Friction: indigenous peoples and food sovereignty

A Research Paper presented by:

Ana Valeria Recalde Vela
(Ecuador)

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

Major:

Agriculture Food and Environmental Studies
AFES

Members of the Examining Committee:

Jun Borras
Murat Arsel

The Hague, The Netherlands
December 2017

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:

Postal address:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460
Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Acknowledgements

Many special thanks first of all to my dear friends in Guatemala. Rolando Lemus, Antonio González and Ronnie Palacios who were my key informants but also kindly introduced me to APO in SMJ. Special thanks also to Antonio González, for guiding me through the most important aspects of my research. I hope to do justice to all the knowledge REDSAG shared with me.

I also want to express my gratitude to all my dear friends from San Martín Jilotepeque, for sharing all of your fascinating life experiences. My dear friends, José Silvio, Hirene, and Chelita. Thank you for being so kind from the smallest to the biggest of favors. For being so welcoming, accommodating, and for introducing me to your neighbors, friends and family. Thank you Chelita for keeping my mother company.

Thanks to my mother who accompanied me day and night through this process; patiently waiting, listening, and supporting me through the weeks of fieldwork. And to my sister too, thank you both for your unconditional help, especially in transcribing endless interviews. Thanks to my father for watching over me and helping me with valuable information. Hopefully this experience can enrich your exchanges with civil society, so that FAO may continue to positively impact rural development in Guatemala.

Thanks to my friends of Acción Ecológica Alex and Xavier for your time and very kind support. You helped me think about the direction of my paper, and introduced me to important contacts who helped improve my analysis. Also to my friend Lily for scheduling my first appointments with important CSOs.

Thanks to my dear ISS friends. Christina, you have encouraged me so much and given me confidence with your help and constant words of support. Our exchanges have been extremely helpful, thank you for your time and kindness. Daniela, my intellectual budbud. Thank you for sharing all your knowledge on anthropology that helped enrich my arguments, thanks to you, and to my dearest friend Naru for our talks and support during stressful times. Also, special thanks to Alberto, Zoe and Tsegaye for your awesome inputs.

Thanks to my reader Murat, for all the comments I received from you during this process, and especially your guidance before going to the field. Thanks for the many useful tips and for reassuring me that my age would not be a setback. Last but not least, thank you to my supervisor Jun, for introducing me to food sovereignty. I am lucky to have worked for and with you. This experience has deeply influenced how I think about development. I will always keep it close to me in my future endeavors. I have learned so much the past months, thanks for pushing me to do better.

Contents

List of Appendices

List of Acronyms

Abstract

Relevance for Development Studies .

Chapter 1: Introduction

Food Sovereignty as a Universalism in Dialogue

Problem and Research Question

Analytical Framework

Methodology

Relevance for Development Studies

Chapter 2: Capitalism and Indigenous Peoples' constructions of Food Sovereignty

Historical Friction: the encounter of capitalism and indigenous peoples

Historical Friction: intergenerational transmission of knowledge in SMJ

Chapter 3: Multiple and competing Sovereignties in Dialogue

Relational Lens

Interactive Lens

Chapter 4: Indigenous Peoples and Peasant-Centric Universalisms

Relational Lens

Interactive Lens

Chapter 5: Conclusions

References

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

List of Appendices

Appendix A — **Interview Guide:** Primary Mapping of Social Relations and Conditions shaping these relations in function of food sovereignty at community level

Appendix B — **Interview Guide**: Understanding food sovereignty in practice by framing interview questions around the six pillars

Appendix C — **Broadly Defined Social Actors Interviewed**

List of Acronyms

AJR— Asociación por la Justicia y Reconciliación

APO—Asociación de Productores Orgánicos

ATALC—Amigos de la tierra América Latina y el Caribe

CCDA—Comité Campesino del Altiplano

CLOC—Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo

CAOI—Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas

CODECA—Comité de Desarrollo Campesino

CODESMAJ—Comités de Desarrollo San Martín Jilotepeque

CONAVIGUA—Coordinadora de Viudas de Guatemala

CONFEPESCA—Confederación Centroamericana de Pescadores Artesanales

CONGCOOP—Coordinación de ONGs y Cooperativas Guatemala

CONIC—Coordinadora Nacional Indígena Campesina

COPROFAM—Coordinadora de Productores Familiares

CUC—Comité de Unidad Campesina

ECMIA—Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Américas

FAO—United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization

FIAN—Food First Information Action Network

FUNDEBASE—Fundación para el Desarrollo y Fortalecimiento de las Organizaciones de Base

IITC—International Indian Treaty Council

LVC—La Vía Campesina

MAELA—Movimiento Agroecológico de Latino América y el Caribe

MAGA—Ministerio de Agricultura Y Ganadería

RALLT—Red por una América Latina Libre de Transgénicos

RAP-AL—Centro Regional para América Latina y el Caribe de Pesticide Action Network (PAN)

REDCASSAN—Red Centroamericana de Seguridad y Soberanía Alimentaria

REDSAG—Red para la Defensa de la Soberanía Alimentaria en Guatemala

SLT—San Lucas Tolimán

SMJ—San Martín Jilotepeque

Abstract

By framing food sovereignty as 'universalism,' this paper unveils various dynamics of food sovereignty as a concept and movement that travel across cultures and geographies. Through this political process, food sovereignty is contested by the plural visions which its adherents advance. By examining indigenous peoples of Guatemala and their encounter with food sovereignty as a case study, I discuss three 'awkward encounters' which have shaped, but also enriched, the ideas of and movements for food sovereignty. First, the historical encounters of indigenous peoples and capitalism and how this shapes contemporary understandings and constructions of food sovereignty. Second, encounters of multiple and competing sovereignties as plural expressions of indigenous self-determination. Thirdly, the encounters between indigenous peoples and peasant-centric universals embodied in food sovereignty which continue to reproduce. By using Anna Tsing's concept of "friction" in analyzing these three encounters, I problematize romantic notions of indigenous peoples and food sovereignty, revealing challenges and contradictions in the constructions of food sovereignty.

Relevance for Development Studies

Thinking from a post-development perspective, development has been a discourse and practice constructed in the global imaginary to exert control upon "under-developed countries" by instilling notions of superiority of Western modernity. Within this discourse, indigenous peoples can be regarded as the antithesis of modernity. An important objective of development today then, is to re-evaluate existing avenues that have until today established hegemonic notions of progress. And while many have argued that it is by looking back to indigenous or traditional ways of sustaining the well-being of humans and nature that we can build new paradigms; it is problematic to not see that we must move beyond dichotomies that reproduce paradigms of modernity if we are to succeed (Agrawal 1995). The discussion of friction emanating in universal encounters is an interesting way of looking at how development, or human well-being is also being constructed through dialogues, encounters, negotiations between ideal universalist notions of well-being and local interpretations of these. In this work I regard food sovereignty not only as a frame of contention used by social movements but also as a discursive ideal goal for rural development whereby the most excluded and marginalized rural peoples can construct their own paradigms and avenues for development.

Key Words: food sovereignty, indigenous peoples, universalism, friction

Chapter 1 : Introduction

"Friction": the awkward, unequal, unstable, and creative qualities of interconnection across difference (Tsing 2005:4). Friction "changes everyone's trajectory" but simultaneously "friction is required to keep global power in motion", a reminder of the "importance of interaction in defining movement, cultural form, and agency" (Tsing 2005:6). This research explores how universalisms interact in "friction" with local spaces, creating new social, economic, and political configurations. More specifically, it explores how food sovereignty travels, as a universalizing ideal, across geographies, political spaces, and cultures, shaping and re-shaping those it encounters, but also re-shaping itself. This has become increasingly apparent, given that in its short history, food sovereignty has been repeatedly redefined by its encounter with actors engaging in the "movement of movements" (Edelman and Borras 2016:68). That is the nature of food sovereignty. As one of the key groups engaging in continuous global and local constructions of food sovereignty, indigenous peoples' stand at a particularly "awkward" place when engaging in the global motion of food sovereignty. Grey and Patel (2014:432) argued that "the central ideas of food sovereignty map imperfectly onto Indigenous struggles in North America". This research turns to indigenous peoples in Guatemala to argue that the friction of their encounter with food sovereignty enriches both, by engaging the many visions on how to build sovereign spaces into dialogue. This work provides a critical analysis of the construction of food sovereignty as a universalism and points at various frictions that come about in the encounter of a universalism, and the "culturally specific" (Tsing 2005:1).

Food Sovereignty as a Universalism in Dialogue

For two decades now, food sovereignty has flourished at the center-stage of rural politics, food politics, agrarian studies, and related fields by becoming "a critical component in global food movements" (Akram-Lodhi 2015:565). It has gained widespread recognition and attention not only for being a "powerful mobilizing frame for social movements" but also for contributing "to the formation of broad-based transnational coalitions" (Edelman 2014:959-960). Food sovereignty was initially framed "as an alternative to the FAO's concept of 'food security'" (Edelman 2014:966). But within a short period, it hastily evolved, broadening its scope via the exchanges among social movements and organizations that adhere to its principles. Its promotion by dominant movement, La Via Campesina (LVC) has been inclined to push for a universalizing narrative around key concepts like food systems and land property systems. This has been key to its powerful frame for mobilizing movements, but these visions have not gone unchallenged.

Food sovereignty has been widely embraced in the Global North and South, rural and urban, farming and non-farming sectors and "increasingly referred to by pastoralist, fisherfolk, and indigenous peoples' organizations and by associated NGOs, CSOs" and even United Nations agencies (Windfuhr and Jonsén 2005:1). Nevertheless, the same universalizing narrative which it is based

upon, produces awkward encounters with the very same peoples on whose names food sovereignty is being advocated. Indigenous peoples are an example of these awkward encounters through which food sovereignty has been and may continue to be redefined, to foster greater inclusion within its struggle to build alternative food system paradigms.

Tensions have, as a matter of fact, been addressed by scholars and proponents. Edelman (2014:965) traces its "genealogy" and reaffirms that the concept has been "contested and in ongoing process of semantic and political evolution" (Ibid:967). Rosset (2013:724) addresses tensions underlying the diversity of movements, which have "over time led to confrontation and debate, usually resolved in expanded visions and evolving collective constructions". Other scholars have taken a legal angle to exploring tensions within food sovereignty. Hospes (2013:121) for instance proposed "a pluralistic approach" in addressing the tensions underlying diversity, while various other contributions have helped disclose how food sovereignty is constructed in practice by social movements around the world. More importantly, how challenges posed by 'big tent politics' are overcome in the renewal of the concept.

An argument made by Patel (2009:669) established that LVC, is bound to "partial universality" in that its members, "despite their variety" and "multiple geographies" must pledge to "a few core principles" "analogue in the definition of food sovereignty", hinting this embodies a type of moral universalism. In the same manner, various other social movements who gathered in Nyéléni (2007), the global forum for food sovereignty, are also subscribing to its universalizing ideals. Anna Tsing (2005) calls "universalism", that which aspires "to fulfill universal dreams and schemes". Universalisms can embody ideals that are "implicated in *both* imperial schemes to control the world and liberatory mobilizations for justice and empowerment" (Tsing 2005:9). Nevertheless, even schemes for justice and empowerment, are bound to reproduce conflicts and tensions; frictions.

Universalism "inspires expansion—for both the powerful and the powerless" as "those excluded from universal rights protest their exclusion" they "beckon to elite and excluded alike" (Tsing 2005:9). Likewise, food sovereignty emerged as a grassroots alternative to top-down food security paradigm. And as a response to the wave of neoliberal capitalism systematically undermining the livelihoods and rights of millions of peasants and rural dwellers around the world. Tsing (2005:7) shows that "universal aspirations must travel across distance and difference", "across localities and cultures", and by doing so "are charged and changed by their travels". As universalisms travel, she argues, they produce "new arrangements of culture and power" because encounters across geographies and spaces are "heterogeneous and unequal" (Ibid:5). Likewise, food sovereignty becomes "hybrid, transient, and involved in constant reformulation through dialogue" (Ibid:9). The following discussion is centered around encounters experienced in the universal travels of food sovereignty.

Encounters: Food Sovereignty & Capitalism

Tsing (2005:1) claims "we are stuck with universals created in cultural dialogue". Food sovereignty too, developed in cultural dialogue from and with various paradigms. This theoretical exploration addresses three of these paradigms: capitalism, social justice, and peasant-centric paradigms. Capitalism is a crucial starting point to understand the logic of food sovereignty. Grassroot peasant-farmer voices articulated food sovereignty by calling against the dominant, capitalist food system, challenging notions of capitalist and modernist superiority. Notions embodied in dichotomies of progress and backwardness as industrial/urban and peasantry/rural. Yet, the contradiction at the heart of this struggle is that rural peoples have long been embedded in capitalist dynamics. An extensive body of food sovereignty literature flags these contradictions.

McMichael's (2014) argument is central. He contends that food sovereignty "emerged as the antithesis of the corporate food regime", yet, it is conditioned by the "restructuring" and alterations of the food regime (Ibid:934). Food sovereignty unfolds in "its multiple forms and circumstances across time and space" in function of capitalist dynamics, it is "conditioned by the contours of the food regime" (Ibid:933). The changing nature of food sovereignty in cultural dialogue with capitalism is depicted in the evolution "from dumping […] and appropriating land for agro-exports, to a displacement of WTO trade rules by (governed) enclosure" (Ibid: 951). Alonso-Fradejas et al (2015:437) explore practical encounters between capitalism and food sovereignty like "the 'mainstreaming' of organic food or Fair Trade products within monopoly firms whose business model is devastating small and mid-sized family farms".

Burnette and Murphy (2015) and Alonso-Fradejas et al (2015) both raise the question of long-distance trade and the insertion of small-scale producers into global value chains/webs. Burnette and Murphy (2015:1065) argues that "agricultural commodity trade is central to the livelihoods of millions of farmers across the globe". They show that although food sovereignty movements are often unclear on their position on trade, movements have also been forced to dialogue with capitalism in this front. Food sovereignty initially rejected trade in "the condemnation of the WTO", but the movement has shifted, assuming a position that "accepts trade under certain circumstances" (Ibid:1070,1068). In fact, the movement cannot be "hostile to trade" as its members too, sell in international markets, and "livelihoods depend on trade" (Ibid:1068,1066).

In this line, Alonso-Fradejas et al (2015) question how food sovereignty constructions can "be repositioned" upon the "rise of flex crops and commodities and the reorganization of production, fragmentation, industrialization, circulation and consumption" (Ibid:439). Although the violent encounter between peasants and capitalism through land enclosures "has affected all forms of land access, use and tenure"; still, dispossession is not always inflicted by "land-grabbing or corporate schemes" (Ibid:440). And small-holders are still compelled into commodification schemes by intangible capitalist forces embedded in global connections, according to Li (2014).

Alonso-Fradejas et al (2015:439-440) remind us that food sovereignty's "original formulation" or initial encounter was around the "struggle against neoliberal globalization" and as a blatant "response to capitalist agriculture's three-decade neoliberal trend of market-driven dispossession of peasant lands". However, responses grounded on food sovereignty are also shaped in the form of "friction, slippage and resistance" as capital advances its "control over the spaces and place where surplus is produced" (Ibid:441). Thus, food sovereignty constructions must be understood as a *process* of achieving the antithesis of the corporate food regime by responding to its many forms, as adherents continue to engage in capitalist structures.

Encounters: Food Sovereignty & Global Justice

Another defining encounter for 'food sovereignty as a universal' is with notions of social justice and rights. As Patel (2009:663) puts it, "food sovereignty is precisely about invoking a right to have rights over food" in line with Hannah Arendt's premise on the "right to have rights" (Arendt 1967:177). Indeed, the cradle of food sovereignty are social movements seeking universal notions of social justice and rights. The late twentieth century experienced the rise of social movements organized around new struggles and "as vehicles of protest: human rights, ethnic identity politics, indigenous rights, feminism, gay rights, and environmentalism" also seeking to advance universalisms including justice, freedom and rights-based demands (Tsing 2005:4).

Likewise, transnational agrarian movements (TAMs) experienced an upsurge stemming in the eighties. Contemporary TAMs originate from efforts "to establish common political threads" articulating "movements and collective actions vertically" (Borras 2016:3). According to Edelman and Borras (2016:61) "La Vía Campesina (LVC) has been the most famous radical TAM on the global social justice movement scene during the past twenty years", or the "most politically coherent and significant group among the contemporary transnational agrarian movements" (Borras 2016:61). However, while some "are better known than others" and "more politically radical"; "there is a diversity of relationships between TAMs that derives from their class bases, identities and ideologies…which are constantly renegotiated and contested" (Edelman and Borras 2016:63). Indeed, in food sovereignty, a crucial "movement of movements" (Ibid:68) is the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC-FS). It is "the largest international social movement network working on food policy and politics and food sovereignty issues" (Ibid.). Situated here is the convergence of multiple "forces with multiple kinds of class and identity politics" (Ibid.). This includes fisherfolk, pastoralists, women, indigenous peoples and many others whom are often "understudied and politically under-appreciated" (Borras 2016:3). Undoubtedly, food sovereignty constitutes a plural movement and must be studied by cautiously disaggregating the multiple perspectives it embodies. But also, the plural understandings and visions of social justice of all socially disadvantaged groups calling for their right to food sovereignty.

Human rights and sovereignty are examples of universal visions for social justice that dialogue awkwardly with food sovereignty, even if the latter is framed as a human right. Hospes (2014:124-125) argues that food sovereignty

"is not logically related to human rights doctrine". Human rights "traditionally sees the individual as the right-holder" comprising agreements where "sovereign states" are duty bearers through a "top-down" declaration by "heads of state" (Ibid.). Claeys (2015) shows the shift that food sovereignty experienced, from focus on "the rights of states to set their own trade policies toward 'internal' dimensions," including "collective rights of peoples and communities" to "determine their own food systems (Ruelle 2016:736). She demonstrates how NGOs and agencies "promote individual over collective rights, as well as assign responsibilities to national governments rather than communities" (Ibid.). It is increasingly clear that food sovereignty poses a critique standard individual human rights universalism, and instead points to a "pluralistic notion of sovereignty and rights-based approach" (Hospes 2014:123). Grey and Patel (2014:436) echo this in the context of indigenous peoples. They claim that speaking of plural "'right relationships'— is preferable" to lessen the implication of a singular right "of the morally autonomous, modernist self" (Ibid.).

Gupta (2014) also claims human rights-based struggles reaffirm the legitimacy of settle-states, but also "indigenous or minority rights are specific to a particular group" (Hospes 2014:124) a conception that is too narrow for how dynamic indigenous identities may be. Thinking of the various adherent groups, social movements, organizations, and their constituent local communities, the call for food sovereignty "reiterates peoples' right to self-determination including the right to participate" in governance; and "the right to various forms of autonomy and self-governance" (Claeys 2015:22). This shows that a rights-based food sovereignty demand is linked to autonomy, self-determination, self-governance or "multiple sovereignties" (McMichael 2009), by granting peoples the right to influence policy that directly affects them.

The awkward encounters with existing social justice paradigms described above, helped unveil a core pillar of food sovereignty, that is, to "challenge inequalities of power", or the universal call for "a radical egalitarianism" (Patel 2009:670). McMichael (200923) argued that today, there are "multiple sovereignties" challenging the modern state from within. Patel (2009) argued that food sovereignty inherently de-centers the state, and instead proposes "multiple and competing" sovereignties. Schiavoni (2015:468) describes this as the process of "making way for other actors across a variety of scales and jurisdictions". This progression on the understanding of sovereignties, from multiple to competing is crucial to my argument.

Encounters: Peasant-Centric Food Sovereignty

Lastly, I discuss another awkward encounter where food sovereignty was "charged and changed" in traveling across "localities and cultures", distance and difference" (Tsing 2005:7). Food sovereignty sprouted from the classic agrarian political economy debate of "capitalism versus the peasant" (Bernstein 2014:1036). And so, the initial mobilizing pillars were centered around peasant worldview. Food sovereignty began as a peasant-centric universalism. A pillar that embodied peasant worldviews was the Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform (GCAR). Particularly LVC pushed this call for access to land through 'genuine' agrarian reform. Agrarian reform is universally defined as redistributing

large private landholdings to landless or land-poor peasants or urban poor. Thus, the territorial land rights of indigenous peoples do not really fall in this category, nor are the many land issues of rural and urban communities, as explained in Borras (2016). In fact, in some societies, agrarian reform was used by central states to colonize indigenous peoples' territories (Ibid.). But "those who claim to be in touch with the universal are notoriously bad at seeing the limits and exclusions of their knowledge" (Tsing 2005:8). Thus, even the most progressive and radical concepts like agrarian reform can reproduce exclusions which is what multiple encounters with indigenous peoples revealed (Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2014, Rosset 2013).

Initially, scholars enthusiastically echoed the call for GCAR. Academia explored how land redistribution to rural families could reduce poverty, showing the promising productivity of small-scale farmers Rosset (1999:11). Many felt that there was a historically "'unfinished business' for redistributive land reform" around the world (Rosset 2001:4-5). But progressively academia began to point out shortcomings. Without specific reference to indigenous peoples, Borras (2008:258) argued that the GCAR should "find ways to better integrate 'global issue framing from above' with 'local/national campaigns from below'. Dunford (2015:10) argued that promoting small-holder autonomous production was a "potentially conflicting" when not accounting for indigenous peoples, pastoralists and fisherfolk. Indeed, Indigenous peoples' rights began to raise concerns as their especially around land titling, and "common property methods of regulating land access" (Rosset 2001:6). Other concerns included "individualism" clashing with "communal land use systems" (Ibid:8). Finally, indigenous peoples' lands are most likely to be sold when their claims to land, or land disputes have not been fully "legally accepted" (Ibid.).

The IPC-FS (2006:22) demonstrates that Indigenous peoples do not view land as a means of production, "habitat or a political boundary. Instead, land is "the basis for the indigenous peoples' social organization, economic system and cultural identifications" with sacred and spiritual attachments to it (Ibid.). Borras and Franco (2012:5) examined this recurring tension between a peasant-centric view of land and other visions. They argued that indigenous peoples do not demand 'land reform' in the conventional meaning of the term partly because such policy has actually historically inflicted pressures on their rights to territory (Ibid.). They demand 'territorial rights'. Increasingly it was made clear that a peasant-centric vision of land expressed around agrarian reform and land rights has awkward and tension-filled interaction with indigenous peoples and food sovereignty. La Via Campesina has over time started to integrate the issue of 'land and territory' as a more inclusive land advocacy framework, although slippage towards 'agrarian reform' is a recurring pattern. Yet, in broader global coalitions, such as in IPC-FS, 'land and territory' has become increasingly the norm in terms of framing the land dimension of food sovereignty. An important moment was the forum on "Land, territory and dignity" in Porto Alegre 2006 where peasant and non-peasant sectors engaged in cultural dialogue resolving this friction by including the vision of territory. Frictions subsequently transform food sovereignty creating "historical trajectories" that are "enabling" and "particularizing" but increasingly less "excluding" of non-peasant, marginalized rural peoples' perspectives.

Emblematic Romanticism & Indigenous Peoples in Food Sovereignty

Exponents of food sovereignty have argued that "the idea of a 'big tent' politics is that disparate groups can recognize themselves in the enunciation of a particular programme. But at the core […] needs to lay an internally consistent set of ideas" (Patel 2009:666). Yet, critics like Bernstein (2014:1033), argue that food sovereignty advocacy "is typically constructed from statements about the global on one hand, and, on the other hand" on "'emblematic instances' of the virtues of 'peasant'/small-scale/'family' farming as capital's other". While understanding this concern, this research seeks to understand the complexity of underlying processes of food sovereignty construction in local spaces where "non-emblematic" instances are found. I look at the case of indigenous peoples and how their encounter with food sovereignty engages in dialogue with capitalism, global social justice, and peasant-centric universals.

Indigenous peoples are a significant case because they represent a recurring example of the romanticism with which academia sometimes portrays 'capital's other'. Many bodies of literature romanticize indigenous peoples particularly through notions of the virtues of indigenous knowledge. These notions stem from the threat of disappearance "primarily because pressures of modernization and cultural homogenization" considered a loss for humanity (Agrawal 1995:420,432). Agrawal (1995) argues that proponents of indigenous knowledge or, *neo-indigenistas*, reproduce a dichotomy conceived by their own contender, modernization theory (Agrawal 1995).

Partial celebration of indigenous knowledge can be found in food sovereignty literature around agroecology (Altieri 1995, Altieri 2009, Altieri and Toledo 2011, Altieri et al. 2015, Altieri and Nicholls 2017, Holt-Giménez and Altieri 2013). Thinking of cultural understandings of sovereignty, an important contribution would to engage with Agrawal's discussion on the politics of knowledge to unpack complexities behind terms like 'indigenous', 'traditional' and 'peasant' as qualifiers to 'knowledge', 'agriculture', 'agroecosystems', 'farming systems', 'technology' and others. The discussion below attempts to begin unraveling cultural understandings of food sovereignty construction. I regard this an important starting point for understanding encounters among plural and overlapping identities gathered under the banner of food sovereignty. The peasant-indigenous friction of land versus territory, which has significant resonance for agroecology, will be my starting point.

Moving to a more contentious topic, a slice of the literature on indigenous food sovereignty carries some degree of nostalgia. Yet, others like Grey and Patel (2015:435) argue that we should avoid imagining indigenous peoples' past "as static, or as romantic expressions of a kinder, simpler bygone era." Morisson (2007:100) explains that food sovereignty represents "an approach that people of all cultures can relate to" and frames "*indigenous* food sovereignty" as a "restorative framework" that "promotes the application of traditional knowledge, values, wisdom and practices in the present-day context". A broader interpretation of indigenous food sovereignty is enshrined in the Atitlán Declaration titled "Indigenous Peoples' Consultation on the Right to Food: A Global Consultation" (Atitlán 2002). Here, "representatives and traditional authorities of Indigenous Peoples, Nations, and organizations from 28 countries, gathered

form all regions of the world" (Atitlán 2002) jointly established a shared understanding of what is food sovereignty according to shared principles of indigenous peoples around the world. Food sovereignty is:

> …the right of Peoples to define their own policies and strategies for the sustainable production, distribution, and consumption of food, with respect for their own cultures and their own systems of managing natural resources and rural areas, and is considered to be a precondition for Food Security (Atitlán 2002).

This definition does not evoke a restorative framework making it less contentious. But it is important to go back to Morrison and question what restorative could entail. Figueroa (2015) asks what it means to "preserve "traditional" ways of life, or "peasant spaces" in a situation where people are far removed from any kind of referents of what these mean in practice?" (Shattuck et al 2015:427). The same can be asked about indigenous peoples living in the countryside; what does it mean to preserve a "traditional" way of life; and are those engaging in food sovereignty construction able to "build the new from the skeleton of the old"? (Ibid). I will ask the question, 'to what extent food sovereignty constructions by indigenous peoples can be restorative given that peoples across the world have not been insulated from capitalist dynamics?'

Encounters between food sovereignty and capitalism are widespread and a source of contradiction for food sovereignty movements worldwide, and indigenous communities are no exception. Tania Li (2014) shows that even isolated indigenous communities from the highlands of Indonesia were compelled to engaged in global commodity capitalist relations leading to sharp social differentiation. In a different context, Isakson (2009:728) shows how small-scale indigenous peasant farmers in the Guatemalan highlands usually maintain their agricultural production and "subsistence-oriented" livelihoods by engaging in "market forms of provisioning" through which they maintain "social protections", such as diversified livelihood strategies, to maintain non-capitalist forms of social reproduction (Ibid.). Even without explicit engagement in a food sovereignty movement, Guatemalan peasants combine "capitalist and non-capitalist forms of engagement", making them part of "a type of post-capitalist politics" (Isakson 2009:755).

Soper (2016:537) also shows how Andean indigenous peasants find export markets to be "more fair than local markets" because they "offer more stable and viable livelihood", echoing Burnette and Murphy's (2015) call to dialogue more with "peasant values, interest, and actions" (Soper 2016:537). Gupta (2014:540) argues that "the diversity of communities that use the language of food sovereignty and its associated rhetoric defies a universal conceptualization", suggesting "challenges to building any kind of unified food sovereignty movement". This is no exception for the plurality of indigenous peoples' histories, contexts and practices worldwide. Gupta (2014) argues umbrella-concepts are useful for coalition-building as seen in the Atitlán Declaration (2002). However, how can differences be negotiated among different movements?

I evoke the central concept raised by Tsing (2005); "friction" which she uses in analyzing global connections with local spaces. Friction is key to the previous discussion of encounters between food sovereignty and other universals. According to Tsing (2005:8) "friction" is a requirement "to keep global power in motion" reflecting "historical trajectories, enabling, excluding, and particularizing"; "through friction, universals become practically effective". I use "friction" as understood by Tsing (2005) to illustrate existing tensions and negotiations that take place in 'awkward' encounters between universalism of food sovereignty and real-life efforts towards achieving it. Attempting to explain how its construction is conditioned and often constrained by these encounters. As mentioned earlier, universals can be both oppressive elite projects and liberatory social justice struggles. Yet, "the concept of friction acknowledges this duality and puts it at the heart of our understanding of "modern" global interconnections" (Tsing 2005:9). This is why it is useful for analyzing food sovereignty framed as a universalism.

Problem and Research Question

Food sovereignty as a universalism positing all peoples may self-determine their food system "albeit consonant with a core set of principles" (Grey and Patel 2014:432) is criticized for being portrayed by academia through "emblematic instances" (Bernstein 2014:1033). Indigenous peoples are a prime example. However, indigenous adoption and construction of food sovereignty is not a smooth, perfect, and romantic encounter between their anti-colonial struggles and a universal strategy to decolonize food systems, as Grey and Patel (2014) would argue. Indigenous peoples engage in multiple frictions in the endeavor to construct their plural visions of food sovereignty based on their histories and engagement with various other actors including other indigenous peoples, CSOs, NGOs and the state. This research addresses the following instances of friction:

1. Indigenous peoples may frame food sovereignty as an individual *or* collective right according to their histories of exchange with capitalism and how these influenced their social relations. Thus, they may espouse various meanings of "who is sovereign in food sovereignty". Multiple and competing sovereignties have been explored by academia (McMichael 2009, Patel 2009, Schiavoni 2015). But the encounter, dialogue and friction between these different sovereignties could also be explored. It is a new challenge that can be investigated using the lens of "friction" among different indigenous peoples' groups and their different visions.

2. Indigenous peoples attempting to construct their visions of food sovereignty also awkwardly encounter peasant-centric universalisms around the lingering "productivist" vision of land, while simultaneously attempting to advance a holistic vision of territory, which includes spirituality, culture, and history. Another challenge is to understand how multiple and competing sovereignties encounter one-another in this axis of friction. Especially in contexts where capitalist dynamics encroached and replaced 'community-centered'

indigenous social relations and diluted cultural forms that held a horizontal relationships with nature.

For Anna Tsing (2005:8) "universals are effective within particular historical conjunctures that give them content and force. We might specify this conjunctural feature of universals in practice by speaking of engagement." As the twentieth century came to an end, we saw a global conjuncture for the reclamation of the rights of peasants, pastoralists, fisherfolk and indigenous peoples against the current global food regime. And as these actors enter in dialogue with capitalism and with one another, friction is bound to occur from engagement. Visions of indigenous food sovereignty too, are subject to frictions and further inquiry into it is necessary. Therefore, the research question is:

How do 'frictions' emerge between indigenous peoples, on the one hand, and capitalism and food sovereignty ideas and practices, on the other hand? Why this is so and what are its implications for how we think about food sovereignty?

Analytical Framework

This research uses the concept of friction and conceptualizes food sovereignty as a universalism, understood from Tsing's (2005) work "Friction" as the master framework. I do not use the latest definition of food sovereignty enshrined in Nyéléni (2007) as an 'idea-type' universalism because of what Shattuck et al (2015:427) argue that "given the many different scales and contexts in which food sovereignty efforts are taking place, scholars cannot simply 'beam down' an ahistorical set of theoretical principles and expect them to apply in exactly the same way in different places". Research should avoid "an ideal, typified notion of what food sovereignty is or is not" (Ibid.). Instead, I use the Nyéléni (2007) definition and pillars as a guiding tool for interviews (see methodology). Building on Shattuck et al (2015) who instead propose a relational approach, a fundamental tool that is used to make sense of real-life constructions versus ideal food sovereignty is Schiavoni's (2017) *historical*, *relational* and *interactive* (HRI) approach to studying food sovereignty, or rather, "efforts towards food sovereignty."

Schiavoni's HRI should help unravel "how efforts to build food sovereignty change the ways in which power is structured and experienced in peoples' everyday lives" (Shattuck et al 2015:427). HRI is something that can help unpack the multiple frictions I identify, by elucidating where power structures lie. First, the historical lens situates state-led infliction of capitalist power dynamics on indigenous peoples through time. A relational lens unveils social and power relations among groups building concurrent and competing paradigms of food sovereignty. Particularly the frictions between different segments. Such as peasant engagement with indigenous constructions of food sovereignty. But also, the friction in the encounter among various indigenous peoples' constructions of food sovereignty. Finally, an interactive approach sheds light into how these dynamics unfold vis-à-vis the Guatemalan state.

Methodology

A qualitative methodology which combines inductive and deductive approaches was used to gather empirical data on the selected case which are indigenous peoples' constructions of food sovereignty in Guatemala. The purpose was to use existing knowledge about food sovereignty from the body of literature to nourish the initial process of gather primary data through fieldwork; and then use that primary evidence to make a contribution to the existing body of literature about food sovereignty according to the existing gaps. The research has taken place in four phases; first a review of the literature on indigenous peoples and food sovereignty, agroecology, and critical literature. Second, fieldwork in Guatemala from July 10 to August 10 where I travelled between the capital city and communities in the municipality[1] of San Martín Jilotepeque (SMJ). Third, after a couple of weeks pause, the research continued in the capital taking place during an international conference on food sovereignty. Finally, I went back to the relevant bodies of literature to find further supporting evidence for my argument, therefore the process was not only inductive but also deductive, in order to solidify a relevant contribution in dialogue with previous knowledge. Methods used include in-depth qualitative interviews and participant observation, where I made use of recording devices, photographing, and fieldnotes. Interviews and the participant observation took place in Spanish, transcriptions of around 15 selected interviews were made with help from third parties. Interview guides were used to lead the discussions, and these were based on the following, (see Appendix A and B).

The Case: Guatemala

Guatemala has a population of indigenous majority; estimates ranging between 40 to 60 percent (Rottenberg 2012:xxi). Official Guatemalan censuses maintain that indigenous peoples are no longer a majority since the 1960s, nevertheless, indigenous leaders and activists claim "censuses have consistently underestimated the number" (Caumartin 2005:13). Another reason to study Guatemala's indigenous peoples and food sovereignty is that it holds a diverse ethnic composition. Next to "ladinos"[2], Indigenous groups are twenty-two Mayan ethnolinguistic groups, next to Garifunas and Xinca (Caumartin 2005:9); each with their particular geographies and histories. Furthermore, Guatemala's indigenous peoples, whom are largely of peasant composition[3], have suffered from racist,

[1] Municipality refers to an administrative district, local self-government or township, composed of a small urban centre and surrounded by villages and their respective settlements

[2] Ladinos are mixed race peoples

[3] In Guatemala, most indigenous peoples are peasants, but there is also a relatively smaller population of ladino-peasants who do not identify as indigenous mostly located in the Southern Coastal area. But CSOs working in rural politics and development always ascribe their identities to both peasant and indigenous farmer groups, even when their activities may revolve more around one group than the other in certain regions and moments. Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014) have a good discussion about this (page 988).

exclusionary, and violently oppressive governing structures since colonial times. This has instigated various frames of contention in the countryside.

Alonso-Fradejas (2015) briefly reviews these frames of contention since the second half of the twentieth century. Starting with the war period (1962-1996) indigenous-peasant struggles demanded a "land-to-the-tiller land reform", which transformed into a "struggle for life" as a result of the violence and genocide they experienced during the bloodiest years of the civil war (Alonso-Fradejas 2015). After the 1996 Peace Accords, during which neoliberal globalization peaked, "militant peasant organizations embraced food sovereignty as their master frame of contention" (Ibid.). A most recent frame of contention, "defense of territory" was also a response to the "emergent project of capitalism" and exclusions "from food, labor and credit markets" and from "controlling the most productive land resources" (Ibid.). Nevertheless, food sovereignty remains the broader frame and overarching political project.

There is also a diversity of peasant-indigenous organizations, sprouting from different struggles. Iconic organization, CUC, emerged in 1972 as a response to military repression and struggle for higher wages in plantations. CONAVIGUA (1988) began to support widow women survivors of the genocide. These organizations took up food sovereignty later on in their trajectory as they joined LVC.[4] CODECA (1992) and CCDA (1982), part of International Land Coalition (ILC), began by defending the rights of peasants to live a dignified life in the countryside. A more recent key player and organizer of the food sovereignty campaign in Guatemala is REDSAG, the network for the defense of food sovereignty in Guatemala. Comprising seventy different peasant-indigenous organizations from around the country, they work to jointly build food sovereignty in localized. Guatemala's agrarian history is also a crucial factor that motivated, its large and diverse indigenous population to embrace the food sovereignty.

At micro-level also, I chose to study a municipality called San Martín Jilotepeque (SMJ) and its surrounding villages/settlements. SMJ belongs to the department of Chimaltenango located about two hours from the capital city and of. This Maya Kaqchiquel Indigenous municipality was chosen due to its historical significance for the food sovereignty movement. SMJ is claimed to be the place where the "Campesino-a-Campesino" or "farmer-to-farmer" method and movement originated, it is "la mera mata"[5] (Holt-Giménez 2006). SMJ was selected, building on Holt-Giménez's work (2006), to investigate implications of indigenous food sovereignty constructions. As Holt-Giménez (2006) shows, SMJ inhabitants despite being indigenous, were far from the 'romantic' communities who lived harmoniously with nature. Firstly, during the seventies, they were highly dependent on green revolution inputs. Furthermore, knowledge which built their notions of alternative agriculture was brought into SMJ by the World Neighbors international NGO. The history of exchange with capitalism and outside actors makes it an interesting research in 2017, and to observe further developments after so many years.

[4] CONIC is another LVC member

[5] Expression in Spanish that means the original plant, the mere plant

Methods

Key informants were selected for in-depth interviews from four broadly defined categories of actors. Each category had at least one key informant and some of them may belong to two categories simultaneously. One key informant was contacted prior to traveling, and he provided other key contacts, so I ended up using snowball sampling. Broadly defined categories for key informants were the following;

1. ***Villagers*** from several settlements around the Kaqchiquel municipality of San Martín Jilotepeque, Chimaltenango. They may or may not be peasants, and may or may not be involved in "formación política" or political formation/training, and/or farmer-to-farmer exchanges on sustainable agriculture and/or agroecology.
2. ***Promoters*** of grassroots organizations or national organizations that hold strong links to local communities and grassroots organizations, they may be community members too. They promote the agenda of their respective organizations, which includes food sovereignty as a main pillar in all cases.
3. ***Members and/or top representatives*** of national level organizations that hold strong linkages to local spaces (communities) and have transnational alliances including with La Vía Campesina or MAELA. These top representatives hold the discourse that governs the organization, where food sovereignty is a central discourse.
4. ***Members and/or top representatives*** of international indigenous organizations that hold strong linkages to national level organizations across the World.

In-depth interviews were useful in function of my research objectives to understand the experiences of villagers and members of national and international organizations regarding their own vision of food sovereignty and their particular perspectives on the existing challenges for food sovereignty construction. Participant observation in local and international encounters complemented the interviews. At the local level participant observation took place in three opportunities; through activities organized by promoters from CSOs and NGOs. First, in a farmer-to-farmer exchange in the village of Cruz Nueva where soil conservation practices were exchanged including tracing for terrace-making, and how to make compost. Another moment was a "political formation" training session in the village of Chuatalún, where different concepts were discussed including sustainable agriculture, agroecology, food sovereignty and "the Human Farm". Finally, participant observation was used to gather data during a debate in the urban area of SMJ among different village promoters on the meanings of sustainable agriculture, agroecology, conservation and food sovereignty.

On the other hand, participant observation at an international encounter took place in Guatemala City from the 4th to the 8th of September 2017. It was the second encounter or second assembly of the 'Alliance for Food Sovereignty of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean' sponsored by FAO,

or "Alianza por la Soberanía Alimentaria de los Pueblos de América Latina y el Caribe". Data was collected form the public event on September 6th titled 'Public Forum: Challenges for Food Sovereignty for the People of Latin America and the Caribbean' where various speakers from international organizations exposed on various topics. Informal conversations were carried out with speakers and representatives from a variety of organizations and in-depth interviews were scheduled. Among the organizations present were the following; CLOC, IITC, COPROFAM, Marcha de las Mujeres, CONFEPESCA, ATALC, MAELA, RAP-AL, CAOI, ECMIA, RALLT, REDCASSAN and FIAN. Participant observation was also a helpful and appropriate way to carry out this research because it allowed me to critically observe social interactions among the different levels of actors attempting to build food sovereignty from each given perspective.

Structure of the Paper

Chapter 1 provided a discussion situated in the existing body of literature on food sovereignty and indigenous peoples. It laid-out the research problem, question, analytical framework and methodology and finally, introduced the country-case of Guatemala. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 discuss three axes of friction through encounters with indigenous peoples. These are capitalism, multiple and competing sovereignties, and peasant-centric universalisms of food sovereignty respectively. Finally, chapter 5 presents conclusions.

Chapter 2 *Friction*: Capitalism and Indigenous Peoples' Constructions of Food Sovereignty

> Capitalism brings with it its own cosmology, its own vision of the order of things (Foucault 1973) which systematically reorders a range of other social relations. Capitalist reordering contorts an inordinate array of relationships, both human and non-human. (Grey and Patel 2015:435)

This chapter sets the scene upon which the dynamics observed in the field occurred or how these were historically conditioned, at a national and municipal level. But first I briefly discuss the "sticky materiality of practical encounters" (Tsing 2005:1) between indigenous peoples under capitalism's attempt to fulfill its own particular "universal dreams and schemes". This friction reproduced throughout history until today, spilling over to contemporary political struggles of rural indigenous movements like food sovereignty. Anthropology can lend us useful insights. Anthropology was first understood as the study of disappearing cultures, "("acculturating") under the onslaught of the capitalist world order" (Sahlins 2000:159). Today, anthropology understands cultures as "'forever disappearing', but only because they perpetually renew themselves, and from the most unlikely sources" (Daston 2000:10). Actually, the creation of "capital's other" was "produced by the colonial encounter", originating "in early modern Western European relations of production" (Sahlins 2000:198). As 'other' colonized cultures responded in "opposition to the colonial civilizing mission" and through the friction of this encounter, 'other' cultures witnessed their own identities and seized them (Ibid.).

A useful contemporary example is depicted by Albert (2004) who invokes the concept of "ethnopolitics" as the process whereby Amazonian peoples came to politically negotiate and reconstruct their cultural identity, and continue their social reproduction through "adaptive resistance" to state sponsored expansion of a capitalist "development frontier" (Ibid:229). State intervention triggered an ethnic movement. The Waiapi, for example, were able to "define and delimitate the territorial space they wished recognition for, in order to expel white gold-miners" (Ibid:230). Through discourse against mechanized mining in favor for "artisanal and autonomous gold mining" they legitimized their claims to territory and mineral exploitation in it; a relationship with nature different to other tribes coming out of isolation whose experience with "whites" was recent (Ibid.). This also portrays Sahlins (2000:201) argument that indigenous peoples have agency in creating their history; often unfolding as a process where "the contradiction between customs and modernity dissolves". The modernist false dichotomy which Agrawal (1995) unmasked dissolves. He claims that "in the struggle with the modern Leviathan, the continuity of indigenous cultures consists in the specific ways they change" (Sahlins 2000:198).

Placing food sovereignty at the heart of these arguments is insightful. Rudolph and McLachlan (2013:1079,1084) tell a story of friction with capitalism in the form of a food crisis. Food insecurity and diet-related disease epidemic in Manitoba was triggered through the violent encounter with extractivist forms of capitalism (Ibid.). They argue that even during European contact, "communities

were engaged in locally adapted food systems based on intact cultural and spiritual ways of life" but after the construction of Grand Rapids Dam indigenous food systems were "fundamentally altered". Echoing perceptions of an "intact" past, Morisson (2007:100) argues that "while the language and concept of food sovereignty has only been introduced into communities and policy circles around the world, the living reality is not a new one in Indigenous communities" (Morisson 2007:100). Similar sentiments were encountered during field-research, articulated by some CSOs including CONAVIGUA whose founder and leader, Rosalina Tuyuc, argued that; "for us, always, since the beginning of existence of indigenous peoples, there was always food sovereignty, because we guaranteed life, health, and food; this always came first". Other informants from villages in SMJ, community members and promoters of FUNDEBASE, the national NGO operating there, agree with this vision, of "*defending* food sovereignty" rather than *constructing*.

Placing these sentiments of a "restorative framework" (Morisson 2007:100) vis-à-vis historically recurring frictions between indigenous peoples and capitalism advanced in anthropology helps build more nuance. A 'restorative' take on food sovereignty is also found in spaces where it might seem counter-intuitive, such as in urban black communities of South Chicago. Figueroa (2013:508) argues that "social memory" brought from the countryside in "everyday food practices derived from agrarian pasts" were the underlying base for "building collective means of community empowerment" embodied in a "Healthy Food Hub" project. It is interesting to see that friction with capitalism not only results in radical changes toward full-fledged capitalist food systems, but also into new configurations that arise in response and/or as resistance. Consequently, a "restorative framework" may advance these new configurations while recognizing that indigenous peoples around the world have not been insulated from capitalist dynamics. A primordial state of food sovereignty is long gone, and food system configurations are constantly renewed through the friction of encounter. In this light, food sovereignty may be one of many expressions of the renewal of indigenous claims to autonomous food systems through the political project it advances. Or as Grey and Patel (2014) argue, a continuation of long standing decolonization struggles.

Historical Friction: The Encounter of Capitalism and Indigenous Guatemala

This section engages the previous discussion with empirical evidence. According to Schiavoni (2017:1), "a historical lens allows us to understand the social structures and institutions that condition the politics of food over time". The history of exchange between capitalism and indigenous peoples in Guatemala centers around the relationship between indigenous peoples with colonial and post-independence states. Conditioning practical and political spaces where food sovereignty constructions are advanced. Grey and Patel (2015:435) depict colonialism "as a subsequent set of institutions and operations of power", which cause "both the *de jure* and the *de facto* erosion of indigenous self-sufficiency and self-determination. In Guatemala also has a history where indigenous self-sufficiency, and self-determination were scoured by the state.

A main tool of domination was firstly *de-jure* de-structuring pre-Columbian indigenous modes of organization and production, for instance "*calpulli*", a basic unit of local community organization in the form of communal property (FUNDEBASE 2012:7). A new system was imposed; based on "absolute control of lands, implementation of forced labor ("*repartimientos*, "*encomiendas*"), and of differentiated social relations for two republics: the republic of Indians and republic of "*criollos*"" (Ibid.). This "rationality and colonial practice" continued post-independence (1821), worsening through more aggressive methods to privatize open-access and communal land by "*criollo*" elites. They instituted taxes on land, and a limit of one square league to the size of indigenous communal lands (Ibid:8). Even the turn from conservative to liberal governments (1871-1944) continued dispossession as part of a campaign to benefit foreign immigrants seeking to agriculture a "profitable" business through coffee and sugarcane unlike native populations (Ibid.). During this time, 0.32% of all land owners held almost half of all arable land (Ibid.).

The Center for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE) listed "economic exclusions and agrarian structures" after "racism, exclusion and subordination of indigenous peoples" the main 'historical' causes of the Civil War (1960-1996) (Caumartin 2005:19). During the conflict "ethnic divisions rooted in racism, unequal power relations, mistrust, suspicion and fear" of "Indian revolts" (Ibid), led to violence which claimed more than 200,000 lives (Rottenberg 2012:xvi). The Guatemalan Truth Commission resolved that acts of genocide were committed against indigenous peoples of five specific Mayan groups (Caumartin 2005:41). Exclusion continues to reproduce in the state's reluctance to enact social policy for development. Targets established in the peace process have been hardly met, and some even worsened, like the increase in maternal and infant mortality (Ibid:52). Recurring tension focalized in the countryside during colonial times and the Civil War made the "Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues" agreement a fundamental point of promise for peasant and indigenous organizations a secure place in institutional government structures and policy-making (Ibid.). Yet, governments implemented devious strategies. For instance, to "intentionally conceal communal land in official statistics, particularly in the 2003 Agricultural Census" (Elías 2015:38).

State institutions that regulate access and instances for conflict resolution are a land fund for market-led agrarian reform (FONTIERRAS), a registry for cadastral information (RIC), and a secretariat for agrarian affairs (SAA) (Ibid.). However, no significant social changes have occurred until today, in 2003 land concertation coefficient was 0.84, and land continues to concentrate (Oxfam 2016:22). Worsening the situation for the indigenous peasantry, free trade policies and structural adjustment, causing a huge influx of imports in basic grains (Caballero 2013:26). By 2005, Guatemalans living in poverty were 56% and extreme poverty 16% from which indigenous peoples accounted for 58% and 72% of these respectively (Caumartin 2005:20). Furthermore, the rates of undernourished people are the highest in Latin America, which increased from 1.4 million in 1991 to 2.5 million people in 2015 (FAO 2015).

The state continues to tackle structural issues of poverty through welfare programs which are usually distribution for fertilizers, food packages ("bolsa

segura", "super-tortilla"), and medical assistance ("hambre cero"). Millions have been spent with little result as they "lack cultural pertinence" with the indigenous majority, failing to be "sustainable and effective" or tackle structural problems (Caballero 2013:30-31). The ministry of agriculture and livestock (MAGA) maintained five programs by 2012, the most notable being PAFFEC in support of family farming and peasant agriculture (Ibid.). It is meant to help improve productive systems and post-harvest for subsistence farmers, while promoting vertical integration for surplus producers, yet critics argue that without access to land this program is "doomed to fail" (FUNDEBASE 2012:57-58). Furthermore, even though PAFFEC is the first government program to propose agroecology, "its practice became a component for distribution of chemical fertilizers" (Ibid:58).

Perhaps a more promising support for the peasant economy is the school feeding program based on local family-farming systems launched in October 2017 by the ministry of education (MINEDUC) with the support of FAO (Yelmo 2017). This can be contrasted to the "privileges granted in favor of agribusiness and mega-projects" but more importantly, (Ibid:32). Currently, there is a new extractivist agri-business project on the rise since the Guatemalan government declared in 2008 that "37 percent of the country's total farmland to be suitable for sugarcane and oil palm cultivation" (Alonso-Fradejas, Caal Hub, and Chinchilla 2011). According to Alonso-Fradejas (2015) argues that "a financialized and flexible type of agrarian extractivism" has been emerging since the mid-2000s, pushing distinctive project of agrarian capitalism small farmers and indigenous-peasants inhabit. The expansion of extractive industries in Guatemala "can easily seem like history repeating itself" as Arsel (2013:592) argued for the context of Latin America. Indeed, Guatemala has been no exception to the "ongoing expansion of extractive industry activities across Latin America" (Ibid.).

An emblematic example of reactions to such polarized rural policies occurred when the national rural development proposed in 2009 (PNRI) was left pending until in 2012 the iconic "indigenous, peasant and popular march" forced the government to resume the process of approval (Caballero 2013:10). Unfortunately, it trumped by the "joint reactionary opposition from the conservative Chamber of Agriculture, political parties and other conservative sectors (chamber of commerce, CACIF[6], CIEN[7]) who saw the approval of PNRI as a threat to their interests which carry on since colonial times, consolidated during the neoliberal era" (Ibid.). Grey and Patel (2015:335) claim that "the unresolved tension between capitalism and indigeneity both signals the failure of the project but also serves to propel it forward, as Settler states seek to finish what they started". This is clearly seen through the institution of policies and laws for rural development which are 'doomed to fail' while simultaneously agri-business development is prioritized due to power asymmetries.

[6] Comité Coordinador de Asociaciones Agrícolas, Comerciales, Industriales y Financieras

[7] Centro de Investigaciones Económicas Guatemala

Historical Friction: Intergenerational Transmission of Knowledge in San Martín Jilotepeque

Gupta (2015:541) argues that food sovereignty construction is "necessarily place based" according to "unique histories and geographies that produce a particular set of circumstances". Zooming in to SMJ to study a local space can be enlightening on how capitalism as a universal forced "powerless minorities" to accommodate "to global forces" through friction (Tsing 2005:2-3). Social structures and institutions of indigenous peoples in SMJ have accommodated themselves through time, conditioning the rural political struggles today.

I begin this story with Don Quirino Hernandez, a promoter trained by the World Neighbors and prestigious community member in his seventies, and my only key informant who remembers what the "abuelos"[8] used to practice and of the existence of different relations with land. He mentioned that it had been more than a hundred years since communal land of SMJ was sold by a mayor, and most of the open-access land was enclosed by coffee "finqueros"[9], while small amounts were taken by indigenous communities. Once land was enclosed, as families grew, land was split each time reducing the plot-size to an average of half a hectare per household resulting in the "minifundio" or "parcela" system where the social structure revolves around the middle peasant.

Don Quirino is the only informant who spoke of communal or open-access land in the past, claiming that the abuelos used practices like crop-rotation when land was abundant, impossible in today's land-scarce context. In fact, most (especially younger) informants don't know what kind of practices existed before. But what is clear, is that knowledge on how to manage agricultural practices and resources communally most likely became irrelevant after a while, and was eventually lost. An example today of a Maya tradition which has been sidelined is "Kuchubal", an old Kaqchiquel form of labor-exchange where a group of "mutual-aid" is formed among neighbors and families, used during times when intensive labor was needed such as harvest time (Holt-Giménez 2006:17,92). It is no longer used to work the land, with the exception of promoters' small farmer-to-farmer exchanges and for re-building public spaces like roads and schools. SMJ Kaqchiquel communities in a sense have internalized capitalist forms of social organization as some older knowledge is replaced with new forms, and culture in relation to land alters through time.

Another historically defining moment for SMJ was the introduction the green revolution. According to Holt-Giménez (2006:5) green revolution development strategies were geared to solve problems of rural poverty, but they in fact created more socio-economic inequality and environmental degradation, evident during the sixties and seventies. The green revolution was a moment not only in SMJ but worldwide when a lot of knowledge was abandoned changing agriculture drastically. At the national level, key informants from the network for the defense of food sovereignty in Guatemala REDSAG and FUNDEBASE

[8] In Guatemala's Maya culture "abuelos" or grandparents is a way to connote previous or older generations, not only one's immediate grandparents
[9] Rich land-owners

(2012:31) point out that there were mass green revolution advertisement campaigns, paired with a discourse devaluating the peasanty and life in the countryside. They contend that the impact wasn't merely technical, but one with deeply rooted implications in disrupting inter-generational knowledge transmission. The reason is that the use of agro-chemicals and others require less physical effort and thus less time in agriculture.

Today this is still a reason why a vast number of farmers choose to use agro-chemicals still. Furthermore, in today's context, households need to diversify their sources of income in order to continue their social reproduction in the countryside through subsistence (Isakson 2009) as conditions for survival in the countryside become more adverse. But, the negative effects of the green revolution have been known for a long time. In the seventies, farmers of SMJ were deeply locked dependent on inputs. Farmers fell into cycles of debt unable to pay credits given for hybrid seeds and many were forced to become day laborers in southern coffee haciendas or banana plantations (Holt-Giménez 2006:16).

This knowledge remains, as depicted in the struggles of those switching to agroecology or sustainable agriculture. During a farmer-to-farmer exchange, participants revealed that agriculture still depends on chemical fertilization. Shifting to alternative agriculture is a process that requires time and more physical effort in creating the fertility necessary to revive the soils. Which is why farmers mix organic manures with small amounts of chemical fertilizers, perhaps as "adaptive resistance" (Albert 2004). Most importantly, the introduction of the green revolution changed the relationship with nature of people in SMJ; those few farmers who talk about the protection of nature do so in function of human health and of the soil. Somewhere along the way the ideology of maintaining a horizontal relationship with nature and discourse of caring for Mother Earth was lost, which other indigenous communities in Guatemala do conserve.

A key player in renewing claims to autonomous rural livelihoods after the destructive friction of the encounter with green revolution capitalism was the international NGO[10] "World Neighbors". At first, SMJ farmers were reluctant to try new techniques but some began to experiment and exchange soil conservation knowledge through farmer-to-farmer exchanges, more farmers joined resulting in a prosperous movement (Holt-Giménez 2006). Key informants affirm that during the time of the World Neighbors, several groups of farmers were trained, instilling importance to sustainable agriculture. During this time, old knowledge was revived after the earthquake of 1976 which destroyed housing and killed many (Holt-Giménez 2006:45). The latent practice of Kuchubal was revived not only to rebuild villages, but was once again used for agriculture in farmer-to-farmer exchanges to build ditches and terraces which are physically demanding practices.

Thus, local Kaqchiquel culture not only benefitted from outside contact, it also enriched an alternative stream to capitalist agriculture by starting the farmer-to-farmer concept and movement. This is how cultures are renewed, through processes of exchange with others, reviving and incorporating

[10] International development NGO founded in 1951 https://www.wn.org/who-we-are/

knowledge and practices. Today, one can still observe conservation work in SMJ, as promoter and key informant José Silvio Tay argues "half of them don't know they work on sustainable agriculture…but it is by nature that people do it; they conserve the soil, build ditches, contours—but without a strategic or political focus". Some families who re-took their work after the civil war, are today custodians of the knowledge and practices from the seventies.[11] The NGO that I stumbled upon in SMJ today also plays a similar role in the promotion of farmer-to-farmer exchanges, sustainable agriculture, agroecology, and food sovereignty. Other grassroot organizations also exist in SMJ like the association of organic producers (APO) and other actors promoting agroecology and other alternatives like permaculture. The next section puts SMJ in dialogue with other indigenous groups, also attempting to build renewed claims to autonomy through food sovereignty.

[11] The two families along many villages who are well-known for their leadership in conservation and sustainable agriculture, are the Tay and Hernandez families, many whom were interviewed. Many are the children of those who were trained by the World Neighbors, some of whom did not meet their parents due to the civil war such as Doña María Dorotea Hernandez.

Chapter 3 *Friction*: Multiple and Competing Sovereignties in Dialogue

The notion of 'sovereignty' is fundamental to the awkward encounters occurring in the universalizing attempts of food sovereignty. As previously discussed, food sovereignty is able to challenge the standard universalist interpretation of human rights by posing a more grounded pluralist vision, in friction with schematic Westphalian sovereignty. Food sovereignty scholars have therefore extensively explored "who is the sovereign in food sovereignty" (Schiavoni 2015:467). Patel (2009:668) noticed that "the power of rights-talk is that rights imply a particular burden on a specified entity—the state", but while food sovereignty challenges state sovereignty, it is simultaneously "silent about the others". Therefore, it delivers the challenge of "multiple and competing sovereignties" (Ibid.). Schiavoni (2015:468) adds that in this encounter, the internal dimensions of sovereignty are subject to redefinition because. I attempt to contribute to the discussion of "multiple and competing sovereignties" by tapping into the "sticky materiality of practical encounters" (Tsing 2005:1) of differing constructions of sovereignty.

Putting internal dimensions of sovereignty into question is not new to indigenous peoples, who have historically demanded rights to self-determination from the authority of the state which encloses their territories. Grey and Patel (2015:432) argue that historically, indigenous peoples have held "a unique understanding" of sovereignty and extensively employed notions of autonomy. Gupta (2014:532) engages "contemporary indigenous sovereignty" through the case of Hawaii. Gupta depicts local sentiment that demanding rights to the settler state could reinforce its legitimacy, therefore dismantling relations of economic dependence with the state should come first. This type of food sovereignty construction puts "community-based solutions rooted in Indigenous responsibility" before rights based mobilization (Gupta 2014:541). This is one vision drawn from a case. I seek to illustrate more cases to argue that indigenous peoples too, may have "multiple and competing sovereignties". The following section attempts to depict different approaches by indigenous communities to building sovereign spaces that aspire to fulfill the right to food sovereignty in friction with one-another.

Relational

To this end, I use Schiavoni's (2017:13) relational lens; described as the "meanings of how food sovereignty and approaches toward it are dynamically being shaped—and shaping each other". She argues "there is no predetermined path" where "no singular, unified vision or project for food sovereignty, but rather multiple, overlapping and often competing efforts" (Ibid.). Empirical evidence indeed reflects multiple, competing strategies for formulating sovereign spaces by various groups vis-à-vis the state; including various organizations, CSOs and communities nationally. Multiple and competing approaches and visions of indigenous autonomy are conditioned by local histories. So it is possible that not all indigenous peoples will claim a "strong" version of sovereignty which includes "politics moored in both space and place" and "politics developed as part of longer struggles against exploitation and colonization of that place" (Grey and

Patel 2014:434). I begin with a national level picture of the different paradigms that exist for creating the autonomy of indigenous peoples. Next, I zoom in to local cases like SMJ to depict how food sovereignty is constructed under different notions of how to become sovereign spaces or peoples.

At the national level, it was observed that efforts to build food sovereignty are localized and scattered. They not only differ per community but are also very much shaped by the particular food sovereignty vision of adherent organizations (CSO or NGO) present in local spaces. And while, most peasant-indigenous organizations in the country claim to work in support of building food sovereignty, each may carry their own particularities in the organizational strategy, and operative locations. For instance, CCDA is based in Sololá, CODECA in Suchitepéquez, REDSAG in Chimaltenango and others like CUC and CONAVIGUA are based in the capital. All of them operate in different geographies and communities, and sometimes their localized work overlaps geographically. A significant problem that key informants can agree upon is that there is remarkable fragmentation amongst organizations that ultimately struggle for the same goals. CSOs have been repeatedly described as "conjunctural" meaning that they co-organize when there is an urgent topic to address or a threat that interests many. Only then they form alliances that dissolve rather quickly until another issue brings them together again.

Key informant from REDSAG explained that most organizations are specialized on certain struggles. For example, CODECA in nationalizing electricity, CUC in land, CONAVIGUA on women's rights, CPO in mining, among many. Therefore, the biggest challenge is in building long-term strategic social movements. He further claimed that while REDSAG is a network for articulating national strategies for food sovereignty among the seventy constituent organizations; there isn't really a singular food sovereignty movement. What is clear is that there is a national indigenous and peasant social movement whereby organizations mobilize together in conjunctures. Notable examples are mobilizations to derogate the Monsanto Law in 2014, against corruption of Otto Perez Molina's government in 2015, the march for water in 2016 and protests against corruption in Jimmy Morales' government in September 2017.

National spaces where food sovereignty is discussed relationally are also scattered. REDSAG for instance holds national assembly among its seventy member-organizations. Another platform of articulation is the Social and Popular Assembly (ASP)[12], but there are many others which assemble and dissolve through time. Informants argued that discussions in such spaces are thematic, so organizations join for discussion according to their interests. And that while this is not negative per se, a more significant setback is partisan politics that divide peasant and indigenous organizations, preventing the rise of strong leadership. Experience in local spaces, can help shed more light on national level dynamics. And broaden our understanding on frictions in the construction of rural struggles.

Adherents to the principles of food sovereignty (NGOs, CSOs) played an important role in spreading the concept to villagers interested in alternative

[12] For more information see http://aspguatemala.org/

agriculture. Key actors are promoters of sustainable agriculture/agroecology and food sovereignty, who are trained under the vision of the organizations they represent. The depictions below are broadly defined cases of food sovereignty constructions at local level daily rural life in two places where indigenous cultures have been reconfigured through pressures of colonialism and capitalism.

I visited a village called Pampojilá in San Lucas Tolimán (SLT) where a grassroots organization "Colectivo Aj Mayón", part of REDSAG, worked for the protection of single mothers, food security, stimulating local economies, and food sovereignty. Promoter from Colectivo Aj Mayón, Genaro, led a beekeeping project bringing beehives and knowledge to landless, single mothers who thus increased their household income. He also led "formación política" about subjects like human rights, state laws, and food sovereignty combined with practical training on keeping a "patio" or courtyard, to grow herbs, and keep poultry. Pampojilá is a village encircled by coffee plantations, which I the main source of employment for the landless majority (only a few families have parcelas).

A single mother interviewed shared her vision of food sovereignty. According to her, it meant being able to derive long-term income from beekeeping, and feeding her family through her small patio system where she grew herbs and kept poultry. Although it is argued that "access to land is a necessary condition to implement agroecology and to achieve food sovereignty" (FUNDEBASE 2012:34) the work of Genaro in Pampojilá consists of making use of immediately available resources, joining women into a cooperative of honey producers, and giving them political training. Although local conditions highly constrain a more radical food sovereignty construction, according to Genaro the process begins by alleviating extreme poverty so that political subjects can be formed.

Villagers around SMJ fare better. My contact was José Silvio Tay, a member of grassroots organization APO supported by FUNDEBASE, a national level NGO who trained him. APO is constituted by some original members of the farmer-to-farmer movement like Silvio's father and their children. Silvio's promoter work consists on monthly trainings on soil conservation, sustainable agriculture, and agroecology through farmer-to-farmer exchanges. But also "formación política" where these alternatives to conventional agriculture are taught along with concepts like food sovereignty. The vision of food sovereignty in the villages I visited was the one advanced by Silvio. And although many farmers interviewed did not remember its meaning they understand it as a form of autonomy of the household. Still, promoters claim that the purpose is not for farmers to memorize definitions, but to experience food sovereignty. Especially older promoters were discomforted and skeptical of political concepts, committed much more to technical aspects of agriculture.

Farmers interpret food sovereignty based on the political training sessions they've attended, where food sovereignty has been discussed, sometimes in-depth other times not. Interviews reveal food sovereignty is understood as subsistence of the household. Or as food autonomy, not having to depend on inputs, state's handouts or even the local store. It also means to care for human health and nutrition, by caring for nature in limiting the use of chemicals in agriculture, and organic farming. The political dimension of food sovereignty may be a less apparent everyday form of resistance. Quite "unorganized, covert, and

unstructured" (Scott 1986), it is peoples' "posicionamiento politico", or political stance, when they choose alternative over conventional agriculture, or locally produced, culturally appropriate foods over junk food from stores. According to Grey and Patel (2015:433) "decolonization is not a static end-goal that orders strategies and tactics, but rather a daily mode of resistance". Choosing alternative agriculture is a daily form of adaptive resistance to capitalism too.

The key point in SMJ is that food sovereignty is constructed upon the vision of the household. Although 'community building' is indeed a long-term goal of FUNDEBASE, there is no real strategy for building a 'moral economy'-like community structure or at least to return to sharing key resources.[13] Although some agroecology promoters do share seeds freely, others sell. But most importantly, the decision to learn agroecology through farmer exchanges is individual. Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014:988) however argue indigenous communities traditionally decide upon agroecology in community assemblies. This can be explained by looking back at historical encounters with capitalism. As Li (2014) shows, indigenous peoples are often differentiated upon class. Indeed, in SMJ we can observe those who have more land are more prosperous. Although, remittances from family members who migrate North are what recently shape economic power relations as Isakson (2014) also shows.

Finally, not all are interested in becoming full-time farmers; many families diversify their sources of income. Two women respondents became involved in Silvio's trainings to subsidize their husband's incomes and improve household nutrition. Being a full-time agroecological farmer requires greater physical effort and time. Simultaneously, Kuchubal in agriculture is no longer practiced, as economic relations now revolve less around farming. Those who own a lot of land also might not want to engage in alternative agriculture and food sovereignty. For instance, José Silvio's neighboring parcela is a conventional maize monoculture grown for markets which affects Silvio's plot through runoff water and pests gravitating toward his agroecological plot.

STL and SMJ are only two municipalities of a large rural indigenous population. Undoubtedly, other configurations formed in different encounters with capitalism exist. I was unable to visit indigenous communities who conserved or recovered their communal territories. However, several key informants cited the case of the Xinca repeatedly, as people who preserve their communal territory, forests, and respective socio-economic and political organizations like the Xinca parliament. FUNDEBASE technical advisor Aníbal Salazar claims that in SMJ they cannot build food sovereignty from an "ancestral" approach like in the Xinca territories they work with, where communal land, forest, and institutions remain. Instead they must attempt to build "household territories that hold some level of community perspective".

According to REDSAG, some communities that they work with have communal territory, but usually just forests. They argue it's rare to see commu-

[13] Although depending on the village, some of them share water. The colony of Chuatalún bought land where water source was located and the costs of pumping, storing and transporting are shared among community members.

nities that have communal "milpa" (diversified maize systems) which would require more land still, but it varies per case. When only forests are communal, people own individual household parcelas to grow milpa, and patios with vegetables, fruits, herbs, and animals. Antonio González pointed out a big challenge after communal land is recovered is to prevent immediate enclosure in plots, often caused by the lack of knowledge on how to manage land as a *territory*. This leads farmers to keep a small piece of land and sell the rest, or fail to manage territory to increase productivity. To add further nuance, Antonio claims class differentiation isn't always in function of land ownership. Farmers may own a lot of land but lack knowledge on how to manage it, so they abandon it.

Further research could shed more light on food sovereignty construction around the community takes place in Guatemala and is advanced by CSOs. But key informants argue that this view of food sovereignty is more complete than one reduced to subsistence of the household. Antonio argues one cannot build food sovereignty by practicing agroecology alone, because everything, people and nature, are connected. Building a horizontal relationship with nature is key, as Antonio argues, in the indigenous vision, land is part of a territory where "humans co-evolve with biodiversity through a harmonious management with nature".

Interactive

Schiavoni (2017) positions the "interactive" lens to studying food sovereignty efforts as a means to understand how state-society relations shape avenues of encounter. Schiavoni (2017:4) explains that an interactive approach "situates food sovereignty construction as neither state-driven nor society-driven alone, but rather as a product of the interaction between and among diverse state and societal actors". This section explores different visions encountered in the fieldwork on how indigenous peoples can simultaneously employ the right to self-determination, collective and individual rights vis-à-vis the state or in opposition to the nation-state. And how this is a fundamental friction in food sovereignty constructions of autonomous spaces and subjects. I argue that indigenous constructions of food sovereignty may implicate various types of sovereign units, not only 'emblematic' community-based forms.

Crystalized in the case of SMJ is the awkward encounter of food sovereignty and an indigenous geography where community-centered social, political, and ecological institutions have reconfigured increasingly according to capitalist relations. This leads to a vision of food sovereignty centered around the household, a truly sticky encounter, as indigenous peoples are often imagined communities maintaining ancestral communal structures. Aware of the present limitations in SMJ's context, FUNDEBASE advances a food sovereignty construction as an individual right that the state must guarantee. Limited to "creating individual political subjects, which means teaching farmers, men, women, children, of their rights as citizens, about state institutions responsible to guarantee those rights" according to technical advisor Aníbal Salazar. This helps reveal how indigenous peoples too, may construct "multiple and competing" sovereignties.

Gupta (2015:541) argued, "tension exists between, on the one hand, a desire for autonomy from the state and, on the other, the necessity of engagement with the state in order to change policy". Part of the challenge in Guatemala is the trauma of the war. State-society relations were severely damaged after state-military forces committed genocide against indigenous peoples. Most key informants agree that there is no state response to dire conditions in the countryside. Caballero (2013:9) argues that although most food production comes from the countryside, "paradoxically, food producers suffer hunger and malnutrition". Soaring poverty and malnutrition of indigenous peoples, leaves the peasantry and local governing bodies to feed their communities under heavy constraints like limited access to resources as they become increasingly besieged by the aggressive expansion of agri-business frontier.

Specific forms of food sovereignty articulated by different groups are the product of this dynamic which underlies Guatemalans state-society relations. This abandonment by the state in a sense, this resonates with Patel's (2009:668) questioning of who is to guarantee the human rights of "refugees, people stripped of nation-state membership, and people who were thus denied the ability to call on state government's power to deliver and protect their rights". Let us be reminded that in 2005 Guatemalans living in poverty were 56% and 16% in extreme poverty, indigenous people making up 58% and 72% of these respectively (Caumartin 2005:20). With the highest rates of rates of undernourishment in Latin America, 46.5% of children under five years old suffered chronic malnutrition today (Quispe 2017). While UNICEF annual report (2014:3) on Guatemala affirms 66% of indigenous children suffered chronic malnutrition.

Interviews confirm that rural indigenous populations in Guatemala feel excluded from the ability to call upon governments to guarantee their rights. REDSAG member argues that the Guatemalan nation-state was created in function of the elite's economic arrangement, who has historically denied and feared cultural diversity. "The nation-state project, required homogenization of all peoples. There cannot be a nation-state here". Indeed, the project of colonization failed, through the exclusion of those which a nation-state should assimilate. Food sovereignty is produced in this encounter, as people seek to end dependence on scrimp state handouts and recover autonomy for their survival. According to Antonio Gonzalez, "food sovereignty is a way for indigenous peoples to exercise their freedom to auto-determine their territorial management and achieve a social reproduction where collective rights exist".

But there are 'overlapping' and 'competing' notions from different groups on how to negotiate their external sovereignty vis-à-vis a contested internal state sovereignty. Internal sovereignty of the state is created by peoples' consent through democratic processes. But key informants argue that indigenous peoples were historically excluded from making those rules which govern society in the first place. Yet, they are themselves divided. Some groups wish to struggle to participate in the nation state through the electoral system, by refounding the constitution or creating a plurinational state; while others seek absolute autonomy as peoples. These approaches don't just coexist or compete, but they also come into friction through dialogue among organizations conforming the national peasant and indigenous movement. This is depicted through the

various opinions of different CSO members about how they ideally envision engagement with the state vis-à-vis other CSOs.

An important example is CCDA. Member, Elvis Morales, argues that the most contentious issue among organizations is how to achieve power within the state. Each organization has their own strategy, and seek to fill any available decision-making space. CCDA launched prominent leader, Leocadio Juracán, to run for office, who became elected deputy to congress through political party "Convergencia" (Perez 2017). He is currently promoting food sovereignty in his political activities. Framing food sovereignty as an individual right, but also attempting to build sovereignties that compete with the hegemony of a colonial state from within the nation-state apparatus is viewed by some as a submission to an exclusionary colonial nation-state. But in localities where alternative traditional indigenous forms of governance no longer exist, like in SMJ, people are limited to engaging with the state. Antonio González, like people of SMJ is a Kaqchiquel Maya. He refers

He refers to dialogue with other groups awkward encounters in the dialogue among different groups

> We [indigenous peoples] have been forced into a logic of the nation-state's rule of law. But of course, as Kaqchiquel peoples, we do believe that the use of human rights is to once again bow-down in submission. However, that is the vision of one [my] particular group. But because we must constantly dialogue with other groups…I think the human rights issue has been accepted. In order to—I believe—to coexist in the same place, with the multiple visions there are. Antonio González, REDSAG

CODECA, is another interesting case. Instead of participating through already existing institutions, CODECA seeks to re-establish Guatemala as a plurinational state through a constituent assembly. But the various visions on how to take power are sometimes obstructive.

> 2015 was a year of uprising, we spoke of the assembly, or 'a' assembly. But it turned out that some ran for elections immediately. Often there is no cooperation, so this discussion of an assembly was sidelined. Now, some stronger organizations are retaking this discussion, and this is good. –Antonio González, REDSAG

Finally, some communities or peoples wish to build sovereign spaces that parallels the nation-state structure through total autonomy. According to REDSAG informant, autonomous governing structures of certain peoples have always existed and functioned as informal governing institutions, but without state-recognition. This form of regional autonomy has been experienced for instance by the Xinca and Mam peoples. They maintain that many such indigenous communities around the country limit their concern around state governance to their local government or mayor, and COCODE (community development committees). This resonates with the opinion of IITC member Saúl Vazquez, organizer of the food sovereignty program. He argues that in Atitlán (2002) food sovereignty was framed not as a standard human right, but as part of indigenous peoples right to self-determination.

Chapter 4 *Chapter 4 Friction*: Indigenous Peoples and Peasant-Centric Universals

> In 2006, LVC too was challenged by "LVC leaders from indigenous peoples' organizations" "to expand their shared vision of agrarian issues to include indigenous perspective of *territory,* rather than just land" (Rosset 2013:726).

I return to another awkward encounter that becomes crucial for indigenous peoples' food sovereignty; peasant-centric universals. This dialogue also links to the multiple competing sovereignties that awkwardly encounter one-another in Guatemala. But first, I go back to GCAR which demonstrates the essence of universalizing peasant discourse, this vision that was limited to challenging market-led reforms (Rosset 2001:2). The 2006 Forum 'Land, Territory and Dignity' in Porto Alegre was an important moment when "food sovereignty travelled through the development of commonalities among diverse grassroots actors, not as an abstract universal that sees particular histories represented as global designs" (Dunford 2015:9). This process was considered "collective analysis" to "re-envision agrarian reform from a territorial perspective" and a "renewed vision" of food sovereignty where "agrarian reform" considers the interests of more actors (Rosset 2013:729).

This development is reflected in the "Guidelines for the Future of agrarian reform framed as an alternative to the World Bank's market-based approach" (IPC-FS 2006:24). This document affirms that "the rights of indigenous and other peoples to land, territory, forests, water and other common property resources" and their "right to manage them using customary law and tradition […] No one recipe can be applied everywhere" (Ibid.). In 2013 LVC reproduced the renewed vision in the "Jakarta Declaration" LVC calling for "a Comprehensive Agrarian Reform" which recognizes "indigenous peoples' legal rights to their territories, guaranteeing fishing communities' access and control of fishing areas and ecosystems and recognizing pastoral migratory routs" (LVC 2013). While land is undoubtedly the starting point for all groups, frictions among them forced food sovereignty to renew its universalizing pillars. Undoubtedly, land is also a necessary condition for indigenous peoples' territorial management and to practice agroecology.

Agroecology is an extension of this friction. Initially, landless peasants who acquired land used conventional agriculture due to their experience working for agri-business but this vision shifted too (Rosset 2013:727). Arguments showed increasing awareness that small-holder peasant production should avoid "pollution of land or water used by indigenous peoples, pastoralists and fisherfolk" (Dunford 2015:10). Thus, understandings of agroecology based on land and territory have also been "the result of dialogs among accumulated experiences with both the food sovereignty framework, and with concrete struggles for land and territory" (Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2014:986). Agroecology is now regarded a substantive pillar of food sovereignty, because without it, it is regarded an empty discourse (Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2014:986). Still, visions of agroecology from indigenous peoples' perspectives could be a rich angle to further

explore those social, cultural, and political dimensions of agroecology. Fieldwork revealed recurrent friction upon the axis of land versus territory.

Relational

Within the indigenous and peasant movement of Guatemala, there is outstanding consensus that food sovereignty is to be achieved through agroecology—or forms of agriculture alternative to the hegemonic green revolution model. Although there are exceptions like CONIC which is shunned by others for that same reason. There are different visions of alternative agriculture encountered in the fieldwork. For instance, Silvio from SMJ combines teaching soil conservation, sustainable agriculture, and agroecology. But many still view agroecology limited to being "the technological flag of the resistance movement" (Altieri 1995). Wittman (2009:816) argues it "involves designing and testing systems for small farmers, using a blend of traditional and localized knowledge and modern agricultural science". Key informants have pointed out a friction with this interpretation of agroecology and indigenous interpretations. These will be voiced in the following paragraphs. I argue this friction is a reproduction of the same axis of land as a factor of production versus territory as culture.

> It [agroecology] has been vindicated for a large majority of peasants. But also by indigenous-peasants; both. But when you speak of agroecology from the peasant perspective it continues to be a 'productivist' vision, *still*. From there [agroecology], they supposedly retake 'ancestral' forms? But only to produce. Not to build a territorial, cultural vision of defending life in the countryside. This is why we must advance discussion on cultural identity and peoples identity, of collectivity which was fractured—Antonio González, REDSAG

From the different visions of alternative agriculture, sustainable agriculture is, according Antonio González who is Kaqchiquel Maya, a peasant mode of production that remains technical and limited to "productivism". On the other hand, agroecology includes recovering ancestral knowledge, a territorial vision, and the defense of rural livelihoods, it is an expression of culture and identity, which is why it is the indigenous path to food sovereignty. Nevertheless, just like food sovereignty, agroecology is still a vision under construction and as it is endorsed by more sectors frictions arise. For example, Rosset (2013:727) showed that increasingly, peasant movements began to question the use of conventional agriculture, which he calls "gradual working out of this logic". "LVC organizations now promote some mixture of agroecology and traditional peasant agriculture rather than the Green Revolution" (Ibid.).

REDSAG expert contends that conventional approaches and productivist visions however, have been internalized by many groups, indigenous peoples included. This creates friction in the shift towards agroecology. Antonio argues "to us [people with strong indigenous identity], agroecology will be defined by culture (not production)" we do not identify "only as peasant, food producers, but also as 'reproducers' of millenary cultures within a demarcated territory". While some members of indigenous organizations have been very positive on the exchange and complementarity of the global peasant-indigenous

dialogue, there are others who are more critical. They question whether the indigenous worldview has and is being considered in global spaces and discussions. A critical sentiment exists that LVC and Europe still attempt to dominate the agenda. REDSAG informants reaffirm that "no single totalitarian strategy can ever exist for all groups and regions."

This awkward encounter is depicted by their concern that "especially the European farmers seek technical advice in agroecology from academia, a vision that alienates those who historically conserved knowledge *socially* and not *academically*". A strong critique to the idea of "scaling-up agroecology" was made. They argued that the indigenous vision of agroecology is not about scale, which is a productivist vision and a misconception which forgoes an integrated understanding of territorial management.

> You cannot speak of doing agroecology in ten hectares. Where do forests, community, water sources… fit in, if our goal is to make all available land productive? How is it ecological to only want to produce? —Antonio González, REDSAG

Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014:989) also spotted this friction from a LVC meeting where the question "of scale in agroecological production" was not resolved. Another example given by REDSAG were seeds. In Guatemala the strategy is to 'defend' the hotspot of seed biodiversity indigenous peoples nurtured across time. On the contrary, in Europe strategies revolve more around 'access' as native seeds are scarcer. The same goes for agroecology; in Guatemala it is about remembering, exchanging, and building from and with indigenous knowledge. Whereas in Europe where indigenous groups are not vindicated like the Americas, academic and technical assistance plays a big role in food sovereignty construction. In this regard, key informants expressed discontent about academia speaking in the name of agroecology movements, because in Guatemala it is something that is constructed and owned by culture, communities, and social movements, not academia. Overall the key friction is that a singular strategy for food sovereignty agroecology as its building block cannot be advanced without friction.

Similar dynamics of exchange among organizations exist at a national level too. Through encounter, different organizations' axes of struggles enrich one another. REDSAG agroecology expert Ronnie Palacios recounted how the frame of contention "defense of territory" developed to incorporate agroecology through exchange.

> Defense of territory was incipient in the struggle of territories against mining industry—this was fifteen years ago. It wasn't precisely about agriculture but defense of territory vis-à-vis extractivist projects, also hydroelectric plants, and monocultures. Today, struggles framed on the defense of territory have reconfigured to incorporate agriculture. Through time we evolve constantly. Now they are also interested in working for food sovereignty in their territories through agroecology—Ronnie Palacios, REDSAG

Agroecology thus, came to be not only a production system but also a form of vindicating indigenous cultures through learning (or remembering). REDSAG, a discusses tensions, or frictions between communities' internalization of capitalist modes of production and social organization in agroecological schools, according to Antonio González[14]. Agroecological schools are spaces where frictions are discussed through "diálogo de saberes"[15]. Here not political discussions take place but also exchange of agroecological knowledges and practice.

> The goal is to reveal what works, what doesn't, and why so that people themselves begin to question conventional agriculture, where their knowledge comes from and under what political notions their actions are framed. Why do we instead want organic food, living soil, biodiversity and how does this link to culture—peasant or indigenous, and where do we come from? —Antonio Gonzalez, REDSAG

Antonio argues that through this process, people may question where ancestral practices are coming from, what it means to be indigenous, peasant or both. Furthermore, REDSAG reasons that the dynamic of learning and building is never the same. "It is not the same dynamic for the school at regional center than the one up north, or the school in the west. Agroecology is practiced differently in function of culture although the core principles are health, community economies, biodiversity and guarantee of food sovereignty." Once again, neither in global or local spaces *strategies* for food sovereignty construction can never attempt to be universalizing. Instead, the awkward universalizing principle of food sovereignty is to have "multiple and competing sovereignties" that dialectically construct new configurations of sovereign spaces through their friction.

Similarly, from a global perspective, key informant and director of the food sovereignty program of the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) spoke of global "relational" spaces. Saúl Vasquez argued that it is important to keep in sight the elements of culture where indigenous identities are maintained such as clothing, language, traditional ceremonies, dances, foods; because this is where ancestral knowledge is kept alive and it can be recovered through the exercise of collective memory. Saúl recounted that during international dialogues, training moments, and workshops peoples who had lost important elements of their culture where able to recover these through exchanges with other indigenous peoples through "diálogo de saberes". He gave the example of Maya peoples from Mexico, Guatemala, and Belize who have similar cultures have exchanged and collectively remembered.

---

[14] Antonio González is a key informant who forms part of REDSAG by leading one of its seventy constituent CSOs, but he also holds a position in the international conglomeration to which REDSAG belongs which is MAELA (agroecological movement of Latin America). Finally, through MALEA, Antonio was at the time of my interviews a representative of civil society in the committee on world food security (CFS).

[15] Defined as "dialogue among different knowledges and ways of knowing" (Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2014:979)

Interactive

> It is insufficient to consider only the structures that might guarantee the rights that constitute food sovereignty—it is also vital to consider the substantive policies, process, and politics that go to make up food sovereignty. (Patel 2009:669)

There are limited state policies that support alternative agriculture, but do so in function of global commodity markets. The most outstanding one is the "national strategy for the development of organic and agroecological production in Guatemala 2013-2023" which is for organic produce export markets (FUNDEBASE 2012:59). The state-society interactions that govern how food sovereignty is being constructed are, again, polarized. One the one hand, there is a state refusing to engage in substantive policy to curve dire social conditions in the countryside. On the other, rural communities and other actors retreating to build community-based autonomy through agroecology as a form of everyday politics. Here, friction with peasant-centric universalism manifests on whether everyday politics are carried out as a conflict of model of productions, or as the vindication of culture/identity. The latter is the key to understanding the "sticky materiality" of this encounter.

FUNDEBASE (2012:43) argues that agroecology is "practiced at the margins of state programs, and it is grassroots indigenous and peasant organizations who have food security and sovereignty in their horizons, who have promoted this strategy in all four cardinal points of the country with results visibly superior vis-à-vis conventional agriculture". This sets the tone for a construction of food sovereignty that is contraposed to a state unable and/or unwilling to provide for indigenous people. REDSAG informants claim that agroecological schools are indeed a tool in the attempt to build autonomy, or work towards *de facto* rather than *de jure* food sovereignty. "We are on the path, through the practice of agroecology. Instead of waiting for an unwilling state to pass favorable legislation, we are already working towards food sovereignty".

But there is great tension here because some groups want to engage more with the state than others. Gupta argued that "sustainable self-determination" may take precedence to "rights-based engagement with the state (2015:541), but this also "eclipses the ways in which law and policy can affect everyday living conditions and cultural practices". According to REDSAG agroecology is inherently political. More than a model of production, it is a way to reproduce indigenous culture and autonomous self-determination. Forming (collective) political subjects from this angle, is contraposed to individual political subjects vis-à-vis rights granted by state-law. It is about vindicating indigenous culture and their rights of self-determination as autonomous peoples. Agroecology (and food sovereignty by extension) from this perspective, is then a political mobilization for identity.

If we compare this interpretation of food sovereignty construction with SMJ where it is framed as an individual right, frictions become clear. Politics is a word that has very negative connotations in the eyes of an average Guatemalan citizen because national politics have a history of blatant corruption, dominated by partisanship especially in rural areas where they use very aggressive patron-

client tactics to gather support.[16] I also encountered reluctance to talk about or engage with politics from older generations (fifty plus), who suffered the violence of the civil war and are genocide survivors. Some of them were even engaged in promoter activities, yet they prefer to keep to technical aspects of peasant-to-peasant exchanges and forego politics altogether.[17]

However, the way in which people "do politics" in SMJ is by their "political stance" against conventional agriculture. This is the corner-stone of the farmer-to-farmer movement. But what is interesting is that the underlying principle of farmer-to-farmer was the solidary-labor exchange indigenous tradition, Kuchubal. Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014:989) depict the differences between indigenous, peasant and proletarian "identity frames". They show that farmer-to-farmer exchanges are a mode of knowledge transmission predominantly used by peasants while indigenous knowledge transmission is "coded in cultural traditions" (Ibid.). It seems like a contradiction; that SMJ where farmer-to-farmer movement was born has indigenous roots. Yet, it is not a contradiction, but the result of history between state-led capitalism and society.

During the war, Kuchubal as form of political organizing in SMJ came to an end because the state perceived any type of indigenous community organizing as a threat, considered support for guerrilla (Holt-Giménez 2006). The farmer-to-farmer movement and its success was disappeared, as many students and leaders of the movement were killed or exiled. During my visits I encountered many informants who had been in exile for a long time, and others whose family members had been persecuted and killed. A Massacre in SMJ took place in the village of "La Estancia de la Virgen" claiming between 300 and 400 defenseless civilian (indigenous) lives (UNOPS 1999).

According to Silvio, a political subject is informed of their rights as indigenous people, peasant and citizen, and demands those rights while the political object is considered target of clientelism, public charity, and "assistentialist" practices. Political stance or positioning occurs when individuals reach a level of conviction of engaging in agroecology and learning more about their citizenship rights. Silvio asserts, "which ever government is running the nation, whether or not they engage with the peasantry, people will continue living and consuming their produce. This is the way we see politics". Nevertheless, there is in fact engagement with state policy. For example, Quirino Hernandez, is a member of a certificated organic coffee collective that exports coffee. As one of the most successful and known promoters in his village, Quirino engaged with

[16] The owner of a small agro-service shop recounted how in 2015 political parties had bought government coupons meant to be distributed through local NGOs to peasants who qualify for this subsidy, and were handing them out themselves to villagers in exchange for political support.

[17] I encountered many informants who had been in exile for a long time, and others whose family members had been persecuted and killed. For more information on the Massacre in San Martín Jilotepeque see: UNOPS (1999) "Guatemala Memoria del Silencio, Casos Ilustrativos Anexo I", Informe de la Comisión para el Esclarecimiento Histórico, Caso Ilustrativo No. 50, pages 73-79

state policy in as form of "adaptive resistance". Working towards food sovereignty with the memory of a violent state has been limiting so everyday politics are subtle.

Nevertheless, the goal of many CSOs or NGOs like FUNDEBASE is to "rebuild the community"—an indigenous ideal. Other localities in Guatemala do actually engage in collective politics. Yet, SMJ no longer had indigenous mayoralties or parliaments but for example the Xinca and Ixil people do. Given all the facts presented, does this make SMJ less indigenous or not at all upon the frame of how different groups construct food sovereignty? Interviews indeed reveal that younger generations feel less indigenous. Kaqchiquel language use declined, and only women wear a traditional attire are commonplace examples. However, I argue that friction generated in the encounter between indigenous peoples' peasant-centric universalisms should not be framed as a dichotomy either. Just like the awkward encounter between capitalism and indigenous peoples, they simply create new configurations through dialogue.

Two key informants from REDSAG questioned the categories of "peasant" and "indigenous". Ronnie Palacios affirms that between ladino-peasants and indigenous-peasants in Guatemala there are more similarities than differences. Ladino-peasants come from an indigenous background, evident in the preservation of indigenous practices such as milpa, also use as the basis of their food and agriculture system. Although it is analytically useful to separate them, it is also enlightening to recognize that by instigating an indigenous-peasant friction, food sovereignty has accomplished a universal mission "to form bridges, roads, and channels of circulation" (Tsing 2005:7).

Hospes (2014) pointed out that the collective rights of food sovereignty apply to a community or nation, while indigenous minority rights apply to particular groups. This framing raises questions on the politics of identification. Bartolomé (2003) establishes the term ethnogenesis as a "process of ethnic revitalization of ethnolinguistic groups" who were never structured through a "comprehensive political organization." It is the "sociopolitical processes that propose the construction or reconstruction of *collective subjects* defined in terms of ethnicity" (Ibid.). He explains it as a process whereby people who had previously abandoned their identities experience a resurgence as part of a particular ethnic group or peoples. Engaging this with food sovereignty, I ask; why should definitions of indigeneity be limited to their territorial attachments and socio-economic institutions?

Guatemala has in fact seen examples of indigenous peoples vindicating their communal property rights, and rights to self-determination like the Chajoma' Kaqchiquel Maya peoples in Chuarrancho (Peláez 2015:86). Under pressures from hydroelectric and mining industries, the community began a process of recovering their "historical and ancestral rights over their land and territory", studying these to create a legal roadmap for strategic litigation. Indigenous resurgence or vindication is what some organizations are advocating. Therefore, cultural understandings of territory that are flexible could be more useful to grasp how different sovereign spaces are created and under what conditions. Like where land was lost, recovered, and where social institutions and identities

reconfigure. Furthermore, Antonio González questions the individual-right vision of food sovereignty.

> Food sovereignty to me would be a kind of self-sufficiency, but if the political dimension isn't there you cannot have food sovereignty. It also need collective political frameworks. You cannot achieve food sovereignty on your own or as a small group; you would lack a natural balance within the community…separating spaces doesn't work. You cannot do agroecology where there are chemicals. –Antonio González, REDSAG

This expresses why agroecology is about the collective community. It isn't only an alternative production model, but a way to build cultural identities through collective politics. Agroecological expert of REDSAG, Ronnie Palacios, argued in this line; that ladino-peasant groups should also vindicate their vision of autonomy as peoples, like indigenous groups do. He argues that at the moment many people don't identify as indigenous due to social stigma and racism. But if there was an indigenous vindication they would. Agroecology, as a political vindication of a culture embedded in a territory, is a vision than can further enrich various food sovereignty movements and visions worldwide.

Chapter 5 *:* Conclusions

Tsing (2005:8) argues that "engaged universals travel across difference and are charged and changed by their travels". It is in broadly similar ways that food sovereignty travels across difference among diverse social groups in the process of food sovereignty construction. I have shown that the travels of food sovereignty produce awkward encounters with and among these groups all the time and everywhere. Skeptics like Henry Bernstein (2014), interpret such awkward encounters as contradictions to the supposed "emblematic instances", exposing fundamental flaws in the idea and practice of food sovereignty. In contrast, scholars and activists advocating for food sovereignty have time and again underscored that food sovereignty is a dynamic and living concept. These advocates have the tendency to use this assumption to implicitly or inadvertently dismiss inconvenient truths, or critical contradictions, exposed in such awkward encounters. Both skeptics and advocates have important reasons for their positions, and I could agree with most of these as I have discussed in this paper.

However, in this study I chose to navigate the middle ground between these two positions. My starting point is, that what was not explored and explained fully by skeptics and advocates is how exactly these awkward encounters related to food sovereignty get played out in real life. "The sticky materiality of practical encounters", as Tsing (2005:1) puts it. By implication, how and why ideas and practice of food sovereignty are actually reshaped and transformed across societies, geographic spaces, and over time? I take these awkward encounters as not unproblematic. Borrowing the concept of 'friction' from Anna Tsing (2005), I demonstrated in this study that it reveals the capacity of renewal that food sovereignty adherents advance. This can be seen as the product of friction, whereby the universal pillars of food sovereignty are adjusted in the face of awkward encounters, shifting flexibly according to new encounters.

In this study, I asked the question "How do 'frictions' emerge between indigenous peoples, on the one hand, and capitalism and food sovereignty ideas and practices, on the other hand? Why this is so and what are its implications for how we think about food sovereignty?". My answer is that frictions experienced by indigenous peoples with capitalism translate into frictions experienced by indigenous peoples in their constructions of food sovereignty. One of the empirical cases in my study shows how commodification and subsequent decollectivization translates into an awkward construction of food sovereignty. Or at least a construction contrary to what food sovereignty advocates would expect from indigenous peoples. Exploring such 'not un-problematic awkward encounters', shows that food sovereignty constructions are in fact deeply influenced by the historical universalizing attempts of capitalism.

The implication of this is that while food sovereignty is commonly framed as the antithesis to the global capitalism's corporate food regime, food sovereignty constructions cannot be framed as such. Food sovereignty constructions are instead, the envisioned strategies and actions geared to shifting oppressive power-relations. The plural constructions of food sovereignty attempt to do this, not only for capitalist power-relations, but also within food sovereignty itself. The awkward encounter between peasant versus indigenous in the land versus

territory debate is testimony of this. Further implications are the following for how we think about food sovereignty are the following.

First, while food sovereignty for many reasons can be considered a restorative framework, for both urban and rural populations; still, movements should not lose sight of the forward-looking nature of food sovereignty as a renewed expression of peoples claims for autonomous territories and food systems against the unfinished projects of capitalism and colonialism. Second, the way in which indigenous peoples do politics is an expression of their desire to engage with the state in various ways. Similarly, the way in which different groups frame their political activities to achieve food sovereignty; indicates what type of sovereign spaces they are seeking to build. While some indigenous peoples see food sovereignty in a collective politics framework and a way to achieve self-determination as peoples; in other places like SMJ, food sovereignty is the daily resistance of taking a political stance and advancing individual rights. The implication of this finding is that indigenous peoples should not be imagined as monolith community-centered capital's other. In fact, their constructions of food sovereignty may or may not be 'restorative' of collective pasts.

Nevertheless, indigenous vindication, and/or of re-building the community, is still an ideal which some organizations seek as part of their food sovereignty constructions. The implications of this go far when placing this at the heart of friction between indigenous and peasant-centric visions. I have shown how some indigenous peoples groups frame agroecology as a type of identity-politics. It is an expression of how culture is reproduced with nature, through knowledge exchange with past and present. This friction challenges the traditionally peasant productivist vision. The replication of the land versus territory friction has the potential to continue enriching food sovereignty movements, especially on how sovereign spaces are built in practice; through what Schiavoni (2015: 475) calls "culturally-based understandings" of "space and territory."

References

Agrawal, Arun (1995) 'Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge' *Development and Change* 26(3): 413-439.

Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon (2015) 'Accelerating towards food sovereignty' *Third World Quarterly* 36(3): 563-583.

Albert, B. (2004) "Territorialidad, Etnopolítica y Desarrollo: A Propósito del Movimiento Indígena en la Amazonía Brasileña" ('Territoriality, Ethnopolitics and Development: In Purpose of the Indigenous Movement in the Brazilian Amazon') in Alexandre Surrallés and Pedro García Hierro (eds) *Tierra Adentro: Territorio Indígena y Perecepción del Entorno,* pp. 221-258. Lima: Tarea Gráfica Educativa.

Alonso-Fradejas, A. J. L. Caal Hub, and T. Chinchilla (2011) *Plantaciones Agroindustriales, Dominación y Despojo Indígena-Campesino en la Guatemala del Siglo*

XXI. (*Agroindustrial Plantations, Domination and Indigenous-Peasant Dispossession in XXI century Guatemala)* Guatemala: IDEAR and Magna Terra Editores.

Alonso-Fradejas, Alberto (2015) 'Anything but a story foretold: multiple politics of resistance to the agrarian extractivist project in Guatemala' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 42(3-4): 489-515

Alonso-Fradejas, Alberto. S. M. Borras Jr. T. Holmes. E. Holt-Giménez and M.J. Robbins (2015) 'Food sovereignty: convergence and contradictions, conditions and challenges' 36(3): 431-448.

Altieri, M. A. (1995) *Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Altieri, Miguel A. (2009) 'Agroecology, Small Farms, and Food Sovereignty' *Monthly Review* 61(3):102-113.

Altieri, Miguel A. and P. Koohafkan (2008) *Enduring Farms: Climate Change, Smallholders and Traditional Farming Communities.* Penang: Third World Network.

Altieri, Miguel A. and C. I. Nicholls (2017) 'The Adaptation and Mitigation Potential of Traditional Agriculture in a Changing Climate' *Climatic Change* 140(1): 33-45.

Altieri, Miguel 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, Miguel A. C. I. Nicholls. A. Henao. L. Marcos (2015) 'Agroecology and the design of climate change-resilient farming systems' *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 35(3): 869-890.

Arendt, H. (1967) *The origins of Totalitarianism.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Arsel, Murat (2013) 'Social conflict, economic development and extractive industry: evidence from South America' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 40(3): 592-594.

Atitlán Declaration (2002) Accessed 18 August 2017 from < https://www.iitc.org/program-areas/food-sovereignty/final_atitlan-declaration-food-security_apr25_engl/ >

Bartomolé, Miguel Alberto (2003) 'Los Pobladores del "Desierto" genocidio, etnocidio, etnogénesis en la Argentina' ('The "Desert" Inhabitants genocide, ethnocide, ethnogenesis in Argentina') *Cuadernos de Antropología* 17(1).

Bernstein, Henry (2014) 'Food Sovereignty via the 'peasant way': a sceptical view' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6):1031-1063.

Borras Jr, Saturnino M.(2008) 'La Vía Campesina and its Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform' *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8(2-3): 258-289.

Borras Jr, Saturnino M. (2016) 'Land politics, agrarian movements and scholar-activism', Inaugural Lecture, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague.

Borras Jr. S.M. and J. C. Franco (2012) 'A 'land sovereignty' alternative? Towards a peoples' counter-enclosure'. TNI Agrarian Justice Programme Discussion Paper, July. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute

Burnette, Kim and Sophia Murphy (2015) 'What place for international trade in food sovereignty?' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6): 1065-1084.

Caballero, A. (2013) *Agricultura familiar, soberanía alimentaria y buen vivir: alternativas y desafíos en Guatemala.* (*Family farming, food sovereignty and the good living: alternatives and challenges in Guatemala*). Guatemala: IDEAR and Magna Terra Editores.

Caumartin, C (2005) 'Racism, Violence, and Inequality: An overview of the Guatemalan Case'. CRISE Working Paper No. 11. Queen Elizabeth House: Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity.

Claeys, Priscilla (2015) *Human Rights and the Food Sovereignty Movement: Reclaiming Control.* New York: Routledge.

Daston, L. (2000) *The coming into being of Scientific Objects*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dunford, Robin (2015) 'Peasant activism and the rise of food sovereignty: Decolonizing and Democratizing norm diffusion?' *European Journal of International Relations* 23(1): 145-167.

Edelman, Marc (2014) "Food sovereignty: forgotten genealogies and future regulatory challenges' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6):959-978.

Edelman, M. and Borras, S. M. (2016) *Political Dynamics of Transnational Agrarian Movements*. Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.

Elías, S. (2015) 'Derechos sobre tierras comunales bajo presión' ('The rights over comunal lands under pressure') *Revista Territorios* 10(10): 35-48.

FAO (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization) (2015) 'El estado de la Seguridad Alimentaria en el Mundo' ('The state of Food Security in the World') Accessed 28 September 2017 <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4646s.pdf >

FAO (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization) and OPS (Panamerican Health Organization) (2016) 'America Latina y el Caribe. Panorama de la Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional: sistemas alimentarios sostenibles para poner fin al hambre y la malnutrición' ('Latin America and the Caribbean. Panorama of Food and Nutritional Security: sustainable food systems to end hunger and malnutrition') Accessed 17August 2017 < http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6747s.pdf >

Food First 'The Six Pillars of Food Sovereignty' Accessed 15 April 2017 <http://www.globaljustice.org.uk/six-pillars-food-sovereignty >

FUNDEBASE (2012) *Políticas Agrarias, Agrícolas y de Desarrollo Rural en Guatemala: del despojo histórico, la descampesinización actual y grandes luchas sociales desde el poder indígena-campesino por la tierra, el territorio y la vida. (Agrarian Politics, Agricultural and Rural Development in Guatemala: the historical dispossession, current de-pesantization and great social struggles from the indigenous-peasant power for land, territory and life')* Guatemala: FUNDEBASE.

Grey, Sam and Raj Patel (2015) 'Food Sovereignty as decolonization: some contributions from Indigenous movements to food system and development politics' *Agriculture and Human Values* 32(3): 431-444.

Gupta, Clare (2015) 'Return to Freedom: Anti-GMO Aloha 'Aina Activism on Molokai as an Expression of Place-based Food Sovereignty' *Globalizations* 12(4): 529-544.

Holt-Giménez, E. (2006) *Campesino a Campesino: Voices from Latin America's Farmer to Farmer Movement for Sustainable Agriculture.* Oakland, CA: Food First Books.

Holt-Giménez, Eric and Miguel A. Altieri (2013) 'Agroecology, Food Sovereignty, and the New Green Revolution' *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 37(1): 90-102.

Hospes, Otto (2014) 'Food sovereignty: the debate, the deadlock, and a suggested detour' *Agriculture and Human Values* 31:119-130.

IPC-FS (2006) 'Agrarian Reform in the Context of Food Sovereignty, the Right to Food and Cultural Diversity: "Land, Territory and Dignity"', paper presented at the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD), (January 2006)

Isakson, Ryan (2009) 'No hay ganancia en la milpa: the agrarian question, food sovereignty, and the on-farm conservation of agrobiodiversity in the Guatemalan highlands' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(4): 725-759.

Li, Tania (2014) *Land's End: Capitalist Relations on an Indigenous Frontier.* United States: Duke University Press.

Li, T. (2015) 'Can there be food sovereignty here?' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 42(1): 205-211.

LVC (La Vía Campesina) (2013) 'The Jakarta Call: Call of the VI Conference of La Vía Campesina' Accessed 16 October 2017 <https://viacampesina.org/en/the-jakarta-call/ >

Martínez-Torres, María E. and P. Rosset (2014) 'Diálogo de saberes in La Vía Campesina: food sovereignty and agroecology' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6): 979-997.

McMichael, P. (2009) 'Global citizenship and multiple sovereignties: Reconstituting modernity' in Y. Atasoy (ed) *Hegemonic transitions, the state and crisis in neoliberal capitalism*, pp. 23-42. New York, NY: Routledge.

McMichael, Phillip (2014) 'Historicizing food sovereignty' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6): 933-957.

Morrison, D. (2011) 'Indigenous food sovereignty—A model for social learning in H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais and N. Wiebe (eds) *Food Sovereignty in Canada: creating just and sustainable food systems.* pp. 97-113. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Nyéléni (2007) 'Declaration of Nyéléni'. Accessed 27 July 2017 <https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?page=forum&lang=en >

Oxfam (2016) 'Unearthed: Land, Power and Inequality in Latin America' Accessed August 29

< https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-land-power-inequality-latin-america-301116-en.pdf >

Patel, Raj (2009) 'Food Sovereignty' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(3): 663-706.

Peláez Villalobo, J. C. (2015) 'Siglo XXI. Las tierras comunales en Guatemala' ('XXI Century. Communal Lands in Guatemala') *Revista Territorios* 10(10): pp. 85-100.

Perez, G. (2017) 'Leocadio Juracán, de líder campesino a diputado del Congreso' ('Leocadio Juracán, from peasant leader to congress deputy') *República* Accessed 15 October 2017. <http://republica.gt/2017/07/24/leocadio-juracan-de-lider-campesino-diputado-del-congreso/ >

Quispe, O.F. (2017) 'El 80% de niños del área rural está desnutrido' ('80% of children in the are undernourished') Accessed 11 October 2017. <http://www.prensalibre.com/guatemala/huehuetenango/el-80-de-nios-del-area-rural-esta-desnutrido >

Rosset (1999) 'The Multiple Functions and Benefits of Small Farm Agriculture In the Context of Global Trade Negotiations' Policy Brief Presented at "Cultivating Our Futures," the FAO/Netherlands Conference on the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land, Maastricht (12-17 September).

Rosset, Peter (2003) 'Food Sovereignty: Global Rallying Cry of Farmer Movements' *Food First institute for Food and Development Policy: Backgrounder* 9(4) 50c:1-4.

Rosset, Peter (2013) 'Re-thinking agrarian reform, land and territory in La Vía Campesina' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 40(4): 721-775.

Rudolph, Karlah Rae and Stephane M. McLachlan (2013) 'Seeking Indigenous food sovereignty: origins of and responses to the food crisis in northern Manitoba, Canada' *Local Environment* 18(9):1079-1098.

Ruelle, Morgan L. (2016) 'Priscilla Claeys: Human Rights and the Food Sovereignty Movement' *Agriculture and Human Values* 33: 737-738.

Rottenberg, D. (2012) *Memory of Silence: The Guatemalan Truth Commission Report*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sahlins, M. (2000) '"Sentimental Pessimism" and Ethnographic Experience: Or, Why Culture Is Not a Disappearing "Object"' in Lorraine Daston (ed) *The coming into being of Scientific Objects*, pp. 158-202. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schiavoni, Christina M. (2015) 'Competing Sovereignties, Contested Processes: Insights from the Venezuelan Food Sovereignty Experiment' *Globalizations* 12(4):466-480.

Schiavoni, Christina M. (2017) 'The contested terrain of food sovereignty construction: toward a historical, relational and interactive approach' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44(1): 1-32.

Scott, Jim (1986) 'Everyday forms of peasant resistance' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 13(2):5-35.

Shattuck, Annie. Christina M. Schiavoni and Zoe VanGelder (2015) 'Translating the Politics of Food Sovereignty: Digging into Contradictions, Uncovering New Dimensions' *Globalizations* 12(4): 421-433.

Soper, R. (2016) 'Local is not fair: indigenous peasant farmer preference for export markets' *Agriculture and Human Values* 33: 537-548.

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

UNICEF (United Nations International Children Emergency Fund) (2014) 'UNICEF Annual Report 2014: Guatemala' Accessed on 11 September 2017 <https://www.unicef.org/about/annualreport/files/Guatemala_Annual_Report_2014.pdf >

UNOPS (United Nations Office for Project Services) (1999) 'Guatemala Memoria del Silencio, Tomo VI, Casos Ilustrativos, Anexo I' ('Memory of silence Guatemala, Volume VI Illustrative Cases, Annex I') Accessed August 30 < https://www.plazapublica.com.gt/sites/default/files/tomo_6_y_7_anexo_i_casos_ilustrativos_1.pdf >

Windfuhr, Micahel and J. Jonsén (2005) 'Food Sovereignty: towards democracy in localized food systems' Rugby: ITDG Publishing.

Wittman, Hannah (2009) 'Reworking the metabolic rift: La Vía Campesina, agrarian citizenship, and food sovereignty' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(4): 805-826.

Yelmo, J. (2017) 'Logran metas de plan de alimentación escolar' ('School feeding plan goals are achieved') *Diario Centro América*. 23 October, p. 1.

Appendix A

Interview Guides: Primary Mapping of Social Relations and Conditions shaping these relations at community level

Further elaborated from: Tania Li (2015) Can there be food sovereignty here?

I. **The characteristics of the crop(s)?**

-Crop: which crop(s) is/are grown? Which are for subsistence and which are cash-crops? How much labor do they require? Who provides labor in the households mainly? What crops were grown before (was there a change)? Is there crop vulnerability to weather changes (climate change)?

-Costs: what are the costs of production? Wages? Inputs? Investment in capital? Rent for land? How long do the crops last without refrigeration? What were the costs before, has this changed?

II. **Access to markets?**

-is there infrastructure (what is the quality) linking to markets? Do they sell produce? How much of it and how much do they keep? How much income does it generate? What type of market is it—village level, town level, municipal level? Are there middlemen (who takes the produce to the markets? Has infrastructure improved? Have markets changed location, size, competition? Has income remained stable? Are there any linkage with urban areas/capital city?

III. **Availability of subsidies?**

-how many families have a member who has migrated? Where to? Do they still have contact? Do they receive remittances? How many households? Does this create differences in class among households? What are other sources of livelihoods; plantation work, migration to cities/towns, working for neighbors? Is there dependence on subsistence? Is there food security? How was it before? Do farmers get credit? Are any farmers in debt?

IV. **Social institutions?**

-formal institutions: Is the land communal or private? Do households have a land title? Is there anyone who doesn't have one? Is any land owned by the state/corporations? How recent is titling?

-informal institutions: is there *Kuchubal*? Subsistence ethic? Are there reciprocity arrangements? Is there exchange of knowledge and seeds? What type of property do people conceptualize when thinking of land? Have any of these arrangements changed? How long have they been there?

V. **Historical development of food sovereignty?** *(added)*

-when did food sovereignty arrive in the communities through NGO/CSOs? When did community members start using (if so) the term? How has their understanding changed through time? When were CSOs /NGOs founded versus when did they first adopt the concept of food sovereignty? How does the farmer-to-farmer movement of San Martín fit into the food sovereignty movement? Which came first according to the local perspective? How has the farmer-to-farmer movement regenerated (if so) after it was dissolved during the civil war? Has *Kuchubal* tradition of community work re-emerged? Has agroecology re-emerged and to what extent is it possible to apply agroecological practices in today's context?

VI. **Campesino-a-campesino Movement** *(added)*

-Is the farmer-to-farmer movement still practiced today? How was it rebuilt after the war? What were the challenges back then, and what are they today? How did farmer-to-farmer articulate a political position back then? How do people of the community do it today? Why is food sovereignty adopted today? What can food sovereignty contribute to your struggles? How is the farmer-to-farmer network or movement, different to food sovereignty? How is it similar and do they complement each other? How receptive or inhospitable is the country's political environment, in order to engage in claiming rights for indigenous peasants

and of nature/sustainable agriculture? What about the relationship with the rural elites?

Appendix B

Interview Guides: Understanding food sovereignty in practice by comparing with the 'ideal-type'

Further elaborated from the Six Pillars of Food Sovereignty, (Food First)

I. Focuses on food for people

What kinds of crops are typically grown here and native to here? what kinds of food are eaten here? Which foods are typical foods (from the elders)? Which food isn't from here that is eaten a lot? What is food grown for? are cash crops prioritized over subsistence or vice versa? Which crops are sold and which are eaten? Which crops are commodities and which are not? What is the rate of malnutrition here? Have there been deaths from malnutrition? Is there food insecurity? In which villages/households and why?

II. Values food providers

Who is considered a food provider? Why and who is not? What are challenges that food producers face in their daily lives? Is there discrimination or marginalization? How much do producers receive for the crops when sold? What is the role of women in food production? Which is knowledge particular to women in food production? Could you say food producers can have a dignified life through their work?

III. Localizes food systems

What is food primarily produced for? How much food is consumed and how much sold/traded? Which markets are accessed—local, regional, national, or international? And which are targeted? How reliable are the markets?

IV. Puts control Locally

How is the territory organized? Are resources controlled collectively or privately? Are resources controlled by community members/households or outsiders to the community? How is water managed? How are seeds managed? Are these resources shared/exchanged or privately purchased—if purchased from where and at what price? If not, how are resources shared? Is biodiversity conservation a concern—if yes how does it take place? Are resources controlled

V. Builds knowledge and Skills

Which technologies do members of the community work with? Which knowledges are necessary for the food and agriculture systems that exist here? Which knowledges need to be recovered, acquired, or developed? How is knowledge obtained and where does it come from? Is knowledge passed on by parents to children? Is there knowledge being lost? How does this affect the next generation?

VI. Works with Nature

what is the model of production? Is the protection of nature a priority for community members? If no, why not? Which are more urgent priorities in the communities? And if yes, how is nature protected? What are shortcomings to the protection of nature and how could this be improved? Are greenhouse gas emissions monitored and managed? What kinds of waste are created in production and what is done with this waste?

VII. Who talks food sovereignty? *(added)*

Who is the FS expert in the village? When have trainings talked about FS? Who understands FS? Has there been a discussion of what FS is? How many people didn't know what FS is? How did people react/interpret it when I explained it? Who knows FS more, young/old, men/women, promoters/villagers?

Appendix C

Broadly Defined Social Actors Interviewed

Villagers	Grassroots Organizations	National Organizations With local links	National Organizations with local & transnational links	International Organizations
Ma. Juliana and husband (peasant/housewife and wage-worker)	**Colectivo Aj Mayón (CSO)** Member organization of REDSAG *-Genaro*	**CODECA (CSO)** (Comité de Desarrollo Campesino) *-Leiria Vay*	**REDSAG (CSO)** (Red para la Defensa de la Soberanía Alimentaria en Guatemala) linked with MAELA *-Rolando Lemus* *-Ronnie Palacios*	**CITI (CSO)** (Consejo Internacional de Tratados Indios) *-Saul Vásquez* *-Mani Stanley*
Ma. Dorotea (peasant/housewife)	**AJR (CSO)** (Asociación por la Justicia y Reconciliación) collaborating with FUNDEBASE *-Cipriana Estrada*	**FUNDEBASE (ONG)** (Fundación para el Desarrollo y Fortalecimiento de las Organizaciones de Base) *-Aníbal Salazar* *-José Silvio Tay*	**CONAVIGUA (CSO)** (Coordinadora de Viudas de Guatemala) linked with La Vía Campesina *-Rosalina Tuyuc*	**MAELA (CSO)** (Movimiento Agroecológico de America Latina y el Caribe) *-Antonio González*
Cecilia (canteen owner)	**CODESMAJ (CSO)** (Comités de Desarrollo SMJ) collaborating with FUNDEBASE *-Clemente Tay*	**CONGCOOP (NGO)** (Coordinación de ONGs y Cooperativas Guatemala) *-Elmer Velazquez*	**CUC (CSO)** (Comité de Unidad Campesina) linked with La Vía Campesina *-Rafael Gonzalez*	
Beatriz (shop owner)	**APO (CSO)** (Asociación de Productores Orgánicos) collaborating with FUNDEBASE *-Eliseo Martín* *-Quirino Hernandez* *-Encarnación Balán* *-Egidio Hernandez*	**MAGA (GOV)** (Ministerio de Agricultura Y Ganadería) *-Maxinio Balán*	**CCDA (CSO)** (Comité Campesino del Altiplano) linked with International Land Coalition *-Elvis Morales* *-Marcelo Sabuc*	
Victoriano (construction worker)				