2010) *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.

Wittman, H. (2009) 'Reworking The Metabolic Rift: La Vía Campesina, Agrarian Citizenship, And Food Sovereignty', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(4): 805–826.

Wolfenson, K. (2013) *Coping With the Food and Agriculture Challenge: Smallholders' Agenda*. Rome: Natural Resources Management & Environment Department, FAO.

Woodhouse, P. (2010) 'Beyond Industrial Agriculture? Some Questions about Farm Size, Productivity and Sustainability', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 10(3): 437-453.

World Bank (2008) *World Development Report*. Accessed November 8, 2014 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/477365-1327599046334/WDR_00_book.pdf>

Wright A. and W. Wolford (2003) *To Inherit the Earth: The Landless Movement and the Struggle for a New Brazil*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.

Zibechi, R. (2012) *Territories in Resistance: A Cartography of Latin American Social Movements*. AK Press: Oakland.