Chapter 6

Food Sovereignty and Gender Justice

The Case of La Vía Campesina

Mark Navin

One of the most exciting organizations in contemporary food justice activism is La Vía Campesina (LVC).[1] LVC represents over 200 million farmers (primarily peasants), from over 70 countries, in a fight for local control over food economies.

> The main goal of the movement is to realize food sovereignty and stop the destructive neoliberal process. . . . Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through sustainable methods and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems. . . . It puts the aspirations, needs and livelihoods of those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations.[2]

LVC insists that food justice requires broad political changes. It requires much more than the guarantee that everyone has enough nutrients to survive. Instead, LVC embraces *food sovereignty*, which requires people to have power over the food systems they depend on.

In this chapter, I focus on what LVC says about the role of gender justice in its organization. LVC says of itself that "the movement defends women [*sic*] rights and gender equality at all levels. It struggles against all forms of violence against women."[3] In an earlier document, the "Declaration of Nyéléni," LVC wrote that "food sovereignty implies new social relations free of oppression and inequality between men and women."[4]

What should we make of these sorts of claims about gender justice? What does the goal of ending gender oppression and gender inequality have to do with ensuring that peasants exercise control over local food economies? Along these lines, Flora has worried that organizations like LVC have a

tendency to place "all manner of movements for liberation from oppression, from the Zapatistas to the women's movement" under the banner of food sovereignty.[5] Here, the suggestion is that LVC may advocate gender justice just because LVC embraces other liberatory struggles, even though there may not be a direct connection between these other struggles and the struggle for food justice. Werkheiser and Noll echo this worry. They say "there is the danger of a muddled movement without clear priorities, and one that is unable to move forward until some standard of ideological purity is met."[6] Social movements need all the allies they can get; they usually avoid unnecessarily turning people away. So, we might reasonably wonder why LVC insists on advocating for gender equality and for an end to all oppression against women.

My argument proceeds as follows: First, I say something briefly about food sovereignty and LVC (Section I). Then, I identify three different kinds of efforts that LVC has undertaken to promote justice for women, and I argue that each of these is connected to the core goals of food sovereignty. These efforts include promoting the full participation of women in LVC's membership and leadership (Section II), valuing and protecting women's knowledge and power in traditional food economies (Section III), and helping women to flourish in the new post-subsistence-farming food economies that economic globalization has created (Section IV). Then, I argue that the efforts I discuss in Sections II and IV may require broader social and economic efforts to promote gender equality and to end the oppression of women (Section V). However, I conclude that the efforts I discuss in III may still seem to be in tension with these more demanding ideals of gender justice, though this tension is not as obvious as it may first seem to be.

I. FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

People who advocate for food sovereignty demand more than a human right to food. They want local communities to have power over food economies.

Various human rights documents and institutions of the post-WWII era assert the existence of a human right to food. For example, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) of 1948 states that everyone has a right to adequate food, a claim that the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR) echoed in 1976.[7] International aid and development organizations have tried to guarantee the human right to food, often under the banner of "food security." According to the UN's 1996 World Summit on Food, food security requires that food be available, that people have economic and physical access to food, and that people have the knowledge and other means to use food to meet their nutritional needs.[8]

Food security is a noble goal—one that we are far from reaching in a world where more than a billion people live on less than $2/day. However, since the early 1990s, groups of activists from the developing world have objected that governments and NGOs who have pursued food security have been insufficiently critical of the many harms of agricultural globalization. In particular, they worry about the ways that food security discourse has been captured by efficiency-based arguments for disrupting traditional subsistence peasant farming:

> Governments and global food industries make us believe that a new era is coming, in which big companies will produce food for everyone. . . . This implies that small-scale farming is outdated: small farmers will leave their villages and settle in cities, where they will find employment in industry or services, and they will buy their food from the local supermarket that sells food from all the continents.[9]

On this model, urbanization, industrialization, and cash-crop exports will generate sufficient economic growth to finance food imports; and food imports will be needed because subsistence agriculture will largely disappear.

Some critics of food security have rallied under the banner of a broader ideal of food justice: food sovereignty. Under the leadership of LVC, advocates of food sovereignty have embraced

> the right of peoples to define their own food and agriculture; to protect and regulate domestic agricultural production and trade in order to achieve sustainable development objectives; to determine the extent to which they want to be self-reliant; to restrict the dumping of products in their markets.[10]

Food sovereignty is focused on power. In particular, the power of developing societies—and even small local communities—to exercise control over their food economies. So, for example, food sovereignty advocates resist the IMF conditionality requirements that prohibit protectionism of local agriculture or that allow global capital to flow in and out of societies with ease. Unlike food security advocates, who may be content with meeting nutritional needs, champions of food sovereignty also focus on "where the food comes from, who produces it, [and] the conditions under which it is grown."[11] Among other reasons, this is because food sovereignty advocates believe that *real* food security requires food sovereignty.[12] They believe that local control of food economies makes peasant agrarian communities less vulnerable to the potentially devastating consequences of rapid changes in the prices of imported and exported foodstuffs.[13] In this way, food sovereignty advocates echo the famous findings of Amartya Sen: Hunger does not result from a lack of food, but from a lack of democratic control over food.[14] Accordingly, food

sovereignty requires that decisions about food ought not to be up to "powerful corporations or geopolitically dominant governments, but up to the people who depend on the food system."[15]

LVC is an international umbrella organization for peasant farmers' groups from around the world that are working together to resist various harms of agricultural globalization. Annette Desmarais, who has written extensively about LVC, says:

> The Vía Campesina emerged in 1993 as the Uruguay Round of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GAT) was drawing to a close with the signing of . . . the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Agriculture and the Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs).[16]

LVC represents peasants, farm workers, and agrarian communities from dozens of countries in the developing world. It has promoted "peasant internationalism" in response to the corporate face of the late twentieth century's economic globalization.[17]

Food sovereignty has implications for gender. In many developing societies, women do a majority of the agricultural work. In particular, women are often ultimately responsible for ensuring that their families have enough to eat. Their work tending small family plots is the backbone of family nutrition. However, unrestrained agricultural globalization has disrupted these practices. In many cases, economic forces have driven women from rural subsistence farming. They now have to try to participate in export-oriented agriculture or they must abandon their villages to seek employment in urban industries. Food sovereignty is about seeking justice in response to these disruptions of agricultural globalization.

II. WOMEN'S MEMBERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP IN LVC

I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that LVC has committed itself to promoting gender equality and to fighting against the oppression of women. The most direct way that LVC has acted on its commitments to gender justice has been to reform itself, and to ensure that women can participate as equals in both the membership *and* leadership of LVC.

From its beginning, women have fought for equal roles in LVC.[18] In 1996, the Second International Conference of LVC created a Women's Working Group (later the Women's Commission) to promote the participation and representation of women in LVC.[19] At the Rome World Food Summit later in 1996, women made up almost 40 percent of LVC's delegates. They

pushed for the inclusion of various proposals in the summit's declarations. In particular, they demanded that women be granted "greater participation in policy developments in the countryside."[20] In 2000, at the Third International Conference, LVC committed itself to the ideal of 50 percent participation by women at all levels of LVC, and it decided that each geographic region would henceforth be represented by one man and one woman.[21]

On the importance of women's equal participation in LVC, Patel writes that "in order for a democratic conversation about food and agriculture policy to happen, women need to be able to participate in the discussion as freely as men."[22] I agree, and I think there are a variety of reasons why this is the case. One reason why women ought to have equal access to membership and leadership in LVC in because this organization claims to act on behalf of peasant farmers, both to promote their self-governance and to resist oppressive forms of economic globalization. Since women are among the world's peasant farmers, their liberty right to self-government requires that they have equal status in LVC.[23] A second reason for women's equal status in LVC is because LVC aims to promote the moral equality of all people (including peasants), against the objectifying forces of contemporary agricultural globalization. Women's full and equal participation in LVC (including in leadership roles) is a way to treat women as equals, and to resist the dehumanizing forces of global capitalism.[24]

III. VALUING AND PROTECTING WOMEN'S ROLES IN TRADITIONAL FOOD ECONOMIES

In many developing countries, women control (or have until recently controlled) household subsistence farming operations. They manage seeds, crop rotation, tilling, and harvesting. Women are also often responsible for the preparation of traditional foods that are grown on their household subsistence plots. Women frequently take pride in this work, and they may experience their roles in subsistence agriculture as sources of power in both the family and the broader community.

Food sovereignty advocates often claim that global corporate agriculture threatens to displace women from their roles in traditional agriculture. For example, Patel writes that peasant women "can find their agroecological knowledge supplanted by the technologies of industrial agriculture."[25] LVC has committed itself to valuing and protecting the contributions that women make to traditional food cultures, and to resisting the tendency of agricultural globalization to supplant women's traditional roles. In the Nyéléni Declaration, LVC wrote,

> Our heritage as food producers is critical to the future of humanity. This is specially so in the case of women and indigenous peoples who are historical creators of knowledge about food and agriculture and are devalued.[26]

Here, the fight against the harms of agricultural globalization is also a fight to preserve the epistemic authority and power of women in traditional food production.

Various cross-cultural studies have shown that the work women do in growing, harvesting, and preparing food is often central to their identities and social positions.[27] So, efforts to preserve food cultures will also be efforts to preserve practices that affirm women's identities and promote their social roles.

Vandana Shiva often focuses on the need to protect women's traditional roles in household subsistence agriculture. She argues that the destructive tendencies of corporate food systems result from broader failures to recognize and value women's traditional food knowledge and practices. In particular, Shiva thinks that traditional household subsistence farming is more sustainable than large-scale corporate agriculture.[28] In her view, this is because women have an organic relationship with nature, while the destruction of women-centered traditional subsistence agriculture heralds the dawn of inherently destructive (and necessarily patriarchal) forms of agricultural production.[29]

Efforts to value and protect women's contributions to traditional food economies seem directly relevant to the central projects of food sovereignty. One way in which women are harmed by contemporary forms of agricultural globalization is that these phenomena often lead to the elimination of women's traditional roles in growing, harvesting, and preparing food for their families. Therefore, efforts to value and protect women's contributions to traditional food economies are straightforwardly efforts to *mitigate* the disruptive harms of agricultural globalization. (In contrast, in the next section I discuss LVC's efforts to help women *adapt* to the disruptive harms of agricultural globalization.)

IV. HELPING WOMEN TRANSITION TO POST-SUBSISTENCE-FARMING FOOD ECONOMIES

One way to help women participate in a post-subsistence-farming world is to help them grow crops for sale and export. But women in many countries are not able to compete with men in commodity agriculture. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations writes that

> women are less likely than men to own land or livestock, adopt new technologies, use credit or other financial services, or receive education or extension advice. In some cases, women do not even control the use of their own time.[30]

LVC helps women adapt to agricultural globalization by promoting land reform (including land redistribution), legal reforms that encourage women's land ownership, initiatives to distribute credit and new technologies to women farmers, and broader political and social reforms that allow women to compete on fair terms with men farmers.

Another way to help peasant women participate in the economies that agricultural globalization has created is to facilitate women's transition to urban life. The decline of small-scale subsistence agriculture has led peasants to abandon the countryside in favor of urban areas in search of employment.[31] Indeed, in recent years, the vast majority of new participants in wage-paying work have been women, because of their rapid move away from household subsistence farming.[32] However, the formal labor force has not been kind to the women of the developing world. They face wage discrimination, unsafe working conditions, and sexual assault and harassment. Furthermore, many of the developing world's urban areas lack effective social services, in part due to the fact that the World Bank and IMF required cuts to these services as conditions for development loans in recent decades.[33] Also, while many peasant women are drawn to urban areas by the promise of jobs in industry, they are often unable to find employment, but are forced to live in urban slums, where they are especially vulnerable.[34] Accordingly, food sovereignty movements may aim to help women adapt to new (food) economies by instituting protections for women workers and by providing urban social services to reduce peasant women's vulnerability to violence and various forms of depravation.

Before moving on, it may be helpful to reflect on Alison Jaggar's insight that women's disproportionate victimization at the hands of economic globalization results from a combination of both global and local causes.[35] Local gender oppression makes women vulnerable to discrimination and abuse when they seek work outside the home (if they are permitted to do so at all). But the forces of economic globalization have made it necessary for women to seek employment outside the home, that is by making subsistence agriculture and homestead production economically unfeasible. So, while we may be tempted to think of this section's adaptation strategies primarily through the lens of "reforming sexist practices in developing societies," these practices are the target of food sovereignty activism because of the destructive impact of the forces of economic globalization. And these forces are controlled by the societies (and corporations) of the developed world. At the very least, this means

that members of wealthier societies should not applaud themselves for their supposed superiority on issues of gender justice. Wealthier societies are not better for women if wealthier societies are responsible for the fact that women in poorer societies are especially vulnerable to gender-based oppression.

V. RADICAL EGALITARIANISM

The boldest part of its commitment to gender justice is LVC's embrace of the ideal of women's full social and political equality. Consider the following, which I quoted at the beginning of the paper: "Food sovereignty implies new social relations free of oppression and inequality between men and women."[36] This is more than a call to make room for women in the membership and leadership of LVC. It also seems to go far beyond mitigating the harms of globalization or adapting to those changes in ways that help women. To quote Patel, LVC appears to endorse "a radical egalitarianism," which would require dramatic changes in the distribution of economic and social power between men and women, and would require a revolutionary reimagining of the family and of gender socialization, more generally.[37]

We may reasonably wonder what full gender equality and an end to gender oppression have to do with food justice. Even though there are many good reasons to endorse these goals, they may not seem to be grounded in a commitment to food justice. Therefore, we might reasonably wonder whether LVC would do better not to commit itself to such demanding goals, since there may be strategic reasons to focus its attention more narrowly.

I think this worry may be blocked. Greater gender equality and an end to (at least some forms of) women's oppression may be necessary if LVC is going to achieve some of its core goals. In particular, in the absence of successful feminist reforms, it may be impossible to guarantee women's equal status in LVC or to protect women from new vulnerabilities created by the decline of subsistence agriculture.

First, women's equal participation in LVC may not be realizable if women are hamstrung by broader social and political inequalities. On this point, Desmarais writes that "women's daily unequal access to and control over productive, political and social resources remain significant barriers to their equal participation and representation in the Vía Campesina."[38] Desmarais adds that "the gender division of labor means that rural women have considerably less access to a most precious resource, time."[39] The Women's Commission of LVC can guarantee as much formal gender equality as it wants, but its efforts will not guarantee women's full participation in LVC. This is why LVC is committed to more radical egalitarian goals than may initially seem to be justified by their concern for food justice. On this point, Menser writes:

> Because of LVC's commitment to equality in participation, it has been forced to innovate to address a most pervasive source of social and political exclusion within its base: patriarchy and sexism. . . . Mere formal inclusion is not enough; women must have equal agency in the institutional processes.[40]

Equality of agency in the institutional process of LVC requires broader social and political equality for women. Accordingly, food sovereignty movements must target social and institutional sexism, if women are going to be able to participate in shaping the policies of LVC.[41]

Second, it may not be possible to protect women from new vulnerabilities created by the decline of subsistence agriculture in the absence of efforts to combat broader forms of gender inequality. Consider the issue of women's ownership of land. Women in almost every developing society have the legal right to own land. But in some countries, like Cambodia, there are weighty cultural norms against women's land ownership. Few women own land even though the law does not prohibit them from doing so.[42] Similar norms exist for peasant women in many parts of India.[43] On a related note, a woman's formal right to inherit land and capital will not help her to compete in agricultural commodity markets if the cultural norm is for families to bequeath property only to male heirs.

Many advocates of food sovereignty are explicit that legal reforms must be accompanied by broader feminist social reforms. For example, while Carolyn Sachs argues that food sovereignty requires "land reform and redistribution," she partners that demand with a requirement that societies "rethink and redefine heteronormative household models."[44] Members of the developed world should not be surprised by the fact that legal reforms are often insufficient to protect the economic interests of women under conditions of sexism. Even though women in the developed world have made great gains in education and employment, the unequal distribution of household labor in heterosexual marriages is a persistent problem.[45] Women in developing societies face this problem, too. As they start to enter the formal labor force, they have continued to do a disproportionate share of unpaid household labor.[46] Clearly, broader feminist struggles are necessary.

I have shown that LVC is unlikely to achieve two of its gender justice goals in the absence of a more radical gender egalitarianism. Women are unlikely to achieve equal status in LVC or be protected from vulnerabilities associated with post-subsistence agriculture unless they have far greater social and economic power.

This leaves the question of how efforts to value and protect women's roles in traditional food economies might relate to broader feminist struggles. On the surface, these efforts to preserve and value food traditions may seem to be at cross purposes with efforts to end the oppression of women, since

traditional food economies often involve oppressive hierarchies of power. For example, we may worry that efforts to preserve food traditions are symptoms of an unreasonable romanticism—a nostalgic longing for an undesirable world that has long ago passed by.[47] I think that this objection goes too far. LVC is not trying to bring back women-led subsistence agriculture in communities where that practice is no longer feasible. In such circumstances, LVC aims primarily at facilitating women's engagement with formal labor and commodity markets. However, in many communities, women-led subsistence agriculture is not yet "the past." In such circumstances, efforts to value and protect women's roles in subsistence agriculture are intended to avoid or mitigate significant harms. Furthermore, a commitment to mitigate some of the harmful disruptions of agricultural globalization does not entail the belief that household subsistence agriculture is the best (or even a good) way to organize food economies. Rather, it entails only that one way to promote the interests of women is to resist massive immediate disruptions to practices that currently feed millions of people. So, even if such efforts do not require a commitment to radical gender egalitarianism, they are at least consistent with such commitments.

But perhaps there is something more intrinsically antifeminist about efforts to value and protect women's roles in traditional agriculture. Perhaps these efforts rely on problematic claims about women's essential natures. That is, even if we accept that women's traditional roles in food cultures may sometimes give them power in the family, as some have argued,[48] we may still worry that women's uncompensated and unrecognized domestic work can "reinscribe women's subordination in the home."[49] If emphasizing women's supposed fundamental differences from men reinforces their inequality and relative powerlessness, this is a good reason to reject the claim that it is emancipatory to emphasize women's (supposed) fundamental differences from men. So, valuing and protecting women's traditional food roles may be inconsistent with broader feminist struggles, after all.

I agree that we may want to reject the gender essentialism to which Shiva (and others) seem committed. It can be both inaccurate and unhelpful to defend peasant women by claiming that they are naturally predisposed toward food work. All women are not the same and all women do not differ from (all) men in the same ways. Furthermore, the claim that women and men have fundamental natural differences may undercut arguments for social and political gender equality that rely on claims about the common capacities, needs, and interests of men and women.

Even though we may have good reasons for rejecting gender essentialism, Shiva may still be right to advocate defending women's traditional roles against the destructive power of globalization. This is a matter of nonideal theory. If we face a choice between maintaining (an admittedly sexist)

system that grants women some power over the food system, and embracing a post-subsistence economy that has no good place for women workers, we may do best to act conservatively. Consider that you should usually try to stop someone from burning down your house, even if it has a leaky roof. But your efforts to save your house should not be taken as evidence that you love your house as it is. Perhaps you'd like to move, but you'd rather stay in your imperfect house than be on the street. I think we can say something similar about attempts to value and preserve women's traditional roles in food cultures. These efforts need not be antifeminist, though they sometimes may be. Indeed, they may be eminently feminist, since they may resist forces that are harmful to women.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have argued that LVC is engaged in three projects to promote gender justice. All three projects are directly connected to the core goals of food sovereignty. I have also argued that LVC's rhetoric about gender equality—and ending the oppression of women—may be justified in terms of some of its gender-justice projects. In particular, LVC will succeed in its efforts to include women in its own organization and to facilitate women's involvement in post-subsistence-farming economies only if broader feminist reforms succeed.

NOTES

1. I am grateful for helpful feedback from Ami Harbin, Phyllis Rooney, and Jill Dieterle.

2. La Vía Campesina, "The International Peasant's Voice," *La Via Campesina International Peasant's Movement*, accessed February 9, 2011, http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/organisation-mainmenu-44.

3. Ibid.

4. La Vía Campesina, "Declaration of Nyéléni," *La Via Campesina International Peasant's Movement*, accessed February 27, 2007, http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/food-sovereignty-and-trade-mainmenu-38/262-declaration-of-nyi.

5. C. Flora, "Book Review: Schanbacher, William D.: The Politics of Food: The Global Conflict between Food Security and Food Sovereignty," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 24 (2010): 545.

6. Ian Werkheiser and Samantha Noll, "From Food Justice to a Tool of the Status Quo: Three Sub-Movements within Local Food," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 27 (2014): 209.

7. Article 25.1 of UDHR states that "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including

food," while Article 11.1 of the ICESCR states that "the States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food."

8. World Health Organization, "Food Security," *World Health Organization—Food Security*, accessed January 21, 2015, http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/story028/en/.

9. Michel Pimbert, "Women and Food Sovereignty," *LEISA Magazine* 25 (2009): 6; see also Shelley Feldman and Stephen Biggs, "International Shifts in Agricultural Debates and Practice: An Historical View of Analyses of Global Agriculture," in *Integrating Agriculture, Conservation and Ecotourism: Societal Influences*, ed. W. Bruce Campbell and Silvia López Ortíz, Issues in Agroecology—Present Status and Future Prospectus 2 (Springer Netherlands, 2012), 107–61.

10. La Vía Campesina, *Tlaxcala Declaration of La Vía Campesina* (Tlaxcala, Mexico, 1996), http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/our-conferences-mainmenu-28/2-tlaxcala-1996-mainmenu-48/425-ii-international-conference-of-the-via-campesina-tlaxcala-mexico-april-18-21.

11. Pimbert, "Women and Food Sovereignty," 8.

12. Annette Aurélie Desmarais, "The Via Campesina: Peasant Women at the Frontiers of Food Sovereignty," *Canadian Woman Studies* 23 (2003): 141.

13. Michel Pimbert, *Towards Food Sovereignty: Reclaiming Autonomous Food Systems* (London: IIED, 2009).

14. Amartya Sen, *Poverty and Famines* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

15. Raj Patel, "Food Sovereignty: Power, Gender, and the Right to Food," *PLoS Medicine* 9 (June 26, 2012): 2, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001223.

16. Desmarais, "The Via Campesina," 140.

17. Walden F. Bello, *The Food Wars* (Verso London, 2009).

18. Annette Aurélie Desmarais, "The Power of Peasants: Reflections on the Meanings of La Vía Campesina," *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 (2008): 138–49.

19. Desmarais, "The Via Campesina," 142.

20. Ibid., 143.

21. Ibid., 144; Annette Aurélie Desmarais, *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants* (Fernwood Publishing, 2007).

22. Patel, "Food Sovereignty," 2.

23. For a defense of democracy that is grounded in the value of liberty, see e.g., Carol C. Gould, *Rethinking Democracy: Freedom and Social Cooperation in Politics, Economy, and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

24. For a defense of democracy that is grounded in the value of equality, see e.g., Jeremy Waldron, *Law and Disagreement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

25. Patel, "Food Sovereignty," 3.

26. La Vía Campesina, "Declaration of Nyéléni."

27. See e.g. Carole Counihan, *Around the Tuscan Table: Food, Family, and Gender in Twentieth-Century Florence* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004); Theresa W. Devasahayam, "Power and Pleasure around the Stove: The Construction of Gendered Identity in Middle-Class South Indian Hindu Households in Urban Malaysia," in *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 28 (Elsevier, 2005), 1–20; Josephine A. Beoku-Betts, "We Got Our Way of Cooking Things Women, Food, and Preservation

of Cultural Identity among the Gullah," *Gender & Society* 9 (1995): 535–55; Patricia Allen and Carolyn Sachs, "Women and Food Chains: The Gendered Politics of Food," *Taking Food Public: Redefining Foodways in a Changing World* (Routledge, 2012), 23.

28. Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development* (Zed Books, 1988).

29. Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism*, 2nd ed. (Zed Books, 2014).

30. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "Gender," 2015, http://www.fao.org/gender/gender-home/en/?no_cache=1.

31. Bello, *The Food Wars*.

32. Arabella Fraser, "Harnessing Agriculture for Development," *Oxfam Policy and Practice: Agriculture, Food and Land* 9 (2009): 56–130.

33. J. E. Stiglitz, *Making Globalisation Work* (New York: Norton, 2006).

34. Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums*, Reprint edition (London and New York: Verso, 2007); Nicole Hassoun, *Globalization and Global Justice: Shrinking Distance, Expanding Obligations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

35. Alison M. Jaggar, "'Saving Amina': Global Justice for Women and Intercultural Dialogue," *Ethics & International Affairs* 19 (2005): 55–75.

36. La Vía Campesina, "Declaration of Nyéléni."

37. Raj Patel, "What Does Food Sovereignty Look Like?" *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36 (2009): 270.

38. "The Via Campesina," 144.

39. Desmarais, *La Vía Campesina*, 178.

40. Michael Menser, "Transnational Participatory Democracy in Action: The Case of La Via Campesina," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 39 (2008): 20–41. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, women make up 43 percent of agricultural workers in developing societies, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "Gender."

41. Patel concurs:

> To make the right to shape food policy meaningful is to require that everyone be able substantively to engage with those policies. But the prerequisites for this are a society in which the equality-distorting effects of sexism, patriarchy, racism, and class power have been eradicated. Activities that instantiate this kind of radical "moral universalism" are the necessary precursor to the formal "cosmopolitan federalism" that the language of rights summons. And it is by these activities that we shall know food sovereignty. (Patel, "What Does Food Sovereignty Look Like?" 270)

42. Fraser, "Harnessing Agriculture for Development."

43. Esther Vivas, "Without Women There Is No Food Sovereignty," *International Viewpoint*, February 2, 2012, http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?page=imprimir_articulo&id_article=2473.

44. Carolyn Sachs, "Feminist Food Sovereignty: Crafting a New Vision" (Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue, Yale University, 2013), 8–9, http://www.yale.edu/agrarianstudies/foodsovereignty/pprs/58_Sachs_2013.pdf.

45. Arlie Hochschild and Anne Machung, *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home* (New York: Viking Press, 1989); Janeen Baxter, Belinda

Hewitt, and Michele Haynes, "Life Course Transitions and Housework: Marriage, Parenthood, and Time on Housework," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70 (2008): 259–72.

46. Vivas, "Without Women There Is No Food Sovereignty"; Shelley Feldman, "Rethinking Development, Sustainability, and Gender Relations," *Cornell Journal of Law & Public Policy* 22 (2012): 649.

47. See e.g. Paul Collier, "The Politics of Hunger: How Illusion and Greed Fan the Food Crisis," *Foreign Affairs* 87 (2008): 67–79.

48. Kurt Lewin, "Forces behind Food Habits and Methods of Change," in *The Problem of Changing Food Habits*, Bulletins of the National Research Council 108 (Washington DC: National Research Council, National Academy of Science, 1943), http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=9566&page=35.

49. Allen and Sachs, "Women and Food Chains," 3.