



International
Institute of
Social Studies

Erasmus



EL FUTURO DE LA ALIMENTACIÓN Y RETOS DE LA AGRICULTURA PARA EL SIGLO XXI:

Debates sobre quién, cómo y con qué implicaciones sociales, económicas y ecológicas alimentará el mundo.

THE FUTURE OF FOOD AND CHALLENGES FOR AGRICULTURE IN THE 21st CENTURY:

Debates about who, how and with what social, economic and ecological implications we will feed the world.

ELIKADURAREN ETORKIZUNA ETA NEKAZARITZAREN ERRONKAK XXI. MENDERAKO:

Mundua nork, nola eta zer-nolako inplikazio sozial, ekonomiko eta ekologikorekin elikatuko duen izango da eztabaidagaia

Operationalizing Food Sovereignty: a critical approach from an ongoing experiment in Turkey

Caner Murat Doğançayır and Umut Kocagöz

Paper # 39

Apirila – Abril – April
24, 25, 26
2017


elikadura²¹

NAZIOARTEKO HIZKETALDIA
COLOQUIO INTERNACIONAL
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM

www.elikadura21.eu

Operationalizing Food Sovereignty: a critical approach from an ongoing experiment in Turkey

Caner Murat Doğançayır and Umut Kocagöz

Introduction: Investigating movement by acting within the movement

It was almost a sunny afternoon when a group of people were travelling in a bus through the Thrace Region of Turkey to arrive the Bulgarian border. Inside the bus were representatives of small farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolks, researchers, seed producers, environmental activists, urban farmers, students, activists working for cooperatives, and some other who would call themselves *quadres* of the food sovereignty movement. The bus was going to Cluj, Romania, to join the 2nd Nyéléni Europe Forum for Food Sovereignty, held in October 2016.

The picture was almost complete, representing the “already-in-construction” (Schiavoni 2016, 3) food sovereignty movement of Turkey, including people from all the regions, ages and genders. Actually, this picture has inspired us for presenting such a paper, as in front of our very eyes, there was the food sovereignty movement emerging, being constructed against the odds, as it was representing a country where there was all means of state oppression against the right to organize, right to demand rights, or even right to have rights (Patel 2009).

The writers of this paper were also part of the delegation, as interpreters, researchers, and part of the voluntary solidarity group of Çiftçi-SEN¹, which was the focal point of Turkey. Moreover, we were, and still, the founding members/cooperators of the Kadıköy Cooperative, a consumer cooperative that operates in one of the most crowded and central provinces of Istanbul, Kadıköy.

In this paper, we would like to focus on Kadıköy Cooperative experience, that we both realize our activism, participate the decision-making process, as well critically investigate through activist/academic research. One of us has been part of the cooperative for almost 2 years when it reborned, and the other for more than a year, handling all the everyday burden since then. In order to do this, we would like to begin engaging critically with the food sovereignty literature as well the urban food justice literature when needed. After, we will describe the food sovereignty “articulation” in Turkey by discussing the conditions and emergence of different kinds of actors within its history. At the end, we will focus on the cooperative experience and try to determine its place within the articulation and see in which ways it differentiates itself from other consumer groups.

¹ Çiftçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu- Çiftçi-SEN (Confederation of Small Farmers’ Unions); the only member organisation of La Via Campesina in Turkey. Çiftçi-SEN is a confederation that is a combination of 7 farmers’ unions each based on a product: tea, hazelnut, grapes, tobacco, husbandry, sunflower and grain. For each product, there is a union which tries to organize the farmers who produce mostly (or only) that product.

From food sovereignty to food justice movements: theory, limits and possibilities

After being used by La Via Campesina (1996) as an alternative for *food security*, food sovereignty as a paradigm, an ontological alternative (McMichael 2004), an analytical framework (Schiavoni, 2016), a political project (Alonso-Fradejas et al. 2015), and as a movement or countermovement (McMichael, 2004) still preserves its popularity and power, most probably for its usefulness and ability to connect different kinds of problems and relations. Moreover, it is clear that till now scholars and activists had made a great effort to contextualize, operationalize and politicize the concept in a fruitful way as it can be now used in a relational, historical and interactive (Schiavoni, 2016) manner that allows us to focus everyday relations (Figueroa 2015) formed around the “food” issues. In other words, the “food” of “food sovereignty” opened up a space for us to talk about every systematic issue around the problem of “sovereignty”.

To follow the history of food sovereignty, this should be taken as a “conjuncture”, that is like both being stuck as well open to new directions and possibilities. It is likely to say that focusing on the “sovereignty” part of “food sovereignty” has deepened the concept and put up new questions problematizing the subject, the “nature” of power, and the relationality of subjects based on power relations. For example, based on Ollman’s (2013) understanding of ‘process’ and ‘relation’, Figueroa (2015) offers a relational conception of “food” that is a kind of “ensemble of relations” that not puts the food only as a matter of commodity or a product, but as social relations of people, which would lead revealing the production of social relations in “particular places and historical conjunctures” (Figueroa, 2015, 503).

So, if roughly the 500 years of the existence of global capitalism has a consequence on the way people encounter and experience food (Figueroa, 2015), the food can also reflect back the relations like what Figueroa calls as “prism” onto the relations of power throughout the capitalist production. Then, what becomes important turns into sovereignty as a “living process”, but not an object (Iles and Montenegro de Wit, 2015). This is not a finite process, but it is a dialectical process between the “project” and “the reality”. This kind of thought focuses on “how” instead of “what” (Iles and Montenegro de Wit, 2015) and “how” is the everyday relations and practices, the relations of power. Thus, from a relational way of understanding things, we arrive at a point where the sovereignty turns into be a “social construction” (Iles and Montenegro de Wit, 2015) where in different time and space, it is always challenged, negotiated, remade through the acts of different social actors.

In this regard, it is possible to see the call for food sovereignty was a success of primarily La Via Campesina and alliances, “exposing” a *political project* through one sector of the society onto a global terrain. The “food” was the connection for different sectors, and the way it connected different sectors has become a *problem of sovereignty*. The call of La Via Campesina, in this sense, was a matter of “self-determination” (Figueroa, 2015) primarily of our food system, but as well

our lives in general. As sovereignty is a “contested terrain” (Schiavoni, 2016) with competing actors (Patel, 2009), the question turns into “who is the sovereign of food sovereignty” (Schiavoni, 2015). To operationalize food sovereignty as a framework, this position needs to be kept in mind so that it can always relate different actors with their interests, social relations, histories and their actuality in a movement.²

Promising challenges of Food Sovereignty Movement

Food sovereignty as a “political project” manifests itself through everyday relations beginning from the production at the farm, delivering food products to the consumers, the shopping in a consumer’s cooperative, as well in demonstrations, actions, local, regional and global forums and meetings, etc. Thus, the political project appears at different moments and places of life, connecting and mobilizing people with different means and modes.

In this sense, what was “at once a slogan” is now “a paradigm, a mix of practical policies, a movement and a utopian aspiration” (Edelman, 2014, 960) and it is legitimate to call it as a “movement” that connects different sectors of the society with a specific kind of knowledge -the one that Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014) calls as *diálogo de saberes*. Whenever we call something as a “movement”, there is the threat to homogenize and reduce the diversity within the movement. Thanks to the scholars and the movement(s) itself, the food sovereignty movement can be considered as “united” movement with all its divergence (Desmarais, 2007).

Today, after passing “historical steps” described by McMichael (2014) it can be said that the focus of attention is based on a global movement connecting the “urban” and the “rural” actors fighting for a common cause: “democratizing the food system” (McMichael 2014), constructing a new state-society relationship (Schiavoni, 2015) that attempts reclaiming autonomy, a democratic self-governing project, or as Borras put it, a political project led by the communities independent from the state (Borras, 2010).³

Edelman (2014, 964) reminds us that the term sovereignty was much related with autonomy at the beginning, which can directly be understood in connection with “independence”, and recalls the nation and/or the state into the question of matter. Hence, as Schiavoni (2015 and 2016) points some other kinds of questions of the contemporary movement regarding a different *governmental unit*, a different sovereignty scale, putting the emphasis on relationality, the political

² To keep in mind, “competing sovereignties” (Patel 2009, 668) is not only a case for the food issue, but also a *zeitgeist* of our contemporary world. The system and anti-systemic movement is living together, one day expressing itself as a radical fight on the streets, another day a meeting together at FAO headquarters, and other day a much more radical war, with guns and tanks, frontline communities.

³ In order to keep in mind, “it is not only social movement alliances but also the past and future possible food riots that connects the rural-urban into a common project” (McMichael 2014, 948).

agenda of food sovereignty movement can be described now, the question of “who is sovereign” in “food sovereignty” (Edelman, 2014, 967).

As the scholars and the movement showed us so far, thinking on this matter of sovereignty brought us back to the contemporary crisis of neoliberal governmentality: who will be governing, as the sovereign body? In what kind of a political/social organization it will be? Scholars and social movements from very local base to broadly global ones are trying to deal with this question, in theory and in practice.

Thus, the agenda of the food sovereignty movement is now focused on the “who” question, putting it as a matter of organization. The questions posed by (Edelman 2014, 974) on who will be the “agent” of the operationalization of food sovereignty is very crucial, but it is only a matter of practice, as only new forms of organizations interrelation with the ones at action can solve the question in practice. As Iles and Montenegro de Wit (2015) propose, making of the sovereign itself is a process, that “there is a politics of making sovereignty” (486). This is where the relations of power occur in a very specific time and place, a context, where social powers encounter, intersect, even fight and determine their sovereignties. In other words, the actor question can only be resolved by the formation of the actor; and this question is broader than the definitions; it is a question of power relations. As Patel (2009) rightly refers to the Bentham’s argument about rights, there needs to be a guarantor of the rights, or put it in a more provocative way, the owner of the rights must become their own guarantor. Probably, it will be the only route for a “self-determined food systems” (Figueroa, 2015, 506) in our contemporary world.

So, the peasant movement building alliance with other sectors of the society in terms of ecological society and public health regarding healthy and nutritious food (McMichael 2004) turned the food sovereignty as a political project, now uniting the different sectors of society in a multiple agent possible, multiple layered, multiple geographical social movement.⁴ Interestingly, it can be said that through food emerged a social movement, a very multitude one, that has the potential to build a new social formation for it connects all different sectors of the society, from diverse social, political, class, gender and race positions, for equality and liberation for all.⁵

The power of food unfolding strands of issues for social movements within food sovereignty concept. These issues articulated within the process of evolving power relations ensembled and the process of social invention of becoming and being sovereign within plurality of contexts, various time-spaces. In this sense

⁴ “The peasant perspective” (McMichael, 2014) as defending the land is now equally the interest of the society is what the food sovereignty movement tries to build in all its agenda. This connection can be defined as politics of hegemony, proposed by the peasants, and turning the consumers as actors of the society who needs to take future into their hands.

⁵ The Landless Rural Workers Movement - MST’s experience in the city centers can be noted at this point. The MST, almost in all states of Brazil, organises “agrarian reform fairs”, that aims directly connect the landless peasants with urban workers through healthy food and show that agrarian reform is a matter of whole society.

questions of subjectivity arose, rooted in and derive from contested global terrain of sovereignty construction.

Within the scope of subjectivity, as the emphasis on the notion of autonomy face with governmentality, scale and the subject of food sovereignty becomes a new contested terrain for social movements. As food sovereignty movement succeeded to keep its unity among diversity, struggle to construct democratic, autonomous food system opens up new terrains that re-connects social actors across urban and rural regions and various scales. Subsequently while constructing democratic, autonomous food system, struggles must aim to simultaneously be owner and guarantor of their own rights to resolve questions of power relations.

Food sovereignty concept evolving into a much more complex political project engaged in and embodied various forms of organizations from different localities, cultures, sectors and social struggles. As it is open to re-connect urban based struggles as well as rural and peasant based movements for a intertwined counter-hegemonic project, subjectivities, tools for urban social movements to translate their experience and action into food sovereignty movement is still open to improvement.

Critique of Alternative Food Initiatives

The role of food communities is mostly lacking in the food sovereignty literature, as food sovereignty still widely recognized (inherently) as a peasant-based concept, but not widely recognized as an “alternative paradigm” for different sectors of the society. Therefore, we would like to investigate the alternative food initiatives (AFIs) literature to supply our discussion.

AFIs literature emphasizes re-localization as a self-fulfilling strategy for the sake of rural and regional economic development as well as food systems improvement together with notions of quality, trust and embeddedness (Bedore 2010; Levkoe 2014). Although food movements act with the theoretical and practical repertoire of alternative agri-food systems and place themselves opposed to conventional one, market-based strategies do not directly part their position from “global” and “industrialized” contents and “local” and “sustainable” do not guarantee any improvement of food access for low-income communities (Mares and Alkon 2011; Bedore 2010; Levkoe 2014).

Stimulating construction of local, niche markets to maintain provision of fresh food in more accessible conditions but remaining insistently at local scale fails to address structural issues of corporate food regime and market based strategies fail to overcome issues around subjectivities of power over access to food. Thus, contested spaces of neoliberal politics limits interests and constrains power of urban food movements to scales of urban districts or at best provincial policies (Clandenning et al. 2016; Levkoe 2014). Moreover, their main focus on the change of individual consumption practices, market-based solutions, consequently limited

interest of community members, lack of harmony between goals and existing practices and being away from targeting structural inequality issues considering control and access over resources and racism are topics that community food projects face with (Block et al. 2012). As the obvious inequality considering the access to food is stated by Sbicca (2012):

(L)ocalized consumer politics is insufficient to bring about food justice because many communities do not have the buying power to obtain organic, sustainable, and boutique food; inequality does not disappear with a spatial ordering of food production and consumption. (46)

Possibilities and Challenges of Alternative Food Initiatives

Taking experiences of AFIs granted and actual improvements for further collaboration despite their limitations seem promising for future food politics. Emerging alliances among alternative food initiatives (AFIs) come up as current and future contributions for an expanded social movement. Networks built upon those alliances crosscuts various scales and places which may help to build social movements with long-term objectives for structural changes to transform food system (Levkoe 2014).

Moragues-Faus (2016) suggests four key lessons to be taken from previous AFI experiences. First, AFIs' variegated politics, suggests developing alternative strategies according to different spatialities and temporalities, needs reconsideration. Second, it is important to set the value of food different from commodity food which makes alternative strategy not *transforming* the market but *replacing* the market. Future attempts should design their agenda of the alternative strategy towards disengagement from capitalist relations together with autonomous social and economic realities. Third, the way ethical food practices are constructed, subjects that initiate dominant practice and the ones that are excluded and the ways of inclusion and transformation should have taken seriously. At last respects of collective consumption must be understood with a relational approach.

Struggle against neoliberalism is not only settled within the arena of national or transnational levels of institutions, rather social movements' spatial politics give instruments of food sovereignty struggle like urban-rural partnerships (Clandenning et al. 2016). Food justice movements connects with and constructs transnational networks in opposition, grassroots organizations built alternatives (urban agriculture experiences or regional food strategies) to disintegrate from global food system, based on daily life experiences and democratic practice (Wekerle 2004). These emerging networks face informative challenges. Unevenly articulated social, economic and cultural capitals inserted by various AFIs lead to unequal access to those expanding networks. Therefore socio-spatial inequalities implicit within AFIs may reproduce and exceed themselves as they involve these networks of together with internal problems they have. Finally, search for a common base among AFIs diversity without dealing with existing controversies

may harm plurality of discourse and agenda of an expanding network (Levkoe 2014).

Possibilities of Food Justice Movements

Food justice movements have repertoires derive both from social justice movements' practical experiences and alternative food movements limits and radical potentials. They also face industrial agri-food systems oppressive nature. Based on anti-oppression ideology that challenges various forms of structural inequalities within the agri-food systems towards self-determination and justice, they put emphasis on developing creative spaces regarding the contextuality of the community (Sbicca 2012). Also, Mares and Alkon (2011) argues that access to healthy, affordable, sustainable and culturally appropriate food is directly related with fighting against "classist and racist structural inequalities that are manifest in consumption, production and distribution of food" (75). Self-reliance, social justice and fundamental human rights are commonly emphasized (Mares and Alkon 2011). Moragues-Faus classifies distinctive notions of urban justice initiatives to transform food system as (2016):

- Horizontal and assembly inspired principles are being used in decision-making processes. Organizations also promote decentralization both spatially and internally.
- Sharing knowledge and raising political awareness through farm visits, criteria design for collective consumption practices and involvement in food sovereignty networks in various scales. Moreover, learning to work and consume collectively becoming pedagogical processes.
- Contributing the creation of sharing spaces through connecting and engaging alliances of food sovereignty movement at different scales and promoting self-management of initiatives.

Sbicca (2012) offers three strands of possible future challenges of food justice movements. First there's will need a common understanding, ideological base and more comprehensive set of tools to be imitated by future development of food justice movements. Second, movements will be paying attention to represent disadvantaged communities' own needs and experiences instead of radical initiatives self-justification. Finally, they will have to be aware of the contradictory contingency of food justice movements that being non-profit organization and face urgent conditions of communities to overcome within the neoliberal political sphere at the same time.

The subjects of struggle considering redistribution and rights of food access are open to questioning. In addition to subjectivity understanding trajectories and patterns of retail food sector across urban geography as reflections of class interests and manifestations of capitalism and its spatial inequalities in urban space might strengthen self-criticism. Struggle between states and grassroots movements is going to reshape the future of collective consumption in or beyond a capitalist society. Food justice movements will search ways for non-capitalist urban food provision to give collective consumption a new form. Retail food

spaces have hybrid character consists of both private and public motivations. Movements will also have to search for possibilities to shift urban food provision based on private ownership which such unequal food distribution shaped by the conflicts between urban citizens and retail corporations towards decentralized private ownership based on public commons. Building just urban food systems upon experiences of alternative retail spaces regarding ethics of consumption, collective construction of necessities, surplus and commons listed under agendas of these movements (Bedore 2010). Construction of alliances among food justice initiatives through urban-rural/farm-to-table networks together with the insistence to stay out of the corporate agri-food system as possible may pave the roads to social justice and sustainability (Sbicca 2012). On the contrary, market-based food provisioning reproduce and justify food as a commodity which inevitably limits its accessibility due to structural constraints of neoliberal policies (Mares and Alkon 2011).

Bridging Food Justice Movements with Food Sovereignty Construction

To examine tendencies of struggles raised by radical food movements towards the approach and construction of food sovereignty, it is suggested to analyze these movements' strategies, concepts and practices and whether they pose challenge against the corporate food regime within the context of neoliberal contested space of urban politics (Clandenning et al. 2016). Food movements, especially food justice movements have parallel motivations in action with food sovereignty as self-sufficiency and self-determination, though there's the need for scaling up and broadening their discourse and commitment to radically transform food system in multiple scales. Researchers find their practices potentials for more democratic food systems considering their developing web of relations through communities, NGOs, local and national governments and transnational alliances based on grassroots level (Mares and Alkon 2011).

It is stated that challenging corporate food regime, food sovereignty offers to *respatialize* social-economic relations through territorial and/or ethnic autonomy, in which there is much more theoretical and practical work to be done in order to *respatialize* it into urban food issues. Transnational approach of food sovereignty movement construction would be translated into alliances between local food systems as *translocal* approach (Mares and Alkon 2011). According to Block et al (2012) food sovereignties agenda regarding urban areas,

- Falsifies the argument that market relations are the only way to regulate food production
- Problematizes unevenly distributed power of control over economic regulation and development
- Struggles to regain control of citizens and peasants who face economic disparity with respect to broad global food system change

Food sovereignty, in this sense, bridges questions of food access with questions of access to land, right to decide, control over resources. As food becomes an issue

of rights rather than a commodity, struggles against urban food inequalities would meet injustices of corporate retail provisioning, transnational neoliberal arrangements and various racist policies (Mares and Alkon 2011). Struggle of citizens and peasants against uneven distribution of resources and access may become a powerful tool of community food activism regarding food sovereignty. Both concepts develop spatial strategies for food systems in different scales that crosscuts issues of uneven distribution of access, control and capital (Block et al. 2012).

Construction of food sovereignty movement in Turkey

In this part, we would like to describe and trace the moments and connections of the formation of food sovereignty articulation in Turkey.⁶ In order to do this, together with a brief history of breaking points of agriculture and food provision in Turkey, we need to go back to 2001, when a significant transformation process in Turkish agriculture started, and as well the one-rule party since today was dated back to the same period. Then, we will describe how the movement articulated itself under three major topics of struggle to lay relations among actors of food sovereignty in Turkey.

Historicizing the food sovereignty articulation in Turkey

The agriculture sector has always been an important part of Turkey, since the times of Ottoman Empire. At the beginning of the Turkish Republic, the rural population was around %85 of the country and agricultural production was %80 of all the production in the countryside (Günaydın, 2014). The governance of the agriculture sector had always been a matter of the state, as it was mostly protective, with different kinds of instruments like production cooperatives, sales cooperatives, credit cooperatives, which aim to organise small farmers to continue agricultural production, as well implement populist policies to gain support from the rural population.

This protective state position begins to change after the 24 January 1980 “economical decisions” and the 12 September 1980 Turkish coup d'état. The military coup was a way to implement neoliberal policies in each sector of society, as well “neoliberalization of society” was at play (Madra and Adaman, 2014). This had some effect on agricultural sector like liberalizing the seed and pesticide market, as well ending the monopoly over some state economic enterprises. Since 1980 till the end of 1990s, Turkey was involved in GATTs rounds, agreed some points with WTO, and implemented 17 IMF credits (Aysu, 2014a). However, it can be said that the protective position of the state has been continued over agricultural production, there was a controlled liberalization, and the farmers

⁶ So, what we try to do here is as Schiavoni (2016, 4) puts it: an investigation on how food sovereignty is constructed within a given time, history, setting, geography, and interactions of different kinds of actors. This, we will call as *articulation*.

were still protected to continue farming as well continue giving support to the ruling parties.

Meanwhile, the neoliberal policies have transformed the food regime with different means. Not to go much deep, “supermarketization” (Keyder and Yenil, 2011) can be a summarizing description to understand how the transformation happened. The transnational companies had opportunities to enter the national market both dominating and transforming the market with cheap products, transforming the spaces of commerce as it was a new trend that in each neighborhood there was a new shopping mall with a specific store for home and food needs.

We would like to recall the 2001 as a significant moment for the Turkish history for all its sectors as well the agriculture. The “volatile economic period” at the second half of the 1990s turned to be a deep crisis in 2001 (Karapinar et al. 2011). There needed to be a global response to this crisis and “together with the IMF, the government initiated a major stabilization program aimed at restoring macro-economic and fiscal stability” (Ibid, 24). There, the “Agricultural Reform Implementation Project” (ARIP) was designed by the World Bank and the Turkish Treasury, and put onto implementation beginning the next year. There were some concrete aims of ARIP in order to re-design thoroughly Turkish agriculture: to change the subsidy structure, from product base structure to a “direct income” structure; to eliminate the role of state-led cooperatives in production, marketing and processing processes; to encourage farmers for different kinds of crops rather than previously subsidized ones (Karapinar et al. 2011; Günaydın, 2014; Aysu, 2014a).

The movement in Turkey has developed how McMichael (2014) described: a political project against the corrupted agricultural policies that withdraw the support for domestic sectors, primarily tobacco, wheat, barley, hazelnut, tea. The call for food sovereignty appear at a moment where there were global changes (Shattuck et al. 2015, 424) affecting position that Turkey has in the global division of labor. The first formation of farmers’ movement was directly against the ARIP: defending the national agriculture sector against a global project that is implemented by the national government. The farmers were rallying with a slogan “WTO, keep your hands off our agriculture” directly grasping the global character of the transformation while accusing the government as it was going to “end” the agriculture sector. It may be noted that the sovereignty was never at the hands of the farmers. Rather, it was the “state” always sovereign over the agricultural sector, and the way it applied its sovereignty was based on economy and population policies. Hence, the subsidy policies, the existence of cooperative unities, and the longtime discourse to support peasantry was different kinds of instruments taking care of and protecting the farmers with different means. Thus, the ARIP was experienced as something “outsider”, designed by intergovernmental actors (WTO and IMF) which were also called as “institutions of imperialism”.

With some other different kind of agents, Confederation of Small Farmers' Unions (Çiftçi-SEN) was both taking part in this process organizing the reaction of farmers against ARIP as well organizing itself at the base level with product-based unions. After a couple of local, sub-regional and at the end national meeting, a decision was given in order to organize in product-base unions (Aysu, 2014b). The first two unions were Grape Producer's Union (Üzüm-SEN) and Tobacco Producers' Union (Tütün-SEN) dated back to 2004.⁷ Moreover, in some international meetings, delegates of Çiftçi-SEN encountered some delegates of La Via Campesina, exchanged ideas. This resulted in Çiftçi-SEN La Via Campesina. It was 2007 when Çiftçi-SEN participated in the foundation of European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC) as a member organization. This membership process beginning from 2004 was the first moment when a social movement from Turkey start using "food sovereignty" in its press releases and then in political vision and proposals.

Hence, Turkey's food sovereignty movement was not "talk the talk" but "walk the walk" (Figueroa 2015, 510) with very little steps. It was 2004, the year with the first farmers' unions, that a nation-wide anti-GMO platform was organized in order to raise awareness and develop proposals. This was another significant issue regarding the food sovereignty articulation, for it was not only farmers but different sectors of society with different kinds of organizations including chambers of engineers, local food, environment, seed, and protection associations, nation-wide NGOs, farmers' organizations and local-based awareness NGOs. Indeed, it was the very first time such a group was coming together in order to oppose a national policy that was directly related with agriculture, food and health.

The Seed law (2006) was aiming to restrict the sale of local peasant seeds by peasants themselves which was a significant event for constructing the corporate food regime. This process brought diversification of issues around food and agriculture, first getting to know more about the "subject" with the diverse global processes, and also connecting with global issues and farmers' movement, Via Campesina, which brought back some wider topic that was not thought before. With the formation of anti-GMO platform, the response to the seed law was formation of seed initiatives from formal associations to non-formal collectives that try to defend, protect, produce and distribute local seeds. This law also opened up a space for a large community to discuss the problems of agriculture and food policies regarding globalization/localization; neoliberalization/public policies; state-corporation intervention/the autonomy of peasants and the citizens in general.

Another issue regarding the agricultural production was the so called "clean energy projects" such as hydroelectric power plants (HEPPs), wind power plants, solar plants; as well mining projects, coal power plants and nuclear power plants.

⁷ It needs to be noted here shortly that the farmers experience organising in autonomous political organisations such as leagues, associations, movements or unions were lacking till that time, and but the cadres of Çiftçi-SEN was coming from a much leftist-political background, has been working in the agricultural sector for some time, but can also be seen that there may be a "malcontent" here with the state and the left (Arsel et al. 2015).

Resistance against a gold mining project (Bergama) was dated back early 90s which became a symbol for the peasant resistance concerning village commons and livelihoods. With the second half of the 2000s, the water usage rights have changed following some institutional reforms in the energy market. This brought the privatization of the rivers as a way of water grabbing (Işlar 2012), where on each river appeared more than one HEPP projects. The peasants' reaction was groundbreaking that in most of the villages they organized in groups to defend their livelihoods, farms and agricultural practices and water commons, getting support from some urban groups as well. It can be said that this process not directly affected the food sovereignty articulation, but expanded the capacity of peasant organization and autonomy in terms of agrarian politics.

While these were the main problems and mobilizations in rural, there were some initiatives organizing in order to "support" the small farmers, to defend the peasant agroecology or traditional/natural agriculture, as well raise awareness on the consumption side. It was 2004 when the "organic agriculture law" had passed and then the organic products were appearing on market shelves by the organic certificate, which was undermining what was once regarded as "natural", "peasant product" and so "real", "produced in the village" or even didn't need any label to be tested if it was real food or not. Thus, now in the new market conditions, peasants were forced to prove that their products were "real" products and the middle-men was the only beneficiary of the process, that has the means to control the prices, regulate the market, speculate over costs and prices, etc.

There appeared some groups directly to support small farmers doing agroecology, in the form of solidarity groups (KEÇİ⁸), consumer cooperative (BUKOOP⁹), food communities (Yeryüzü Association), organic markets (Buğday Association) etc. As well, some more major groups like Slow Food had started operating in Turkey trying to raise awareness in some specific topics, one of which is the introducing the Earth Markets in collaboration with some municipalities in some different cities. Apart from these groups, there appeared some "in-between" groups that have the tendency to be new entrants, some have means to buy new land and start farming, some others just stay in seeds production, for example, and some other like starting urban farming.

To sum up the history of food sovereignty construction in Turkey, it is important to underline the late history of agricultural modernization which was state centered and small farmers favored agricultural sector roughly until 80s. Then, liberalization of agricultural market and integration into international trade following increasingly become dominant neoliberal policies and transnational trade agreements terms. In this sense, terrain of retail and food provisioning came under the control of the corporate regime. Reconfiguration of neoliberal restructuring in agriculture after 2001 crisis in national level used new institutional tools. Until then, against the sovereignty of corporations and the state, farmers in

⁸ Kentlilerin Çiftçilerle Dayanışma İnisiyatifi - Initiative of Urbaners to Support Small Farmers.

⁹ Boğaziçi Mensupları Tüketim Kooperatifi - Boğaziçi University Members' Consumption Cooperative.

Turkey started to organize for a counter-hegemonic sovereignty discourse in a political manner. Farmer organizations engaged into global networks of food sovereignty through La Via Campesina membership. First steps of food sovereignty construction were based on knowledge sharing using public awareness campaigns against pro-GMO policies. Knowledge sharing developed into spaces of exchange by seed sharing networks. Energy policies in the second half of 2000s focused on commoditization of resources triggered different strand of struggle demanding control over resources and autonomy regarding livelihoods. Simultaneously policies converting small farmers into small enterprises urged them to transform their tacit knowledge of production into intellectual property. In this conjuncture, new social actors have emerged to reverse neoliberal policies regarding agriculture and food provision into alternative economic spaces across urban and rural regions of Turkey.

Relations among the actors of Food Sovereignty

Evolution of neoliberal expansion within agricultural production relations and food provisioning reveals crude expression hegemonic and counter-hegemonic actors across the contested terrain of food sovereignty construction in Turkey. A relational layer of examination of food sovereignty construction in addition historical approach would help us to examine how networks of food sovereignty is being constructed. Based on the presentation poster we prepared in the name of Nyéléni Delegation of Turkey in November 2016, relations among actors of food sovereignty are classified regarding their terrain of action and tools they use during their struggle. Here, we try to see the connections and intersection points of different actors based on their common struggles or articulations in various kinds. We tend to understand the movement through its manifestations regarding different themes that determines the multiplicity of the movement's political agenda starting with land issues, conflicts surrounding seed and struggle to change food system.

Land Issues

Regarding issues related with land (land reform, terrier guidelines, land grabbing) Turkey has been facing different kinds of conflicts in different spaces such as plateaus, pastures, forests, mountains, shores and other rural/agricultural territories. The most prominent issues related to land is transformation of agricultural lands into energy and so-called “development” projects, as well as some projects for “service” (mega-projects like bridges, highways, airports, mass housing). have been a focus of these kind of projects. For example, agricultural lands are commodified in the name of “expropriation” and then sold out to companies who build up energy plants on those lands. Last but not the least, urban gardens have been affected by this general trend as well. The last agricultural lands inside the cities have been transformed for other kind of use in the name of “public interest”, such as the historical urban gardens in Istanbul,

located at the shores of the old town where still exist farmers producing for local markets.

It is mostly the peasant-farmers, urban gardeners, pastoralists, fisherfolks who have been affected by these projects. In most cases, those affected by the projects gather in some autonomous initiatives, get support from NGOs, food communities, researchers, farmers unions, and sometimes from local governments. In most cases, these are manifested as campaigns to build up consciousness, direct actions including fight with armed police forces, as well as legal struggles to cancel the proposed projects and demand environmental and social justice. There is also a tendency of becoming new entrant to farming in order to construct the rural areas as a space for resistance against the capitalist accumulation. Thus, the land issue is mostly a farmer based issue that gets attention from some urban groups.

Conflicts around Seeds

As noted above, the proposed law (2006) has banned the exchange of local seeds if they are not registered. Although GMOs are not allowed in Turkey, it has been one of the most prominent struggles of food sovereignty movement to cancel a proposed project. The seed issue is mostly related with agricultural land, but as well as urban gardens. The “seed exchange festivals” have been a prominent event and tradition among peasants, urban gardeners, researchers and food activists across different parts of the country. These festivals are also related with peasant markets, for some of the festivals are held in these kinds of markets.

The actors who produce, distribute and save the seeds are first of all the farmers/peasants. Apart from them, there are some NGOs directly working on seed issues, in order to “trace” and find the local seeds, invent some preservation tactics, and exchange with the ones who are in need of local seeds. Moreover, some food communities, researchers and local governments are also interested in preserving and distributing seeds, organising “seed exchange festivals”.

In order to resist against the proposed GMO system, a large coalition containing different sectors of the society were organised and mobilised, with campaigns, actions and demonstrations. Moreover, legal struggles were held and suits were opened to stop the process. The most contemporary and prominent struggle for seeds are the seed exchange practices. The government has been preparing to submit a new law in order to restrict the usage of non-certificated seeds which is proposed to be implemented in 2018. There is a public awareness on the matter subject and the essence of this law has been considered as a “corporate law” by diverse actors of the movement.

Struggle to change food system

The right to healthy food as main component of food sovereignty is threatened not only by GMOs, but also corporatization of food and agriculture systems as well. Commercialization of the food production and distribution is the main problem. Moreover, the industrial system is very much more stationary. Agro-

business is dominating the agricultural production, industrialization of the food system is taking part in each sector of agriculture: spread of monoculture and contractual farming. Destruction of pastures and plateaus results in emergence of industrial livestock and poultry. Fishing farms are also emerging as a result of destruction in the shores. The urban farming has been destroyed in the case of urban gardens. Moreover, the destruction of peasantry close to city centers also affects the food regime, in terms of distribution and access to cheap and healthy food. It is a fact that the middleman is the one who gains from this relationship as the distributor. The companies are mostly the ones who takes the middleman position in order to maximize their profit.

There are multiple actors some of which work together to change the food system as well as resist to the industrial/agro-business food model. The main actor in this area is the food producers: peasant-farmers, the new farm-type farmers, urban farmers. There is a lack of organization among the farmers, and where they are organized, it is mostly the product-based farmer unions.¹⁰ The community-supporting farming is new and developing. There are organized consumer groups who support agroecological farming and small-farmers that do agroecology. Moreover, consumer cooperatives are also a form of organizing within the consumers. These groups, with some NGOs, are the best alliances of small farmers to develop an alternative food model. Activist NGOs, food communities, and researchers are also taking part in supporting the farmers.

Place of food communities in food sovereignty movement

Placing food communities within three active themes of food sovereignty movement in Turkey express how and with whom they act and experience. Each theme opens up space for food communities to get in contact with all kinds of actors within the movement. For land issues, food communities meet with other kinds of actors in certain kinds of struggles like legal struggles, campaigns or direct action for urban farmlands, agricultural lands, meadows or problems of fisherman. Considering issues of seed or food, these communities build alliances with all actors of food sovereignty to protect or develop farmers' markets, urban farms, terrains of agriculture, husbandry or fishery using tools of legal procedures, campaigns, demonstrations but above all new networks of farmers' markets or various forms of self-organization.

The national level of food sovereignty construction as put by Schiavoni (2016) is a very contested domain in Turkey, for the Turkish state has always been the protagonist of the sectors, whether by directly operating, or by "protecting" the actors, regulating the markets. In other words, the state, or governments operating the state power had always claimed sovereignty just for their part,

¹⁰ To organise within the farmers and consumers is itself a struggle in Turkey. The small farmers have tried to organise in unions, and the state tried to block this process by opening suits against small farmers. The legal struggle has continued around 5 years and now the small farmers gained their rights to organise in unions.

without the participation of neither social movements nor autonomous civil society institutions. For instance, after the launching of the “National Agriculture Project” in November 2016, we have heard Erdoğan calling “his” minister to take some measures in order to diminish the “middleman” system, to support farmer and the consumers who are the losers of the current food system as if it was not their governments who have been promoting agri-food system.

In order to oppose the current agri-food system and agrarian transformations, the food sovereignty articulation does not have a political program. As we described above, though there appeared some concrete proposals so far as promoting peasant agroecology; preserving, producing, using and distributing local/peasant seeds; promoting and popularizing peasant markets; building food communities and consumer cooperatives in order to gain support for small farmers as well as building self-organizations; defending land, water, and commons against the neoliberal enclosures; last but not the least, promoting the project of food sovereignty in terms of discourse and intellectual work, these efforts are *partial*, and haven’t turned into a popular project yet. There is a tendency to form a “food sovereignty network” after Cluj meeting of Nyéléni, and this needs some time to be realized regarding the contemporary problems Turkey has been facing.

Experience of a consumer organization: Kadıköy Cooperative

Founding and Current Conjuncture of the Cooperative

After the Gezi movement in 2013, assemblies were formed in neighborhoods, universities and some workplaces. One of the most lively and productive districts of Istanbul, Kadıköy, with a population of five hundred thousand people, was hosting some very active and crowded assemblies, in different neighborhoods, some of which continued almost 2 years. In these assemblies, people were discussing their very basic problems about the neighborhood as well the most prominent problems of contemporary Turkey. Most were people from the neighborhoods, so there was a local character of the assemblies. Attending the assemblies was open to each person who felt to be attending. The only common quality was listening and respecting to each other, as well proposing some discussions that were meaningful concerning the assemblies’ existence. This was a form of opening up a political space building up from the ground base, on a “common” base. In other words, people were commonizing what it was once a technical political unit, the neighborhoods, turning them into livelihoods, some actual places where power relations occur.

The commoning act drives a way of understanding the political with a different rationality: apart from all the differences based on political identity, race, gender, culture, language, there is a common interest based on a rationality that forces people to act together – that is – a compulsory being/acting together; overlapping of interests and destinies towards the future, a bright defining of the common

“enemy”, and so fighting together, no matter of the differences.¹¹ It can be said that this is a primitive form of what Martínez-Torres and Rosset (2014) calls as *diálogo de saberes*. It is “primitive” in a sense that it is the basic common ground where collective organizing of politics begins, but not at a level of *constructing* a common political program and an organization.

The discussions to organize a consumer’s cooperative in Kadıköy district begin in neighborhood assemblies by a group of activists that were in search of building-up a more structured form of organization with concrete aims. In order to discuss the potentiality of a cooperative, they organized a workshop (2004, February) inviting different initiatives which had prior experience, as well Çiftçi-SEN to give much information about the contemporary situation of agriculture. At the beginning of 2010, it was only BUKOOP in the legal form of a cooperative, that was aiming to implement food sovereignty, working directly with small farmers doing agroecology. This is important for two reasons: first, regarding food sovereignty, BUKOOP was the only example that can be studied; second, BUKOOP was working directly with Çiftçi-SEN, or it was a “model” designed by Çiftçi-SEN and some other food sovereignty activists in order to spread cooperativism as an alternative political organization aiming food sovereignty. Thus, it was not a coincidence in the workshop that these actors were present and sharing their experiences. Cooperatives have emerged through the farmers promoting the movement with a strategy to organize alternative ways of relations between the farmers and the consumers, constructing a face-to-face system, a solidarity system with participatory modes of engaging each other.

After the workshop, there emerged a first group to work on the principles and a draft organizational model in order to realize the process. Hence, the group couldn’t decide on what kind of a model that they would like to operationalize: a formal cooperative, a street cooperative, a non-formal food community? The group couldn’t agree on the points, and gave a break for a couple of months. At the end of 2014, a new group formed, containing activists from the old group as well new ones, that had experience with BUKOOP, and working directly with Çiftçi-SEN solidarity group. This new becoming-group process was much dedicated in a common ground, putting up the agenda to form a formal cooperative, and setting a “common work method” based on common needs and collective decision making processes. The “need” was put as a self-determining organization, working collectively, on the “consumption area”. In this way, this could be a popular organization empowering people on their everyday lives as well participation to political processes first and foremost like food and agriculture policies.

Decision to form a formal cooperative was a prominent one, with some causes and effects: first, the legal conditions for formal cooperatives in Turkey are not in favor of the citizens, the cooperatives have been turned into profit-minded corporates. The taxation process for a cooperative is not in favor of cooperatives

¹¹ For a much deep understanding of the “rationality of the politics of the commons”, see Kocagöz (2014).

comparing with corporates. Thus, there are no “advantages” in terms of trade relations. Second, cooperatives are legal organizations open to control of the state. It is a very likely possibility that the members of the cooperative would fail in meet some legal-fiscal necessities so that the cooperative is very much open to control and financial fines/punishments. On the other hand, cooperatives give room to “legal” trade, opening cooperative shops in different locations and creating a space for popular access. Second, cooperatives are legal organizations with which members can do different various activities such as publishing, organizing activities, finding new trade opportunities, uniting with other cooperatives to form confederations, and so on.

Taking the advantages and disadvantages of a formal cooperative, the group decided to call itself “Kadıköy Consumption Cooperative - Initiative”, an informal group that took the initiative to organize at the base level, recruit new members so that the cooperative can have a much powerful root at the central neighborhoods of Kadıköy district. In order to do so, the Initiative organized 5 pre-ordered packages containing products directly from the small farmers, organizing events such as a panel on food crisis and food sovereignty; a panel with a member of MST on Agrarian Reform Cooperatives; workshops, documentary screenings, and weekly meetings that have started 2 years ago and still going on. In November 2016, the cooperative was formed legally, taking the name of Kadikoy Cooperative, with 7 founding members/cooperators; and 25 activists with a base of around 300 people.

Nearly 20 activists gather each week to decide on the directions of the cooperative. These meetings are a process of setting a common working agenda. Collective decision making and participation is a practice from the beginning. Cooperative works with 5 main principles:

- Working directly with the small-producers (be small farmers, or producers in different sectors), preferably the organized ones (in cooperatives, local associations, village commons, unions etc.)
- Mutual initiative on production and consumption
- Collective work and sharing
- Ecology based social relations
- Solidarity

These principles define how cooperative operates as well how it connects with the other sectors of the society. For example, organizing is promoted and organized producers are preferred when working with a new producer. Collective and participatory decision making tools are used and also promoted for other sectors and organizations. A vision on ecological relations are promoted in order to circulate the discourse around defending the commons and environment. Following the international cooperativism principles, solidarity is promoted and defended as a form of relating with different sectors and different organizations worldwide.

It can be seen that “food sovereignty” is not defined as a principle of the cooperative, or we haven’t talked about it yet. The principle of “mutual initiative on production and consumption” was a collective attempt to define food sovereignty by not depending just on food and not using the concept “sovereignty”.¹² Hence, it is clear that what the cooperative has been applying so far is a form of food sovereignty, regarding the organization forms described by Moragues-Faus (2016), a “self-determination of food” and other products based on collective decision, direct relation with the producers, and promoting all these relations in terms of cooperativism. .

Last January, the cooperative organized an open workshop in a neighborhood, proposing some participatory ways to discuss food sovereignty. Around 50 people joined the discussions to understand how they have been experiencing the food crisis in everyday lives and in general, and what would be the alternatives to overcome those crises. The workshop was entitled “food crisis and food sovereignty” and it aimed to discuss those concepts with a popular way, with people who are directly experiencing the problem. At a final report on the workshop, it is noted that the participants were eager to talk about the solutions to food crisis and proposing alternatives in order to implement food sovereignty, rather than discussing the concept itself (Kadıköy Cooperative, 2017).

Moreover, the cooperative has a shop run by volunteer work by the activists in order to sell the products taken directly from the producers. It is also the most common place to know about the cooperative, its structure and aims, while shopping, it is always a conversation that takes place with the activists and buyers. The ones who want to be a part of the cooperative are invited to meetings that are done weekly, and also to the public meetings where cooperative activists talk about the principles, aims and history of the cooperative as well answer to the questions who wants to learn more. Thus, the cooperative shop is where the shopping happens, but it is more a place where people encounter with the cooperative and the idea of food sovereignty in general.

The cooperative has an organizational model that organizes the division of labor and how people can relate to the cooperative. In order to organize the labor of the activists, there are the “sectors” working on specific issues: Sector of Formation, Sector of Organization, Sector of Finance and Legal Matters, Sector of Communication, Sector of Relations with Producers, Sector of Coordination. Apart

¹² Regarding this problem, translation issue, as put in Shattuck et al. (2015, 428) is also a matter of fact for Turkish. We mostly translate the word sovereignty as *egemenlik* which directly reminds us the *sovereignty of the nation* that is identified with the state. Thus, the word itself makes us lose the real meaning that is the empowering of people, but again reproduces the nationalistic/statistic way of understanding the concept. However, when we translate the word sovereignty as equal to independence or autonomy, they also resonate different kinds of political implications. Thus, it always turns out to be a process of first uttering the concept and then trying to explain it through its history as well as its implications, principles and the agents who have been using/promoting it. As we have stated in the first part, this is a political problem related with the “sovereignty” itself, and Turkey is as well experiencing the similar dynamics with that of the other parts of the world.

from these groups, for each producer, there is one volunteer taking care of the products of that producer, which is called the “responsible” person for the producer. These responsible activists follow the products in order to give purchase order, and be responsible of the whole process.

Discussing the bridge between movements: Possibilities of Consumer Cooperatives in Food Sovereignty Construction

As we noted above, the cooperative operates in a district where 500 thousand people lives, but at the beginning its base was about 300 dwellers. In general, food communities in Turkey follows a much “molecular” way of organizing: limiting the groups with up to 50 people; dividing the groups when it reaches to 50, and form new groups. These groups are always informal groups, some working under associations and some do not have any formal base. All share the common ground for changing the food system, but prefer to organize in small groups that resembles a kind of affinity group, consisting “conscient consumers”.¹³ However, the cooperative tends to follow another way.

Possibilities and Limits of Kadıköy Cooperative

Kadıköy Cooperative express itself as to organize within the 500 thousand of population. Of course, this is not a realistic position, but a motivation to spread the organization within masses. The different sectors operating are formed in order to achieve this mission, especially the ones for Organization and Formation. These two sectors co-operate in order to organize public events, reach new people, spread the word and politics that the cooperative has been supporting. In other words, the cooperative defines a “base” for its organization, a base for recruiting new members and activist for its work, but not a base to spread ideology in a very broad sense, but the knowledge of its own experience together with its achievements and failures. The Sector of Formation is formed in order to introduce the concepts and principles of the cooperative as well give a broader information about the current agri-food system, and the proposals of the cooperative such as agroecology and food sovereignty.

In this sense, we would propose that the political vision used and promoted by the cooperative such as “base work”, “formation process”, “strictly working with farmer organizations”, “raising awareness”, “self-organizing”, “solidarity economy”, and organizing bottom up and constructing “a model for collective participation of the masses” can be generalized and promoted/proposed for the other sectors of the society, especially for the urban working people. Cooperativism or cooperatives related with food sovereignty in general can be considered as one of the diverse manifestations within the ontological alternative

¹³ As Schiavoni (2015) notes, “a term gaining in popularity is prosumidor(a), a combination of the words for producer (productor(a)) and consumer (consumidor(a)), in an attempt to blur the lines between the two” (475). This is a very similar case in Turkey as well. Combination of üretici (producer) and tüketici (consumer) appears a word tüteticici that underlines that the consumer is not only a consumer anymore but as being part of the decision making process, s/he becomes a producer as well.

in food sovereignty (McMichael 2014, 933) or the “food sovereignty counter-movement” (McMichael 2014, 935).¹⁴

We would, then, say that Kadıköy Cooperative is far more beyond than a “vote with your fork” (Figueroa, 2015, 501) experience. Regarding the limits of “individual consumption practices” (Block et al. 2012), the cooperative focuses on changing the everyday relations as well as the food system in general, by promoting an “ontological alternative”, as being part of the food networks as well as the food sovereignty articulation. In this sense, it has been part of building alternative strategies, trying to replace the current capitalist market, building up participatory model for the masses, and taking consumption as a matter of collective practice (Moragues-Faus, 2016).

Hence, as one of its primary aim is to get rid of the middleman and support the small farmers for their agroecological production and a food sovereignty project in general, the problem put by Edelman et. al. (2004) is still valid:

“But to go beyond scattered and mostly localized market arrangements between producers and consumers (internationalized mainly through fair trade), and work towards large-scale food system-wide reform, public policy carried out by the central state is essential. This leads us back to the contentious issue of the role of the state in food sovereignty (918).”

The cooperative has its own limitations in terms of gaining enough support, but changing the agri-food system cannot be limited to efforts of a cooperative. In some events, activists of the cooperative propose that “if 500 thousand people would join this movement and claim that we want agroecology in the future of Turkish agriculture, rather than agribusiness, that would be something”. This can be a real challenge for the state and agribusiness, but who will decide on that?

Apart from this challenge, there still lies the problem of inequality among diversified consumers (Sbicca, 2012). The cooperative operates in a neighborhood that is mostly characterized by white-collar workers, who have access to cultural and intellectual capital, which does not “represent” the poor of the society at all. Moreover, to access healthy and nutritious food has become a matter of intellectual awareness, being in knowledge about food and access, which creates some “informative challenges”, as re-localization is not a guarantee for the poor sectors of the society to access “real” food automatically (Mares and Alkon, 2011; Bedore, 2010; Levkoe, 2014). Actually, apart from the sustainability of the collective work, this is the main challenge of the cooperative in order to enlarge its base, and construct a real popular alternative for the masses. As noted above, the motivation of the cooperative is to become an organization of the masses, connecting diverse groups in an organizational body based on common interest. Thus, resonating with Martinez-Alier (2002), building up the “food sovereignty of the poor” will determine if the cooperative will success to achieve its aims, or not.

¹⁴ It should be noted that as the experience of BUKOOP inspired Kadıköy Cooperative, the cooperative as well gave inspiration to a new initiative that is formed shortly after the formalization of Kadıköy Cooperative: Koşuyolu Cooperative - Initiative. This is a very clear example of how this cooperative model can spread and popularize if it achieves much success and gains more attention from the different sectors of the society, as building the network from the grassroots (Levkoe 2014).

The questions put by (Edelman, 2014) on who will be the “agent” of the operationalization of food sovereignty is very crucial, but it is only a matter of practice, as only new forms of organizations interrelation with the ones at action can solve the question in practice. In other words, the actor question can only be resolved by the formation of the actor; and this question is broader than the definitions; it is a question of power relations, that only formations of power will solve the matter. Then, the question turns into another: *how* will food sovereignty proponents consolidate more power to actualize food sovereignty?

References:

- Aysu, A. (2014a) Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Devlet ve Tarım. In ed: Abdullah Aysu and M. Serdar Kayaoğlu, *Köylülükten Sonra Tarım*. Epos: Istanbul.
- Aysu, A. (2014b) Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Köylü Mücadeleleri. In ed: Abdullah Aysu and M. Serdar Kayaoğlu, *Köylülükten Sonra Tarım*. Epos: Istanbul.
- Alonso-Fradejas, A. Borrás, S., Holmes, T., Holt-Giménez, E. & Robbins, M. (2015) Food sovereignty: convergence and contradictions, conditions and challenges. *Third World Quarterly*. 36:3, 431-448. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1023567
- Arsel, M., Adaman, F., & Akbulut, B. (2015) Environmentalism of the Malcontent: anatomy of an anti-coal power plant struggle in Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 42:2, 371-395, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2014.971766
- Bedore, M. (2010) Just Urban Food Systems: A New Direction for Food Access and Urban Social Justice. *Geography Compass*. 4: 1418–1432. DOI:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2010.00383.x
- Block, D.R., Chávez, N., Allen, E. et al. (2012) Food sovereignty, urban food access, and food activism: contemplating the connections through examples from Chicago. *Agriculture and Human Values*. 29:2 203-215 doi:10.1007/s10460-011-9336-8
- Brent, Z., Schiavoni, C.M & Alonso-Fradejas, A. (2015) Contextualising food sovereignty: the politics of convergence among movements in the USA. *Third World Quarterly*. 36:3, 618-635. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1023570
- Clendenning, J., Dressler, W.H. & Richards, C. (2016) Food justice or food sovereignty? Understanding the rise of urban food movements in the USA. *Agriculture and Human Values*. 33:1 165-177. DOI:10.1007/s10460-015-9625-8
- Desmarais, A.A. 2007. *LVC. Globalization and the power of peasants*. London, UK, Ann Arbor, MI, Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing and Pluto Press.
- Figueroa, M. (2015) Food Sovereignty in Everyday Life: Toward a People-centered Approach to Food Systems. *Globalizations*. 12:4, 498-512. DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2015.1005966
- Edelman, M. (2014) Food sovereignty: forgotten genealogies and future regulatory challenges. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 41:6, 959-978, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.876998
- Edelman, M., Weis, T., Baviskar, A., Borrás, S., Holt- Giménez, E., Kandiyoti, D. & Wolford, W. (2014) Introduction: critical perspectives on food sovereignty. *The*

- Journal of Peasant Studies*. 41:6, 911-931. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2014.963568
- Günaydın, G. (2014) Köylülüğün Dönüşümü. In ed: Abdullah Aysu and M. Serdar Kayaoğlu, *Köylülükten Sonra Tarım*. Epos: Istanbul.
- Iles, A., & Montenegro de Wit, M. (2014). Sovereignty at what scale? An inquiry into multiple dimensions of food sovereignty. *Globalizations*. Advanced online publication. DOI:10.1080/14747731.2014.957587
- Islar, M. (2012). Privatised hydropower development in Turkey: A case of water grabbing? *Water Alternatives* 5(2): 376-391.
- Patel, R. (2009). Food sovereignty. *Journal of Peasant Studies*. 36(3), 663–706.
- Martinez-Alier, J. (2002) *The Environmentalism of the Poor*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham.
- Martínez-Torres, M. & Rosset, P (2014) Diálogo de saberes in La Vía Campesina: food sovereignty and agroecology. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.872632
- Ollman, B. (2003) *Dance of the dialectic: Steps in Marx's method*. Durham, NC: University of Illinois Press.
- Kadıköy Cooperative (2017) Gıda Krizi ve Gıda Egemenliği Atölye Raporu (Report of the Food Crisis and Food Sovereignty Workshop). 13 February. <http://www.karasaban.net/gida-krizi-ve-gida-egemenligi-atolye-raporu/>
- Karapınar, B., Adaman, F., & Özertan, G. (2011) *Rethinking Structural Reform in Turkish Agriculture: Beyond the World Bank's Strategy*. Nova Science Publishers: New York.
- Keyder, Ç. & Yenal, Z. (2011) Rural Transformation Trends and Social Policies in Turkey in the Post-Developmentalist Era. In ed. Barış Karapınar, Fikret Adaman and Gökhan Özertan, *Rethinking Structural Reform in Turkish Agriculture: Beyond the World Bank's Strategy*. Nova Science Publishers: New York.
- Kocagöz, U. (2014) Rationality of the Politics of Commons. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Istanbul Bilgi University.
- La Vía Campesina (1996) La Vía Campesina: Proceedings from the II International Conference of the Vía Campesina, Tlaxcala, Mexico, April 18–21, 1996. Brussels: NCOS Publications.
- Levkoe, C. Z. (2014) The food movement in Canada: a social movement network perspective. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 41:3, 385-403, DOI:10.1080/03066150.2014.910766
- Madra, M. & Adaman, F. (2014) Understanding Neoliberalism as Economization: The Case of the Environment. In Yıldız Atasoy ed., *Global Economic Crisis and the Politics of Diversity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mares, T. M. & Alkon, A. H. (2011) Mapping the Food Movement: Addressing Inequality and Neoliberalism. *Environment and Society*, 2(1).
- McMichael, P. (2014) Historicizing food sovereignty. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 41:6, 933-957. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.876999
- Moragues-Faus, A. (2017) Emancipatory or Neoliberal Food Politics? Exploring the "Politics of Collectivity" of Buying Groups in the Search for Egalitarian Food Democracies. *Antipode*. 49: 455–476. doi: 10.1111/anti.12274.

- Sbicca, J. (2012) Growing food justice by planting an anti-oppression foundation: opportunities and obstacles for a budding social movement. *Agric Hum Values*. 29:4 455-466 doi:10.1007/s10460-012-9363-0
- Schiavoni, C. (2015) Competing Sovereignties, Contested Processes: Insights from the Venezuelan Food Sovereignty Experiment. *Globalizations*. 12:4, 466-480, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2015.1005967
- Schiavoni, C. (2016) The contested terrain of food sovereignty construction: toward a historical, relational and interactive approach. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2016.1234455
- Shattuck, A., Schiavoni, C., & VanGelder, Z. (2015) Translating the Politics of Food Sovereignty: Digging into Contradictions, Uncovering New Dimensions. *Globalizations*. 12:4, 421-433, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2015.1041243
- Wekerle, G. R. (2004) Food Justice Movements: Policy, Planning, and Networks. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 23:4, 378 – 386 doi: 10.1177/0739456X04264886

Nazioarteko Hizketaldia

ELIKADURAREN ETORKIZUNA ETA NEKAZARITZAREN ERRONKAK XXI. MENDERAKO:

Mundua nork, nola eta zer-nolako inplikazio sozial, ekonomiko eta ekologikorekin elikatuko duen izango da eztabaidagaia

2017ko apirilaren 24 / 26. Europa Biltzar Jauregia. Vitoria-Gasteiz. Araba. Euskal Herria. Europa.

International Colloquium

THE FUTURE OF FOOD AND CHALLENGES FOR AGRICULTURE IN THE 21st CENTURY:

Debates about who, how and with what social, economic and ecological implications we will feed the world.

April 24th - 26th. Europa Congress Palace. Vitoria Gasteiz. Álava. Basque Country/Europe

Coloquio Internacional

EL FUTURO DE LA ALIMENTACIÓN Y RETOS DE LA AGRICULTURA PARA EL SIGLO XXI:

Debates sobre quién, cómo y con qué implicaciones sociales, económicas y ecológicas alimentará el mundo.

24 / 26 de Abril, 2017. Palacio de Congresos Europa. Vitoria-Gasteiz. Álava. País Vasco. Europa.

GUNTZAILEAK/COLABORAN/COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS



LAGUNTZA EKONOMIKOA/APOYAN/WITH SUPPORT FROM

