

- Schiavoni, C. (2009) "The Global Struggle for Food Sovereignty: From Nyéléni to New York in Food Sovereignty," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(3): 663–706.
- Sinclair, K. (1991) *Kinds of Peace: Maori People after the Wars, 1870–85*, Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Slocum, R. and Saldanha, A. (2013) *Geographies of Race and Food*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2014) New Zealand Social Indicators – He kete tatauranga – Labour Market, Wellington: Statistics New Zealand, viewed on November 11, 2015, http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/nz-social-indicators/Home/Labour%20market/employment.aspx.
- Stevenson, S. (2011) *Edible Impact: Food Security Policy Literature Review*, Whakatane: Toi Te Ora – Public Health Service, BOPDHB.
- Te Hotu Manawa Māori. (2007) *Food Security Among Māori in Aotearoa*, Auckland: Te Hotu Manawa Māori.
- Timmer, P. C. (2012) "One Billion Hungry: Can We Feed the World?," *The Wilson Quarterly* 36(4): 131–134.
- University of Otago and Ministry of Health. (2011) *A Focus on Nutrition: Key Findings of the 2008/09 New Zealand Adult Nutrition Survey*, Wellington: University of Otago.
- Wilkie, K. (2014) "Families Feel Bite of Food Cost," *Stuff.co.nz*, 7 December, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/New Zealand/national/10260101/Families-feel-bite-of-food-cost>.
- Wittman, H. (2011) "Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?," *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 2: 87–105.
- Wittman, H., Desmarais, A. and Wiebe, N. (2010) *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*, Halifax: Fernwood.
- Wynd, D. (2005) *Hard to Swallow: Foodbank use in New Zealand*, Auckland: Child Poverty Action Group.

INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY IDENTITY IN FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

The possibilities and pitfalls of
translating a rural social movement

Ian Werkheiser

Food sovereignty is a growing, vibrant discourse in food justice. International organizations such as La Via Campesina connect hundreds of local food sovereignty groups all over the world; food sovereignty as a concept has been included in the Ecuadorian and Venezuelan constitutions; and it has gained increasing currency among academics. However, food sovereignty has its critics. Some argue that the movement, which addresses a wide variety of environmental and social ills, is too diverse to be sensibly described as being about food. Activists respond in part that due to certain characteristics of food, truly reforming the food system without addressing these wider issues is impossible. Further, certain characteristics of food allow it to act as a central boundary object, making it an ideal candidate to provide a frame with which to address a wide range of injustices. Food sovereignty, they argue, must push toward a radical re-imagining of society. Another objection arises in response to this view. Some worry that these connections between food and wider issues might only be natural ones to make for the rural subsistence food producers who started the food sovereignty movement; food sovereignty as it is pursued by activists may be less salient for other peoples in other places. If this is right, then food sovereignty may be an effective social movement in some contexts, but it would not be as promising a candidate for a global movement as it is purported to be.

This chapter addresses these concerns by exploring what food sovereignty is, and how it uses an imaginary of food to ground and motivate the movement. It then looks at how and how well food sovereignty translates into contexts other than those in which the discourse first emerged. Ultimately, this chapter argues that food sovereignty can be a global social movement, but the successful translation of food sovereignty into the contexts of communities in wealthy countries will look far different from what is usually supposed by both advocates and critics of the movement.

Food sovereignty

The term "food sovereignty" was introduced to the world stage in 1996 by La Via Campesina (henceforth, Via) at the World Food Summit for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the

United Nations (FAO) (Patel 2009).¹ Vía is an organization of self-described “peasants” who see their food practices as essential to their communities’ identities and survival and further see threats to their food practices as arising in large part from the exploitative institutions of global capitalism (Nyéléni Declaration 2007; Our World is Not For Sale 2001; Tlaxcala Declaration 1996).

There are multiple senses of the term “food sovereignty,” and these senses reflect differing goals and commitments within the movement. This chapter will focus on the way in which the term is employed in transnational and local social-justice activism. For activists, the term denotes how people and communities should have sovereignty over their food systems.² This amounts to the following definition of food sovereignty:

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; and to provide local fisheries-based communities the priority in managing the use of and the rights to aquatic resources. Food sovereignty does not negate trade, but rather, it promotes the formulation of trade policies and practices that serve the rights of peoples to safe, healthy and ecologically sustainable production.

(Our World is Not for Sale 2001)

This transnational justice sense of food sovereignty captures a broad range of concerns. One set of criticisms sees this diversity of concerns and aims within the movement as problematic. Food sovereignty is a diverse discourse, bringing together concerns about the rights of indigenous people, women, and the environment. Food sovereignty focuses on reforms to the economy, land use, international trade, and a host of other issues. For some critics, incorporating “all manner of movements for liberation from oppression, from the Zapatistas to the women’s movement” (Flora 2011: 545) under the banner of food sovereignty is too great a burden for one idea, especially one merely about food.

For advocates within the food sovereignty discourse, these seemingly disparate issues are inherently interconnected and inseparable. This is because, on the one hand, the food system is deeply interwoven into the fabric of modern global capitalism. Thus, advocates of food sovereignty contend that to try to deal in isolation with the challenges surrounding food will likely be doomed to failure, as the system in which food is embedded will remain unchanged. On the other hand, the various ways that we intend food, both when it is present in front of us and in our imaginations, are a central part of people’s concepts of themselves and of their communities. For these advocates, it will inevitably support currently existing (and unjust) power structures that harm individual and community flourishing if we ignore the ways in which food is co-constituted with individual and community identity and instead think of the problem merely in terms of access to food (Nyéléni Declaration 2007; Our World is Not For Sale 2001; Tlaxcala 1996). For food sovereignty activists, the recognition of the interconnectedness of food with economic, political, and cultural systems, and the concomitant need to address them as a whole, is a virtue, not a vice, of food sovereignty. In addition to its promise for finally making headway against the perennial problems of food insecurity, this framing enables food to be a single boundary object (Star and Greisemer 1989) that grounds and motivates a host of other concerns. In other words, our desire to ensure food security for all can force us to deal with other injustices.

This concept of the centrality of food to our community and individual identities underlies both the practices and commitments of food sovereignty activists. In terms of practice, food sovereignty activists are not interested only in petitioning the state and powerful social institutions for redress, but rather to engage in the prefigurative politics of “propaganda of the deed” (Breines

1989; Graeber 2004), by showing that food practices and more just social relations can co-exist by beginning to create them. As Menser (2008) points out, food sovereignty in this sense “aims to cultivate and proliferate an alternative model of agricultural production and a corresponding political program,” one that “draws upon local and traditional knowledge in combination with laboratory studies to farm in such a way as to meet local cultural needs, provide for human health, and conserve biodiversity” (31).

In terms of commitments, this means that for food sovereignty activists, fixing injustices in the food system requires more just social relationships generally, and vice versa. A good example of this is the importance of justice for women for many food sovereignty activists. Vía, for example, has Assemblies of Women that meet regularly to discuss women’s issues, and these assemblies release important declarations and policy statements. This is not just a separate good that is also of interest to members of La Vía Campesina; rather, it is seen as playing a central role for communities to achieve food justice and for Vía to be an effective organization. As Wiebe says in her 2013 article, “Side by side and in solidarity with the men of La Vía Campesina, we bring political analysis, experience, and energy to the shared goal of creating a future that is more just, egalitarian, peaceful, ecologically healthy, and life-giving” (5). Justice for women within Vía strengthens the community and makes it more effective at pursuing its goals, both by making consensus decisions better informed, and by making such decisions actually consensual, and thus more likely to be adopted by community members, including women. Vía is engaged in a number of programs to aid the lives of women, and it pays particular attention to their participation in the food sovereignty movement. Indeed, members of Vía often say that it was the incorporation of women’s voices into Vía – which happened only after the organization had been an active peasant-rights group for some time – that allowed it to realize the importance of sovereignty and of food as uniting themes for the many issues facing small-scale farmers in the global South. These members say that the decisive Nyéléni Declaration came about only because of participation by women, who had taken important leadership roles prior to that meeting (Wittman et al. 2010).³

It makes sense that the usefulness of food as a central boundary object could be intuitive for the subsistence farmers and for other (self-described) peasants who made up the bulk of the founders of the movement. For people intimately familiar with food in all stages, from production to distribution to preparation to consumption to disposal, it may well be possible to sit at a meal and have that experience evoke a web of interrelations, which can be evaluated in terms of their justness. It may further be possible to think about justice issues and have food present itself as an obvious example, a thread running through those various issues, and ultimately as a frame for understanding complex problems. Taking food to be centrally constitutive to identity and to justice might then, as advocates suggest, be an effective means of motivating a transnational, radical, social-justice movement addressing systemic problems in the food system as well as community and individual flourishing more generally.

However, it is possible that this social imaginary surrounding food might be a product only of the communities and people initially engaged in food sovereignty – rural subsistence farmers – and therefore not translatable to a global movement. As Thompson (2015) says, “[food sovereignty] points to the way entire rural communities, local cultures, and longstanding social relations are brought together through the production, preparation, and consumption of food” (75). However, as he goes on to argue, “unfortunately, as compelling as this argument is for the small farmers that Vía Campesina represents, it is not an idea that necessarily travels well” (Thompson 2015: 75). The widely used Nyéléni Declaration, for example, lays out principles of food sovereignty that call for a focus on food producers, and the Declaration goes into significant detail about particular means of production such as farming and fishing (see Declaration’s appendix). These details point to the lived experiences of the authors, but they may not resonate as central issues to people from other contexts.

Food sovereignty has been taken up by activists in contexts quite different from its origin, including among people fighting for better wages for service workers in the food system in the US, people fighting for more control over their food systems in relatively affluent Vermont, and people fighting to protect heritage food traditions in Italy (sometimes against international fast-food chain stores, sometimes against immigrants to the country selling local food from their home cultures) (Alkon and Mares 2012; Ayres and Bosia 2011; Fairbairn 2012). Of course, many details and applications of food sovereignty need to change in these different contexts. Perhaps the translation is no more difficult than translating food sovereignty into the contexts of disparate peasant communities around the world, with their different food production methods and the cultures around them. On the other hand, if there is some unique problem of translation for food sovereignty from rural subsistence communities in poor countries to communities of food consumers – by and large – in relatively affluent countries, it is worth exploring what that problem may be.

For some critics, this concern about the movement not “traveling well” might be predicated on a misunderstanding of the concept of food sovereignty that is used by many activists. Namely, there is a tendency among some critics to think that food sovereignty is necessarily committed to a kind of food self-sufficiency, or food independence. Perhaps this derives from the meaning of “food sovereignty” as sometimes used by states in contexts often focused on food independence and national security (Koont 2011; La Vía Campesina 1996). If food sovereignty necessarily entailed this ideal of independence, it would not be a useful or even possible goal for many groups, such as urban dwellers. However, though food sovereignty activists have stressed the importance of the integrity of producers and food production processes, they do not argue for isolated communities to be able to produce all their own food. Rather, the ideal of food sovereignty entails maximally local control over communities’ food systems (Menser 2008). Those systems will often – perhaps always – include connections with other communities to share food, tools, skills, and so on. Urban communities fighting for food sovereignty may well envision a system that includes affordable grocery stores along with urban gardens and other elements in a complex food system; for food sovereignty the important characteristic of that overall system is that it is determined by the affected communities through processes that are as democratic as possible. Thus understood, many of the actual overarching principles of food sovereignty – e.g., community and individual flourishing, maximally local and democratic decision-making, broad transnational networks of solidarity and mutual aid – seem like plausible candidates for a large, transnational social movement.

There is another, deeper version of the concern about translation and portability of food sovereignty to other contexts. It is an open question whether food plays or can play the same role in communities that do not produce much food, as compared to the central role it has among self-described peasants. In particular, for non-rural communities food is less obviously connected to other justice issues, such as gender justice, land reform, economic justice, and so on. Even if it is the case in non-rural communities that fixing food injustices requires addressing other issues in society and culture, food might not serve as the best rallying cry for making those changes. To address this concern, it is worth exploring the phenomenal nature of food for people not as immediately, materially connected to its production.

Food

It is not a new idea to argue that food carries enough meaning for its producers that it can motivate movements for justice. Indeed, the idea occurs at many points throughout history. From the Tiller movement in ancient China, 700 BCE, to the Diggers in 17th Century, to the Farmworker Movement in the US in the 19th Century, many social movements have taken the practice

around food as a model for social reform. The experiences of producing food – working with the land, cooperating with one another by necessity, watching something grow and caring for it without being able to control the process directly – encourage particular types of values and cultural practices for many who work as producers.

Such examples highlight the roles of producers and show how models for justice emerge based on valuing food production. For consumers, particularly in the modern age, the commodification and fetishization of food may render the production process and its values opaque; this is why many have advocated for an engagement with food production to some extent in all sectors of society (e.g., Berry 1977; Thompson 1994; 2010). However, there is a possibility that engagement with the phenomenon of food as experienced by modern consumers will not only fail to connect them with these justice-related values of production, but connect them instead with the efficiency- and consumption-based values of the current global industrial food system – the opposite of the reaction food sovereignty activists are hoping for. As the activist and writer Derrick Jensen worries:

If your experience – far deeper than belief or perception – is that your food comes from the grocery store (and your water from the tap), from the economic system, from the social system we call civilization, it is to this you will pledge back your life. . . . You will defend this social system to your very death.

(2006: 696)

The question, then, is whether food can serve as a boundary object for those not engaged in “the peasants’ way” (as “La Vía Campesina” translates in English) to motivate a transnational, radical, social-justice movement. A sign that it may is that, as put by Dena Hoff, the North American coordinator of La Vía Campesina, “Everybody eats” (Ridberg 2013). By this she means that food is something everyone engages with every day, at least in consumption, and often in preparation and distribution, even if they do not engage with it as a producer. There are two elements of our experience of food as eaters that hold some support for Hoff’s vision – food’s material connection to justice and ethics, and food’s phenomenological connection to justice and ethics.

First, eating food can be experientially as well as materially tied to ethics and justice. It is widely agreed that eating has a material connection to ethical and justice-based issues, even for those who disagree on which food system would be more ethical, or on the relative importance of eating compared to other activities. This material, ethical connection is what undergirds the Fair Trade movement (e.g., Goodman 2004), ethical vegetarianism/veganism (e.g., Plumwood 2000; Singer 1975), appeals for sustainable fish consumption (e.g., Jacquet and Pauly 2006), food-miles labeling (e.g., Singer and Mason 2006), many boycotts of particular food products or producers (e.g., Singer and Mason 2006), and a host of other social movements around the consumption of food. In all such cases, the act of consuming particular foods is seen as lending material support and reinforcement to ethically charged practices by producers. Thus, for many people and communities not focused on food production, food nevertheless serves as a tangible, salient reminder of ethical and justice issues. For urban communities, a lack of access to fresh, healthy, affordable food can be a constant reminder of social inequity and its material consequences.

Phenomenally, it seems to be the case that, even for consumers, food can be bound up with awareness of where it came from, how it was produced, and other salient interconnections. When we eat (as marketers and menu-writers well know), knowing something about how it was prepared, where the recipe or ingredients come from, and other narrative details about the food can be as much a part of the enjoyment of the meal as the feeling in the mouth, the information registered by the tongue, the smell, the appearance, the location of the experience, the company, the

sounds during the event, and other elements that help build up into the overall taste. This narrative aspect of the experience of eating has a distinctly normative flavor – some narratives are good and taste good, while others are bad and taste bad. For example, for many people in our culture, authenticity and naturalness (whatever those might mean) have strongly positive connotations and enhance the taste of the food with which they associated, while artificiality has more negative connotations and can have a deleterious effect on the taste of our food. This is well known by marketers who often try to create a sense of authenticity and naturalness for their products (see, e.g., Cloud 2008; Molleda and Roberts 2008).

While this account runs the risk of making narratives into aesthetic experiences consumed by the eater, a narrative understanding of our relationship with food also creates the possibility for something more. This normative component can sometimes be bound up to ethics and justice. The rise of fair-trade, organic, shade-grown, vegetarian, and other such monikers (however ineffective these particular labels might be at correctly indicating the qualities they promise) shows that for many, there is a profound preference for food that is part of ethical and just processes. Further, people do not enjoy being told about unethical aspects of foods they enjoy – such as the harvesting process for much of the chocolate we consume (see Mustapha 2010) – particularly while they are eating. (Perhaps this is because they are thus prevented from conveniently forgetting these facts.) It seems to be the case that such information is more distasteful to people than discussion of other injustices, which do not directly pertain to the food they are eating; thus such hesitance is not merely a desire to focus on the pleasurable experiences of eating without being reminded of injustice generally. Rather, in a sense, it seems that ethical food tastes better and unethical food tastes worse (Kaplan 2015). We can see this with stark clarity in the case of people for whom ethical considerations render many foods entirely inedible, such as moral vegetarians or vegans. Speaking from personal experience, it was not long after becoming a vegetarian for moral reasons that meat became not only something I chose not to eat, but indeed something I found deeply unappetizing. The unethical nature (as I perceived it) of meat made it taste and smell bad.

There are times when an eater knows of ethical and justice concerns, but those concerns appear not to affect the eater's enjoyment of a food. In such cases I would argue that the ethical narrative content of the food is still one aspect of the experience, but that aspect does not become salient due to being overwhelmed by other aspects. For example, sometimes food is rejected on ethical grounds due to the material effects of consuming the food, without much thought given to what the experience of eating the food would be like, as was likely the case for many who engaged in the boycotts of particular grape farms as part of the United Farm Workers' campaigns in California in the late 1950s and early 1960s (see Ganz 2009). Other times, eaters enjoy a food despite knowing the ways in which it is unethical, such as for those who understand and decry the treatment of workers in banana plantations, yet enjoy bananas, or those who are disturbed by the production methods of foie gras and yet enjoy it. However, in these cases, it seems probable that most people who actually hold those values would enjoy an ethical and just version of those foods more, much as bland food can be enjoyable despite the fact that properly seasoned food might be enjoyed even more. If not, we would have normative grounds to criticize their enjoyment of the food as revealing either an insensitivity toward or endorsement of the unethical aspects of the food (as happens in some discussions between vegetarians and meat eaters). This phenomenon of the ethical or justice-based aspects of eating has potential as a source of normativity to be harnessed in support of the food-sovereignty movement. If eating highlights ethical and justice concerns, then food could be an excellent candidate for a framework to understand and address the concerns of food sovereignty activists, as the act of eating connects a host of justice and ethics issues that are not otherwise easily put into a single framework.

A food-sovereignty movement may also be supported by another salient element of our experience of food as eaters: the ways in which food is bound up with our identities, values, and practices, both as individuals and as communities. The experience of eating is an experience of one's culture and of bonding with one's community, particularly when we sit down to eat with others. In a sense we are eating culture when we sit down to the table. This is both an experience of identity and a performance of identity for anyone eating at the same table.

This is most obvious in people whose eating practices differ significantly from mainstream cultural norms. The ways in which food is co-constituted with community identity is relatively clear when communities must work to actively preserve their food practices, such as in the case of kosher practices for observant Jews. It is not necessary to be a kosher slaughterer to recognize that your kosher food values and practices as a consumer are inseparable parts of your community's culture and identity in a shared social imaginary. This phenomenon is less apparent for members of cultures in which food plays a less explicit role, and particularly for members of dominant cultures for which cultural practices and values are made invisible rather than brought into relief by the most prominent food distribution and production systems. However, despite this invisibility, this cultural component of food is also salient for those dominant cultures with less explicit dietary values. For example, the social imaginary around meat in Western culture is bound up with what we imagine as a culture of masculinity, patriotism, and so forth (Adams 1990). This cultural orientation would make it difficult for many North Americans to change their eating habits overnight to abandon meat in favor of a plant-based diet; combined with other dominant ideologies, this cultural identity ensures a high level of resistance to institutional changes that put ranchers out of business or otherwise make eating meat difficult.

At the level of individual identity, too, the co-constitution of food and identity becomes more visible in cases where an eater's food practices significantly differ from the norms of her larger society, such as for someone on a severely restricted diet, someone who refuses to eat a food on moral or religious grounds, or someone who considers herself a wine connoisseur. In such cases, the eater's identity and its interconnections with food become salient at every meal, and this identity is performed to others, whose responses may differ in the degree to which they ignore, comment upon, or police the behavior against deviation from the societal norm.

This co-constitution of identity and food is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it means that structural change to the dominant food system is difficult, as that system reinforces and is reinforced by culture and by food practices. (For this point, it is instructive to return to the idea of cultural allegiances expressed by Jensen [2006] quoted above.) On the other hand, it means that food is a daily act of engaging with one's culture and community, and thus a vivid place to begin or to reinforce a conversation about justice and community flourishing. If that conversation can begin to change food habits, those changes can have quite profound ripple effects on people's attitudes toward other institutions. Sometimes this "conversation" is not a verbal one, but instead a silent change in the discourse. Food choices by one party can often ethically charge a situation that previously was seen as unproblematic – what Adams (1990) calls standing in for the absent referent of the victims of particular food choices. While Adams refers to the non-human animals being eaten after being symbolically and materially reduced to meat, it is also the case that the producers of the food are also often an absent referent.

We can see the power of food as a resonant aspect of larger social change, even for mere consumers, in the historical example of sugar and the slave trade in England. The push for a boycott of sugar – produced on slave plantations through particularly brutal practices – accomplished

several important goals. Materially, it affected slaveholders by hurting their economic interests. In accomplishing this goal it also made every teatime and meal an opportunity to show solidarity with victims of the slave trade, beginning or reinforcing conversations about the abhorrent nature of slavery among those sitting at the same table. This helped reinforce the identity of being an Abolitionist for those who participated in the boycott. It was thus an act of pressure against the slave trade, a recruitment and retention mechanism for Abolitionists, and a lever to change the culture.⁴

Translating food sovereignty

It seems at least possible that food sovereignty as a movement could resonate in contexts far removed from those in which it first emerged, even for those people whose primary interactions with food are as consumers and perhaps preparers. This is true both for food sovereignty's argument that addressing food insecurity requires fixing deeper problems in society, and also for the argument that food is a good frame within which to work toward radical change. However, this does not mean that casual adoption of the framework of food sovereignty will be successful for groups interested in food and justice in the US and other wealthy economies. Such adoptions have been attempted, but they sometimes diffuse the radical political potential of food sovereignty, properly understood, by reducing it to a simplistic – and sometimes even jingoistic – argument for local food (Fairbairn 2012) to the exclusion of other concerns such as immigrant communities (Alkon and Mares 2012) or solidarity and support for distant communities (Navin 2014). These attempts to use the rhetoric of food sovereignty without sufficient self-reflection in a US context also run the risk of reinforcing neoliberal discourse, such as by focusing on market-based approaches, even if it means pricing food-insecure individuals and communities out of the healthy food market (Alkon and Mares 2012).

In these cases, problems arise when food sovereignty is reduced to a call to be closer to the production of food, on the one hand – either by growing some food oneself or by minimizing food miles for purchased food – and, on the other hand, a vague sympathy toward producers in poorer countries. This flattening of food sovereignty allows it to stand alongside so-called “happy meat,” “paleo” diets, and other such food choices, to be added to the list of options available to privileged people living as consumers in a neoliberal system of industrial capitalism. This translation loses the resistance to neoliberal globalization that is fundamental to food sovereignty. Instead, it is precisely that element of resistance that the work of translation ought to preserve. Thus, the expansion of food sovereignty as a framework for justice should move from the model provided by subsistence food producers resisting neoliberal globalization in poor countries to the model of communities in rich countries, producing some food but to a much lesser extent, figuring out how they can best resist neoliberal globalization from their position of relative privilege – especially by identifying and creating opportunities for radical solidarity and mutual aid with other, less privileged communities.

It is not possible for this chapter to define exactly what that translation should look like. Rather, such a translation must occur in democratic dialogue within and between communities. To do otherwise would undercut the commitment to maximally local, democratic decision-making, which is the hallmark of food sovereignty (Menser 2008). Such a democratic, justly conducted conversation utilizes the “propaganda of the deed” (Breines 1989; Graeber 2004) to prefigure the kind of food sovereignty movement that is its goal, and indeed to prefigure the society that food sovereignty activists ultimately aim to achieve.

Conclusion

It is perhaps ironic that the worries about translating food sovereignty into other contexts are usually expressed about moving from a context of production to one of consumption, yet it is precisely the retention of the production aspect of food sovereignty, as opposed to its radical political aims, that has caused failures of translation into more privileged contexts. It is perfectly consistent with dominant US culture, for example, to value the production of food as a noble goal, and even to value more abstractly the producers of food. Indeed, the celebration of cowboys and the use of phrases such as the “heartland” show that this valorization is already a part of mainstream US culture. If this symbolic appreciation is the meaning of food sovereignty in a US context, then food movements seem destined to ignore or even support current unjust institutions. Much more challenging to translate into mainstream US culture is the resistance to current global economic and political systems, radical solidarity, and maximally local yet transnationally linked democracy. It is important to stress that this work will require translation, rather than simple importation – for example, it is an open question what maximally local, democratic decision-making around food systems means in the US, with its dependence on large numbers of migrant and immigrant agricultural laborers. Addressing questions such as this one would be of benefit not only to the US food system, but also to the movement of food sovereignty as a whole, in part because many laborers in the US food production and distribution system come from the same subsistence food production communities that originated the food sovereignty movement, and in part because accelerating climate change will vastly increase the volume of migration and immigration in the future.

Fortunately, such translations may be possible. It is certainly the case that food is a fetishized commodity for many, cut off from the labor and materials that created it. Yet even in this fetishized state there is a phenomenal character of food that ties it to its origins, and this embeds our cultures and our communities and individual identities within our experiences as eaters, not only as producers. That these connections can emerge every day with such vividness makes food a promising vehicle for critical self-reflection and change, and one that cannot be avoided or entirely ignored in any community that is striving for justice.

Notes

- ¹ For recent scholarly work delving into the complex history of food sovereignty, see McMichael (2014) and Edelman (2014). While some disagree as to the origin of the term, all sources agree that Vía was one of its most prominent early exponents, and Vía has continued to play a prominent role in advocating for and developing the concept in the years since its inception.
- ² Even within this discourse of transnational social justice there are differences in conceptions of what these goals require. For a discussion of different conceptions of food sovereignty as either reformist or revolutionary, see Werkheiser et al. (2015).
- ³ For a good discussion of gender in food sovereignty generally and in Vía in particular, see Navin (2015).
- ⁴ See Hochschild (2005) for a good discussion of the sugar boycott in the Abolition movement in England.

References

- Adams, C. (1990) *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Alkon, A. H. and T. M. Mares. (2012) “Food Sovereignty in US Food Movements: Radical Visions and Neoliberal Constraints,” *Agriculture and Human Values* 29(3): 347–359.
- Ayres, J. and M. J. Bosia. (2011) “Beyond Global Summitry: Food Sovereignty as Localized Resistance to Globalization,” *Globalizations* 8(1): 47–63.

- Berry, W. (1977) *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture*, San Francisco: Sierra Club.
- Breines, W. (1989) *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Cloud, B. (2008) "Synthetic Authenticity," *Time Magazine*, viewed on 10 November 2015, http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1720049_1720050_1722070,00.html.
- Edelman, M. (2014) "Food Sovereignty: Forgotten Genealogies and Future Regulatory Challenges," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6): 959–978.
- Fairbairn, M. (2012) "Framing Transformation: The Counter-Hegemonic Potential of Food Sovereignty in the US Context," *Agriculture and Human Values* 29(2): 217–230.
- Flora, C. B. (2011) (Book Review) Schanbacher, W. D.: "The Politics of Food: The Global Conflict Between Food Security and Food Sovereignty," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 24: 545–547.
- Ganz, M. (2009) *Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Organization, and Strategy in the California Farm Worker Movement*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodman, M. K. (2004) "Reading Fair Trade: Political Ecological Imaginary and the Moral Economy of Fair Trade Foods," *Political Geography* 23(7): 891–915.
- Graeber, D. (2004) *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology*, Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Hochschild, A. (2005) *Bury the Chains: Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire's Slaves*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Jacquet, J. L. and D. Pauly. (2006) "The Rise of Seafood Awareness Campaigns in an Era of Collapsing Fisheries," *Marine Policy* 31(3): 308–313.
- Jensen, D. (2006) *Endgame, Volume 2: Resistance*, New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Kaplan, D. (2015) "What Does Ethics Taste Like?" *Moral Cultures of Food* (Keynote Address). University of North Texas, March 20.
- Koont, S. (2011) *Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- La Vía Campesina. (1996) "Declaration of Food Sovereignty," viewed on 10 November 2015, <http://www.voiceoftheturtle.org/library/1996%20Declaration%20of%20Food%20Sovereignty.pdf>.
- McMichael, P. (2014) "Historicizing Food Sovereignty," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(6): 933–957.
- Menser, M. (2008) "Transnational Participatory Democracy in Action: The Case of La Vía Campesina," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 39(1): 20–41.
- Molleda, J. C. and M. Roberts. (2008) "The Value of 'Authenticity' in 'Glocal' Strategic Communication: The New Juan Valdez Campaign," *International Journal of Strategic Communications* 2(3): 154–174.
- Mustapha, K. (2010) "Taste of Child Labor Not So Sweet: A Critique of Regulatory Approaches to Combating Child Labor Abuses by the U.S. Chocolate Industry," *Washington University Law Review* 87(5): 1163–1195.
- Navin, M. (2014) "Local Food and International Ethics," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 27(3): 349–368.
- . (2015) "Food Sovereignty and Gender Justice: The Case of La Vía Campesina," in Jill Dieterle (ed.), *Just Food: Philosophy, Food and Justice*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 87–100.
- Nyeléni Declaration. (2007) *Nyeléni 2007—Forum for Food Sovereignty*, viewed on 10 November 2015, <http://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290>.
- Our World is Not for Sale – Priority to People's Food Sovereignty, WTO Out of Agriculture. (2001) *La Vía Campesina: International Peasant's Movement*, viewed on 15 Oct 2015, <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/food-sovereignty-and-trade-mainmenu-38/396-peoples-food-sovereignty-wto-out-of-agriculture>.
- Patel, R. (2009) "Grassroots Voices: Food Sovereignty," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(3): 663–706.
- Plumwood, V. (2000) "Integrating Ethical Frameworks for Animals, Humans, and Nature: A Critical Feminist Eco-Socialist Analysis," *Ethics and the Environment* 5(2): 285–322.
- Ridberg, R. (2013) "Leading the Fight for Food Sovereignty, An Interview with La Vía Campesina's Dena Hoff," *World Watch Institute*, viewed 10 November 2015, <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/6514>.
- Singer, P. (1975) *Animal Liberation*, New York: Random House.
- Singer, P. and J. Mason. (2006) *The Ethics of What We Eat: Why Our Food Choices Matter*, Emmaus, PA: Rodale Inc.
- Star, S. L. and J. R. Greisemer. (1989) "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals on Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology," *Social Studies of Science* 19(3): 387–420.
- Thompson, P. B. (1994) *The Spirit of the Soil: Agriculture and Environmental Ethics*, New York: Routledge.
- . (2010) *The Agrarian Vision: Sustainability and Environmental Ethics*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- . (2015) *From Field to Fork: Food Ethics for Everyone*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tlaxcala Declaration of the Vía Campesina. (1996) viewed 10 November 2015, <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>.
- Werkheiser, I., S. Tyler, and P. B. Thompson. (2015) "Food Sovereignty: Two Conceptions of Food Justice," in Jill Dieterle (ed.), *Just Food: Philosophy, Food and Justice*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 71–86.
- Wiebe, N. (2013) "Women of La Vía Campesina: Creating and Occupying Our Rightful Spaces," in *La Vía Campesina's Open Book: Celebrating 20 Years of Struggle and Hope*, viewed 10 November 2015, <http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/publications-mainmenu-30/1409-la-via-campesina-s-open-book-celebrating-20-years-of-struggle-and-hope>.
- Wittman, H., A. Desmarais, and N. Wiebe. (2010) *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature, and Community*, Oakland, CA: Food First Books.