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

---

Food sovereignty and the City: Policy, Solidarity and the Right to Food

Christopher Yap, Paula Fernandez-Wulff, Silvia Zucchermaglio

Paper # 91

Apirila – Abril – April
24, 25, 26
2017

elikadura²¹

NAZIOARTEKO HIZKETALDIA
COLOQUIO INTERNACIONAL
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM

www.elikadura21.eus

Food sovereignty and the City: Policy, Solidarity and the Right to Food

Christopher Yap, Paula Fernandez-Wulff, Silvia Zuccermaglio[1]

Executive Summary

Decisions made in urban contexts significantly impact food systems and particularly small-scale food producers in rural areas. While the food sovereignty movement has successfully mobilised to participate in international policy processes, policy-making in urban contexts, and urban processes more broadly, still represent something of a 'black box'.

The impact of policy decisions made in urban contexts extends well beyond city limits. Urbanisation, the increase or decrease of demand for food, and the economic and political dominance of urban policy processes by large agri-food corporations are examples of issues that deeply affect small-scale farmers around the world. However, the processes that drive and shape these issues are complex, rarely involve non-urban actors, and are often difficult to influence. It is for precisely these reasons that 'the urban' represents simultaneously one of the greatest challenges and opportunities for the food sovereignty movement.

The aim of this paper is two-fold: firstly, it seeks to problematise 'the urban' in the context of food sovereignty and the human right to food and nutrition; secondly, it presents and frames key political principles of food sovereignty in a way that might help the movement to engage critically with urban policy processes, build solidarity with urban-based social movements, and re-think the human right to food in a way that can be claimed and operationalised at a local or territorial level. This paper argues that critical and strategic opportunities to promote food sovereignty in urban contexts arise from adopting and advocating for rights-based approaches in urban policy-making, including the processes by which policies are developed, as well as the policy outcomes themselves.

The first section of the paper introduces some of the reasons why the food sovereignty movement should deepen its engagement with urban policy-making and processes. The second section examines critically the rural-urban binary, arguing that both rural and urban contexts are products of global capitalist processes. The section then outlines some of the key actors and processes that govern urban policy-making. Finally, it outlines how the urban has emerged as a focal issue in international policy fora and the situation of the right to food in these processes.

The third section proposes a framework for articulating key political considerations of food sovereignty in urban contexts, comprising six mutually

---

[1] A draft working paper prepared for Hands On The Land Alliance by Christopher Yap, Paula Fernandez-Wulff, and Silvia Zuccermaglio
April 2017

supportive principles – democratic control, social justice, inclusion, solidarity, autonomy, and territorialisation. These principles were developed to reflect on ongoing intersectional urban struggles, particularly those by marginalised groups. Our hope is that this framework might facilitate critical engagement with urban policy processes, promote solidarity between rural and urban social movements, and helps refine progressive understandings of human rights and the right to food. We hope that this framework contributes to an emerging, broader conversation about the role of cities and urban inhabitants in the struggle for food sovereignty.

Note on Language

This report uses the term 'food sovereignty movement' to refer to the various, diverse peoples, groups and organisations struggling for food sovereignty around the world. The authors recognise that there exist multiple food sovereignties, and that groups mobilised towards an idea of food sovereignty hold diverse thematic interests and political outlooks.

To refer to these struggles as a unified movement is not to overlook the specificity of challenges facing small scale farmers and other food actors living in different contexts, nor the specificity of their claims. Rather, the authors hope to emphasise commonalities, shared experiences and shared opportunities between groups struggling for food sovereignty, particularly as they relate to urban policy processes.

Why Should the Food Sovereignty Movement Engage with the Urban?

Rural Constituencies Are Deeply Affected by Urban Policies and Processes

Food systems are impacted by policy decisions made in both urban and rural contexts, at different scales, by diverse actors, with diverse motivations. The lives of small-scale food producers are continuously affected by policy processes at the local, national, and international levels. These policy processes often have profound impacts on the modes of production, the types and nature of livelihoods in the food system, the protection or destruction of communities, and the future of small-scale food production itself.

Decisions that impact food systems are progressively being made at the local level, and increasingly in urban contexts. While the food sovereignty movement has successfully mobilised to participate in international policy processes through mechanisms such as the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), Human Rights treaty bodies, and other processes, the fact remains that urban policy-making and processes (defined as policy-making processes happening in urban contexts), more broadly, still represent something of a 'black box'.

The impact of policy decisions made in urban contexts extends well beyond city limits. Examples of urban-related issues that deeply affect rural areas around the world are manifold: urban growth and related displacement of rural communities, and the increase or decrease in demand for food from the city, including areas where public authorities have direct responsibility such as public procurement. Moreover rural communities are rarely actively involved in urban policy processes, despite being particularly affected by resulting outcomes. Although these issues are well-known, the processes that drive and shape them can be complex, inscrutable, rarely participatory, and often difficult to influence. But it is for precisely these reasons that 'the urban' represents simultaneously one of the greatest challenges and opportunities for the food sovereignty movement.

Urban (Local) Policy Spaces Are an Opportunity to Regain Lost Political Space at International and National Levels

Human rights have always had a tenuous hold in international spaces, but the situation has regressed significantly in recent years, leading many to question whether civil society can have a true voice in international and national policy fora. In the context of the right to food, human rights defenders, advocators, and campaigners have lost much of their voice, particularly as governments have actively avoided the creation of accountability mechanisms where their obligations could be upheld. The rise of right-wing and technocratic governments has led to the loss of historical allies of the right to food in international policy spaces, such as Brazil and the Philippines, and weakened commitments by EU states. The increased influence of business and corporations has watered down language of human rights obligations towards constructions such as "corporate social responsibility" – in efforts to replace the role of the State as the duty bearer to protect, respect, and fulfil human rights obligations, with corporate actors that have accountability to shareholders, rather than people.

Recent policy 'solutions', including the generation of multi-stakeholder spaces for policy-making, has also ignored the clear and fundamental power differentials that exist between actors in the food system. The rise of these spaces in the context of food security and nutrition and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) brings about risks, including the confusion of the roles of states, intergovernmental organisations, civil society, and the private sector. It is important to recognise that creating a participatory space alone does not automatically generate an inclusive, equitable, transparent, and accountable process, nor does it automatically contribute to the realisation of human rights.

The weakening commitments and the difficult process for human rights coherence has turned some international policy spaces into spaces of contention, rather than spaces for progressive standard setting. While it is important to continue to retain the spaces gained at the international level, it is equally important to implement parallel actions and advocacy, as well as expectations for meaningful participation, at the local level.

In some cases, the local is perhaps the most effective space for human rights coherence and reclaiming accountability. For many people and communities, the local level (whether the city, municipality, or rural village) is the level of government that has the most impact on their daily life, and offers the most accessible space to engage in policy-making.

Trends towards decentralisation and subsidiarity also imply that local governments are increasingly consequential policy actors. Local governments are also those who actually translate national human rights strategies and policies into practical application, giving them first-hand experience with human rights policy implementation, monitoring, and evaluation processes. For these reasons, exploring new modalities and the potential for formative change in engaging with local governments can represent significant renewed opportunities for social movements and civil society.

Cities Can Be Leveraged to Advance Food Sovereignty

The global struggle for food sovereignty has seen the emergence of a diverse and remarkable movement. However, as the movement becomes more consolidated and unified, the more its language and actions reflect the motivations and experiences of those already engaged. In order to further the struggle for food sovereignty, it is necessary to engage, critically and cautiously, with new social actors and processes, in new material and political spaces.

Within the food sovereignty discourse, urban inhabitants are often reduced to the role of 'consumers', and their agency framed in terms of purchasing power. However, the reality is that, in urban contexts, there are myriad rights-based social movements, community-based organisations, and political struggles. Recognising commonalties with these groups is an important opportunity for the realisation of food sovereignty.

At the same time, we see the rise of the "urban" as a focus of international policy processes. This focus represents an important opportunity to engage in food-related issues at the municipal scale, particularly as they might either help or hinder the struggle for food sovereignty. Depending on how urban policies are designed and translated into practice, they could either herald a radical

opportunity to transform food systems or reinforce and worsen the current, dominant one.

The perceived bias in policy-making towards urban development and the over-prioritisation of urban constituents has reflected naturalised dichotomies of urban and rural contexts. This is compounded by the fact that since 2008, over half the world's population is understood to live in urban areas. However, by critically examining the rural-urban binary, which pits rural against urban for policy priority, we can shed light on significant new opportunities for social movements across rural and urban contexts, to claim space in a more integrated, rights-based policy paradigm.

What is the Urban?

Critically Defining the Urban

Ideas behind 'rural' and 'urban' are critical to the notion of food sovereignty. Whilst the food sovereignty movement is rooted in the struggles of rural producers, the movement continues to grow and diversify, including an increased awareness of the need to engage with cities, urban inhabitants, and urban-based policy-makers.

The urban is easy to identify, but difficult to define. Some scholars have characterised cities in terms of their (non-legitimate) political power over their surrounding regions,[2] while others have highlighted their historical role as tools of the nation-state.[3] While cities could be understood as built environments with high population densities, the complex political, social, and economic drivers of urbanisation mean that a purely spatial definition is insufficient.

Many scholars have also criticised the rural-urban binary as an ideological construct. Raymond Williams, for example, argued that the perceived divide was created and sustained through historical class conflict.[4] Feminist scholars in particular have criticised the urban-rural binary as one that reproduces naturalised ideas of hetero-masculinity (production, commerce, waged labour) and femininity (unwaged labour, the home, nature), through what has been termed a "gendering of spatial difference."[5]

At the same time, any effort to categorically differentiate rural and urban contexts finds itself on rapidly shifting ground; "The clear distinction that once existed between the urban and the rural [is] gradually fading into a set of porous spaces of uneven geographical development under the hegemonic command of capital and the state."[6]

[2] Weber, M. (1978 [1922]). The city (non-legitimate domination). In R. Guenther & C. Wittich (Eds.), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (pp. 1212–1374). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

[3] Mumford, L. (1968). The Myth of Megalopolis. In *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (pp. 525–567). New York: Harcourt Brace International.

[4] Williams, R. (1978). *The Country and The City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[5] Buckley, M., & Strauss, K. (2016). With, against and beyond Lefebvre: Planetary urbanization and epistemic plurality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 34(4), 617–636: 621.

[6] Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso: 19.

More recently, in the context of food systems, scholars and policy-makers have started to think in terms of city-regions, recognising the interconnectedness of cities with their peri-urban and surrounding rural regions. This approach emphasises the dynamic exchange of materials, information, capital, and labour across the rural-urban interface. While this approach does reflect the day-to-day realities and strategies of people living in and around cities, it also reproduces the rural-urban binary, with urban areas at the centre of development.

Elsewhere, scholars have interpreted the rural-urban as spatial manifestations, and inevitable consequences, of macro-economic processes. David Harvey frames cities as concentrations of surplus capital, produced within the global capitalist system.[7] And so cities can be understood to play critical roles both in driving the global economy, and absorbing surplus wealth.

Viewed in this way, urbanisation is more than the building of houses, roads, and infrastructure within bounded or definable areas. It is the reorientation of land, resources, the economy, and society itself, towards capitalist modes of production and exchange, leading inexorably to the growth of urban centres. This can be seen clearly in the vast amounts of land, infrastructure, and labour used to grow, process, and transport food to cities. The question then becomes less about issues arising from the growth of cities (a material process), and more about issues arising from the urbanisation of society (a political, socio-economic process).

Precisely because of these complexities, it is important to define the urban, not as an object, but in a way that allows for an examination of the strategic engagement, advocacy, and solidarity opportunities of the food sovereignty movement. To this end it is useful to think of cities in terms of the actors, institutions, and organisations that characterise them, particularly in the context of food policy and food politics.

Actors and Processes in Urban Governance

Urban governance can be understood as the sum of legal frameworks and political and administrative capabilities that enable local governments to respond to the needs of the urban population and conduct the day-to-day management of the city, as well as the processes whereby people engage in and shape these activities. Whilst urban governance clearly impacts surrounding regions, decision-making is broadly urban-centric.

The organisation and capacity of urban local governments varies considerably around the world. But some trends are identifiable. City Mayors hold huge political power, particularly in capital or large cities, and their support or opposition can significantly bolster or hinder efforts for change. Cities typically have a structure of local officers, or councillors, elected or appointed to seats in local government, which may or may not be supplemented by lower-level, local authorities and bodies with sector-specific mandates, such as for health or housing.

Local authorities are largely responsible for the coordination, planning, and management of public services in cities, including budgetary control, and may

---

[7] Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso.

create ordinances or bylaws to these ends. Recent years have seen a concerted effort by local governments to coordinate and link up public services from the local to the national level, such as for environmental services.[8] Whilst some urban planning and budgetary decision-making processes may include the community, the extent and degree of participation varies wildly between countries, between sectors, and even between projects.

Meanwhile, local governments are invariably under immense pressure to save money, prioritise issues, and streamline services. Local governments are also vulnerable to sudden budgetary changes made according to political decisions at the national level.

The challenges facing local government are compounded by global Neoliberal trends. Global financial restructuring and the reconfiguration of the nation state have had dramatic implications on the way that cities are governed and managed. Cities are increasingly positioned within a global, rather than national economy. Accordingly, local economic and planning policies are increasingly oriented towards gaining a competitive advantage;[9] "governance […] is being rescaled, policy is being reoriented away from redistribution and toward competition."[10]

The governance of urban food systems, in the city and beyond, is a complex and often fragmented process, leading to a high degree of variability across cities and their surrounding regions. Critical decision-making process regarding food production, processing, retailing, and procurement can range from transparent to entirely opaque. Food systems are impacted by decisions made by both elected and unelected officials, by urban planning, public health, and education policies, amongst countless other processes. It is in this fragmented and competitive context that, despite the rise of urban consumer cooperatives, direct sales, and farmers' markets, large supermarkets have come to dominate food systems in cities of all sizes.

More promisingly, some cities, such as Malmö (Sweden), Turin (Italy) and Toronto (Canada) have developed and implemented coherent food strategies which integrate spatial planning, rural communities, health and nutrition, and participation.[11] These strategies have been developed in collaboration with citizen groups, through devices such as Food Policy Councils. These new political spaces offer important opportunities for participation in the governance of food systems.

Urban centres are also characterised by a dynamic and mobilised civil society. Whilst food production may only be a tangential issue for many urban groups, organisations and collectives are organised around similar issues to those of food sovereignty, for example social justice or identity politics. Groups mobilised

---

[8] In the UK for example, environmental waste services are coordinated between local authorities and the national Environment Agency.

[9] Peck, J. (1998). Geographies of Governance: TECs and the Neoliberalisation of "Local Interests." *Space and Polity*, 2, 5–31.

[10] Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2/3), 99–108: 100.

[11] *See for example* Toldo, A. Pettenati, G. & Dansero, E. (2015). "Exploring urban food strategies: four analytical perspectives and a case study (Turin)." In G. Cinà & E. Dansero, *Localizing urban food strategies. Farming cities and performing rurality.* 7th International Aesop Sustainable Food Planning Conference Proceedings, Torino, 7-9 October 2015. (pp. 270-282) Torino, Politecnico di Torino.

around the increasingly visible practice of urban agriculture often share specific experiences with rural producers, such as issues regarding access to land and regulation of small-scale scale food production, as well as structural discrimination on the basis of race or socio-economic status.

Untangling and understanding the myriad decision-making processes and policies made in urban contexts that impact food systems remains one of the most pressing challenges for the food sovereignty movement.

The Rise of the Urban and the Marginalisation of the Right to Food in Policy

Regional and international development agendas are increasingly focusing on 'the urban', influenced by narratives of increasing urbanisation and its consequences. Cities have been widely characterised as both the problem and the solution for the sustainability of human societies. However, urban-centric development models have fallen short in creating and implementing State accountability mechanisms that ensure legitimacy and effectiveness of policy approaches for all people. These models have also been criticised by civil society for not recognising the role of rural communities in building sustainable futures nor the specific challenges facing these communities.[12]

Notably, the SDGs framework largely privileges urban development over rural livelihoods. SDG 11 (on the sustainability of cities and human settlements) and its further expansion through the New Urban Agenda (NUA)[13] also prioritise urban development over a more balanced approach to urban and rural development, as was envisioned in the Habitat II Agenda, and fails to anchor policies in the human rights obligations of States.[14]

In fact, the SDGs avoid right-based language entirely. SDG 2 ('End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture' by 2030) does not include the right to food, but rather frames the issue in terms of needs. Avoiding rights language evidences States' reluctance to adopt human rights as a tool to achieving food security, despite evidence for its effectiveness.[15]

Civil society has also denounced SDG-related targets and monitoring tools, claiming they excessively privilege quantitative indicators that ultimately reward industrial agribusiness and economic growth, while not recognising related environmental and social costs.[16]

---

[12] Forster, T. and Mattheisen, E. (2016). "Territorial Food Systems" Protecting the Rural and Localizing Human Rights Accountability", *Right to Food and Nutrition Watch Keeping Seeds in People's Hands*; p. 38.

[13] The New Urban Agenda consists in a set of principles and guidelines agreed at Habitat III, the third UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development held in Quito in October 2016. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN Habitat) (2016). *New Urban Agenda Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All.*

[14] *See* Habitat International Coalition (2015) Fractured Continuity: Habitat II to Habitat III.

[15] Sano, H. O. and Feiring, B. (2015). *A Human Rights Review of the Proposed SDG Priority Indicators*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for Human Rights.

[16] Molly D. Anderson. (2016). "Moving toward People-Centered Monitoring of the Right to Food and Nutrition", R*ight to Food and Nutrition Watch. Keeping Seeds in People's Hands*; p. 15.

The European Union has followed a similar trend. The European Urban Agenda, launched on 30 May 2016, signed by EU Ministers responsible for urban matters as an initiative to better coordinate multi-level cooperation among member States, EU institutions, the private sector, and local authorities, does not consider food a public policy issue.[17]

Over the past decade the number of networks of urban authorities and interests has also grown considerably. Among these, the Local Governments for Sustainability Global Network (ICLEI), International Organisation of United Cities and Local Government (UCLG), Eurocities, and C-40 are playing an important role in promoting integrated rural-urban planning and local solutions to global issues, but with an underlying obvious urban-centric perspective. For many of these networks, food systems and policy is an important entry point that crosses many issues. Within these groups, the renewed global interest in city solutions has led to the creation specialised spaces within the networks to discuss food system issues, as well as increased creation of local policies explicitly or implicitly related to food system governance and issues.

In this context, the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact is representative of this increasing interest of cities. Focusing on urban food policies through a territorial approach, this city-led process emphasised local policy for improving the right to food in cities.[18] While there are excellent provisions in the Pact, it reproduces the trend of urban-centric policy and planning by focusing on enhancing "stakeholder participation at the city level"[19]. Moreover, with the exception of a few very general references to accountability the Milan Pact lacks an effective mechanism to keep local authorities accountable to people and communities.

Box: The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact is an international agreement open to all cities willing to develop sustainable food policies. Launched on the 15th of October 2015 by the Mayor of Milan, the pact has been signed by over 130 cities from all over the world. The Milan Pact's main goal is the establishment of a governance framework for developing local policies fostering equitable and sustainable food systems by covering six thematic areas: local food governance, social and economic equity, sustainable diets and nutrition, food production, supply and distribution, and food waste and loss.

This raises concerns regarding the effective participation of local rural communities in the development, implementation, and evaluation of food policies, most often designed in cities but directly affecting rural populations. This

---

[17] Council of the European Union. (2016). *Establishing the Urban Agenda for the EU 'Pact of Amsterdam'*.

[18] In particular, §30: "Review public procurement and trade policy aimed at facilitating food supply from short chains linking cities to secure a supply of healthy food, while also facilitating job access, fair production conditions and sustainable production for the most vulnerable producers and consumers, thereby using the potential of public procurement to help realize the right to food for all", MUFPP (2015)

[19] Urban Food Policy Framework for Action, Recommended Action no. 2. Milan Urban Food Policy Pact, October 15, 2015

is particularly important to mitigate against 'policy capture' by powerful corporate actors, who successfully lobby to secure their interests at the expense of both local small producers, and society as a whole. While the Pact is an important opening, it will require a robust effort and mobilisation of civil society organisations to ensure that these measures are coherent with international human rights principles – in other words, ensuring accountability and putting communities and those most affected by food insecurity at the centre of policy-making.

Opportunities to Harness the Potential of Urban Policies for Food Sovereignty

Mobilising Human Rights in Urban Policy Processes

Human rights constitute a common narrative to social movements' struggles, one that can help understand and frame social demands for legal, policy, and institutional change. Building common discourses and strategies based on human rights, struggled-for from above and from below, may prove pivotal for synergy and solidarity between rural and urban social movements.

First described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the right to food is a legal construct, which can be understood as "the right of every individual, alone or in community with others, to have physical and economic access at all times to sufficient, adequate and culturally acceptable food that is produced and consumed sustainably, preserving access to food for future generations."[20] From this perspective, the promotion of human rights is not a paternalistic, benevolent concession, but rather an obligation that the public authority (at national or local level) must fulfil.

The FAO outlined seven principles that should guide processes for the implementation of the right to food in regional, national, and local policies: Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Transparency, Human dignity, Empowerment and Rule of law (also referred to as the PANTHER principles – see box). These principles can be a particularly relevant tool when framing demands for the operationalisation of the right to food at the local level. Together, they constitute a checklist for a rights-based approach. Among other conditions, PANTHER requires communities to be collectively empowered by making them aware of both their status as right-holders, and the possibility of bringing an action in case of human rights' violations. For this purpose, independent remedy mechanisms have to be ensured to hold the State and its institutions accountable to people.

> **Box: the PANTHER Principles**
>
> **P**articipation requires that everyone have the right to subscribe to decisions that affect them
>
> **A**ccountability requires that politicians and government officials be held accountable for their actions through elections, judicial procedures or other mechanisms
>
> **N**on-discrimination prohibits arbitrary differences of treatment in decision-making

---

[20] UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter. (2014). *The transformative potential of the right to food*. A/HRC/25/57. The right to food was first described in Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). The Right was included in the Article 11 and General Comment 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), and rendered internationally justiciable through the Limburg Principles (1987), Maastricht Guidelines (1997), and the Optional Protocol (2008/13). The Right is also recognized, among others, in Article 12(2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1995); Articles 24(2)c/e of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989); and Articles 25f and 28(1) of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006).

> **T**ransparency requires that people be able to know processes, decisions and outcomes
>
> **H**uman dignity requires that people be treated in a dignified way
>
> **E**mpowerment requires that they are in a position to exert control over decisions affecting their lives
>
> **R**ule of law requires that every member of society, including decision-makers, must comply with the law.

Human rights-based approaches emphasise the recognition of the equal rights of all people and the redistribution of the resources required for material wellbeing and social inclusion.[21] In this sense, human rights-based approaches to policy-making are much more than a technical process. "The move from a limited conception of needs, conceived in terms of meeting a minimum of requirements, to a focus on rights entails a shift towards embracing a more strategic vision of what citizens are entitled to and require for their further development".[22]

A human rights-based approach to food policy considers food security as a direct outcome of the right to food. It values peoples' knowledge and experience in developing methods to assess hunger and malnutrition and to monitor the implementation of rights, particularly those of marginalised groups. Directly supporting food sovereignty, this approach recognises small-scale food producers as the main contributors to food security, and reserves for them a central role in the drafting, implementing, and monitoring of policy.[23]

While the human right to food and nutrition is a set of normative frameworks that defines the relationship between the State and people and communities, it can also be understood as a collective claim that has emerged from the struggles of individuals, communities, and social movements around the world against processes of marginalisation, domination, and oppression.

Understanding the right to food as part of the struggle towards food sovereignty, not necessarily attached to the State and courts, but as a living, struggled-for entity, can be particularly relevant for those institutional spaces where economic interests do not necessarily influence discussions, as they often do at the national level. In this context, urban institutions, which govern local-level politics and processes, could be seen as dynamic, adaptive, and responsive to the diversity of challenges facing heterogeneous populations, in and around cities.

'Translocating' food sovereignty notions has proven particularly difficult in urban centres of the Global North. As such, harnessing the potential of urban-based institutions through demands framed in human rights language can provide both a common narrative and a defensible structure for social movements' claims

---

[21] Mitlin, D. & Patel, S. (2005). Re-interpreting the rights-based approach ñ a grassroots perspective on rights and development. ESRC Global Poverty Research Group. Available: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G00482.pdf: 3.

[22] Molyneux, M. & Lazar, S. (2003). *Doing the Rights Thing: rights-based development and Latin American NGOs*. London: ITDG Publishing.

[23] FIAN International (2016). *Right to Food and Nutrition Watch Keeping Seeds in People's Hands*: 15.

for legal, political, and institutional change. In this way, a human rights-based framework roots demands for food sovereignty in and around cities in mechanisms of accountability and meaningful participation.

A core challenge to mobilise food sovereignty in urban spaces is how the human rights framework can be used in a way that also speaks to the imaginaries of urban-based social movements with whom the food sovereignty movement shares struggles, but not necessarily vocabularies. Being particularly attentive to intersectional struggles, the following section presents a set of mutually-supportive principles that strengthen human rights coherence and which can be mobilised in order to (1) identify and deepen commonalities between the food sovereignty movement and urban-based social movements; and (2) identify policy opportunities in urban contexts in order to frame claims of human rights in terms that are recognisant of both rural and urban constituents.

Principles to Further the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty through Urban Policies and Processes

- *Claiming Democratic Control in Urban Policy Processes*

Democratic control of food systems is a central principle of the food sovereignty movement. It is fundamental in ensuring an implementation of the right to food that respects the livelihoods of both rural and urban people.[24] The food sovereignty movement emphasises the right of people to participate in decisions regarding the production, processing, and distribution of food, and the broader governance of food systems, as well as the importance of democratising policy processes from the local to the international level. To this end, those struggling for food sovereignty have utilised various forms of deliberative, direct, and participatory democracy.

Learning from other social movements that share similar conceptions of democratic control can prove beneficial to expand inclusive understandings of notions like democracy and self-determination. Democratic control implies a substantive conception of citizenship; one based on participation and action, rather than on status or legality. This is, "a more active notion of citizenship: one which recognises the agency of citizens as 'makers and shapers' rather than as 'users and choosers' of interventions or services designed by others."[25] By recognising the limitations of representative democracy and State-framed decision-making processes, this citizen-centred conception of democratic control allows citizens to shape decisions regarding policy, planning, and modes of production, with transformative potentials, both politically and economically.[26]

From this perspective, human rights principles, such as participation and transparency, must be rooted in democratic control in order to leverage a more substantive form of "citizenship" and work towards a democratic realisation of human rights. On one hand, human rights requirements of transparency and participation are fulfilled by ensuring everyone's right to subscribe to decisions affecting their lives and by guaranteeing that policy processes, decisions, and

---

[24] Nyeleni Forum for Food Sovereignty (2007). *Declaration of Nyéléni. Forum for Food Sovereignty*; Via Campesina (1996). A Future without hunger. Rome: World Food Summit.

[25] Gaventa, J. (2002). *Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability*. IDS Bulletin, 33(2): 5.

[26] Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the Right to the Global City: Reimagining the Capitalist World Order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 27(3), 564–590.

outcomes are not opaque. On the other hand, as a collective, people-centred process, democratic control becomes a central pillar to rethink and implement a right to food that is reconceptualised by social movements, both rural and urban. Placing democratic control as a core imperative informs and reframes the state-centred perspective from which human rights principles are traditionally articulated, and repositions people and communities as the primary agents of change.

Policy processes promoting democratic control by food producers can illustrate how the principle of democratic control could be framed and claimed in the context of urban policy processes. Through the example of city-based farmers' markets, we can examine how a policy process can be made more or less democratic.

Farmers' markets are increasingly visible across many cities across the Global North and remain a central component to life in many cities and urban centres across the Global South. They represent an important opportunity to bring healthy food into cities and support small-scale farmers. However, due to the opacity of the setting-up process, farmers can be left of out the markets' organisational boards and thus out of related decision-making spaces. Questions including where they are established (e.g. issues of land ownership), for which communities (generally affluent or disenfranchised), and by means of what kind of structure (e.g. a third-party organisation, oftentimes related to a large corporation, or a managing board made up of the same farmers) are rarely discussed in urban policy spaces.

In order to be made more democratic, a policy or programme supporting the development of farmers' markets, or food markets generally, should involve diverse actors through each stage of its conception and development; this should include rural producers, as well as urban inhabitants. However, in order for democratic control to be realised, people and communities must exert their agency in decision-making processes and mobilise when this agency is constrained.

Democratic control of policy and planning for farmers' markets can ensure that they are accessible to all, as well as reflecting the diversity of small-scale producers and products. In order to democratise the benefits of farmers' markets, policy and planning should allow for rural and urban producers and citizens to decide how markets are governed, including pricing policies, where they are established, who can sell, etc.

In urban processes, democratic control therefore implies people's direct engagement in crucial decision-making spaces that cities are beginning to open in the context for food, agriculture, or even rural development. These new spaces can enable people's direct control over the whole process of local food system restructuring, including the identification of policy priorities, the implementation of strategies, and the monitoring of outcomes.

- *Thinking About Social Justice as Parity of Participation in Urban Policy*

Scholars have defined social justice in terms of both the "social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers in social life"[27] and "the elimination of institutionalised domination and oppression."[28] Nancy Fraser has argued that social justice requires participation parity, which can only be achieved through concurrent processes of identity recognition, economic redistribution, and political representation.[29] Social justice is critical for the realisation of human rights and food sovereignty.

In the context of food sovereignty, the struggle for participation parity has taken the form of distinct human rights-based claims. Firstly, those who struggle for food sovereignty struggle for cultural, political, legal, and institutional recognition. Whether in law or in practice, misrecognition takes place through the hierarchisation of cultural values,[30] which can only be challenged through 'affirmative recognition of difference'.[31] Those who struggle for food sovereignty share many of the recognition struggles Fraser acknowledges, such as race, gender, sexuality, religion, or nationality. In the specific case of peasants, the struggle for cultural recognition is two-fold: against the institutionalised subordination of alternative agricultural practices; and for cognitive justice, or the right for a plurality of knowledges and ways of knowing to co-exist.[32] The movement has not only struggled for cultural recognition, but also for the political and legal recognition of the peasant identity and peasants' rights, particularly through the work done towards a UN Declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas. The movement has also made significant progress towards the institutional recognition of women rights and the rights of indigenous peoples. Recognition, in all its aspects, is therefore a key part of recent developments in human rights obligations.

Second, the food sovereignty movement has also successfully mobilised at the international level to participate in the governance of agricultural systems, claiming the political representation of traditionally marginalised groups in international decision-making fora. Simple access to these fora can lead to situations characterised by power imbalances, as often seen in "multi-stakeholder spaces". In fact, participation as access to multi-stakeholder fora has revealed dangerously insufficient to ensure human rights and social justice, as multi-stakeholderism "ignores differences in interests, roles, and responsibilities among the parties and negates power imbalances."[33] Claiming political representation, in a way that acknowledges power relations, is part of a demand that human rights are implemented.

---

[27] Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review* 36

[28] Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* NJ: Princeton University Press: 15.

[29] Fraser, N., and A. Honneth. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange.* London/New York: Verso; Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review* 36

[30] *ibid.* Fraser, N., and A. Honneth.

[31] Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking Recognition. *New Left Review* 3: 116.

[32] Coolsaet, B. (2016). Towards an agroecology of knowledges: Recognition, cognitive justice and farmers' autonomy in France. *Journal of Rural Studies* 47, 165–171.

[33] McKeon, N. (2016) *Are equity and accountability a likely outcome when foxes and chickens share the same coop? Critiquing the concept of multistakeholder governance of food security.* FoodGovernance.com, 19th December.

Thirdly, the movement has also struggled for redistribution, making significant progress towards the reframing of land, seeds, and knowledges, as public goods, commons, or collective property. This demand for redistribution can be seen in struggles for the right to produce: struggles for land access and against land grabbing; different networks that freely exchange and protect seed; or the campesino a campesino movement and diálogo de saberes that claim indigenous and peasant knowledge over the scientisation and technologisation of agricultural practices. These claims for redistribution, as part of the right to produce, must therefore be integrated in any implementation of the right to food.

For these reasons, the operationalisation of the right to food from a food sovereignty perspective must include the three key processes of parity of participation. In this context, human rights can be a powerful tool to claim the recognition of a plurality of knowledges and identities, the representation in policy-making processes, and the redistribution of resources (economic, environmental, or otherwise), all necessary for genuinely participatory processes. It is critical to catalyse the efforts undertaken at the international level in order to demand that these human rights obligations are respected, protected, and fulfilled at the local level.

In order to realise social justice towards the realisation of the human right to food, social movements must continuously negotiate various spaces of participation. Recognising that the nature of participation both shapes and is shaped by spaces of participation is a critical step in understanding processes of participation and their significance for social movements.

When we speak about spaces of participation, distinction must be made between 'claimed' and 'invited' spaces, and between 'organic' and 'induced' participation. Organic participation refers to when groups of citizens act independently of government to hold dialogue and make decisions. Organic participation enables self-organised citizens the opportunity to 'set the agenda'. It is associated with social movements, horizontality, and grassroots mobilisation.

Organic participation is often associated with claimed spaces – spaces created by and for the community. These can be physical spaces, claimed through occupation or demonstration; political spaces, such as citizen forums; or virtual spaces, such as collectively managed social media networks. Claimed spaces can be critical for the articulation and the defence of collective human rights, particularly for marginalised groups or groups excluded from other spaces of participation.[34] They can also be transformative in terms of the conscientisation and self-organisation of communities. "These are spaces of contestation as well as collaboration, into which heterogeneous participants bring diverse interpretations of participation and democracy and divergent agendas. As such they are crucibles for a new politics of public policy."[35]

[34] Brown, A. (2006). *Contested Space: Street trading, public space and livelihoods in developing cities*. Rugby: ITDG Publishing.

[35] Cornwall, A., & Schattan Coelho, V. (2007). Spaces for Change: The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas. In A. Cornwall & V. Schattan Coelho (Eds.), *Spaces for Change: The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas* (pp. 1–29). London: Zed Books: 2.

By contrast, induced participation refers to processes that involve citizens, but are managed and controlled by governments. Induced participation is associated with invited spaces – spaces created and controlled by governments, such as planning consultations. In these spaces, communities have limited agency to make change, and the power to shape agendas or make decisions rests with government actors.

The reality is that, in urban contexts, most spaces of participation exist somewhere between this two-by-two model. In practice, local governments may support local community initiatives, introducing an element of induced participation as initiatives scale up. Similarly, community groups may co-opt formal processes to serve a specific agenda, i.e. claiming space in an otherwise invited process.

Different models of participatory food governance in cities, such as Food Policy Councils and other similar devices are examples of policy spaces that can be mobilised for the implementation of the right to food from a food sovereignty perspective. These are spaces that can be used by civil society to claim the operationalisation of human rights through the creation of processes where communities are at the centre of decision-making processes and where participation parity can be successfully claimed. However, in order to effectively demand that human rights obligations are complied with and that the elements of participation parity are included, these spaces have to be mobilised to raise critical issues of social justice so that they are placed on the policy agenda, including the recognition (including the non-exploitation) of agricultural and food workers, the fairer redistribution of resources, and a political representation that explicitly acknowledges power imbalances.

- ### *Demanding Inclusion Beyond Non-Disrimination*

"Calls for inclusion arise from experiences of exclusion."[36] Accordingly, the notion of inclusion, as a democratic principle and imperative, emerged primarily from the struggles of social movements through the twentieth century, particularly from Black civil rights movements, queer and feminist groups, and indigenous peoples.

The food sovereignty movement prioritises inclusion as both a political imperative and a principle for its own governance. The movement has driven a range of both institutional and methodological innovations to push for the inclusion of marginalised groups, particularly rural women, in decision-making processes. Moreover, food sovereignty groups, such as Réseau Semences Paysannes in France, have recognised that inclusive processes can not only be more effective, but transformative for those involved.[37]

Similarly, various urban social movements have emphasised the significance of inclusive spaces, and inclusive policy-making. The Community-led Plan for London, developed by a coalition of social movements, emphasises how implementation guidelines for local government could actively "create social

---

[36] Young, I. M. (2002). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 7.

[37] Pimbert, M. (2008). *Towards Food Sovereignty: Reclaiming autonomous food systems*. London: IIED.

inclusion."[38] Moragues-Faus and Morgan have also emphasised the importance of creating "inclusive food narratives" to enable the development of more just urban food policy and food systems.[39]

Demands for inclusion are not made on the basis of shared attributes or interest, but rather in recognition of difference. In this way, inclusion is inherently linked to individual and collective identity politics and intersectionality. Recognising the diversity and complexity of identities requires an epistemic plurality – in other words, valuing all knowledges and ways of knowing. Inclusive spaces cannot be predetermined, but rather should be developed inductively and proactively, to reflect the heterogeneity of participants in a democratic process.

In terms of policy and legal opportunities to demand truly inclusive spaces in the city, the human rights principle of non-discrimination is an important entry point. Established by art. 2 ICESCR and developed in the PANTHER principles, this principle "prohibits arbitrary differences of treatment in decision-making". Thus conceived, it is insufficient for mitigating or addressing structural inequalities in urban policy-making. It focuses on formal equality and special treatment to particular groups, but it implies no positive obligation on the part of the government, key for addressing structural power imbalances and social inequalities.

An example of what inclusive policies can be designed in the city is the growing policy support and stimulation of community gardens in the last three decades. While the practice of urban agriculture has a long history in cities in Europe, only recently have municipalities begun to recognise the multi-dimensional benefits of urban food production,[40] particularly for marginalised groups.[41] This period has seen the rise of urban agriculture policy and planning across the Global North and South.

From a policy perspective, in order to realise the potential benefits of urban agriculture, it is not sufficient that either material spaces, such as allotments or community gardens, or political spaces, such as planning consultations or policy forums, are merely 'open to all'. An 'open' policy may be non-discriminatory, but is highly unlikely to be inclusive. Rather it is likely to be dominated individuals with greater time or wealth, reproducing existing inequalities in the city.

Inclusive urban agriculture policy and planning should positively discriminate towards and prioritise the participation of marginalised and under-represented groups, including women, migrants, and vulnerable citizens, in order to contribute to the implementation and realisation of the right to food. It is also key for

---

[38] Just Space (2016). *Towards a Community-Led Plan for London: Policy Directions and Proposals*. London: Just Space: 62.

[39] Moragues-Faus, A., & Morgan, K. (2015). Reframing the foodscape: the emergent world of urban food policy. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(7), 1558–1573.

[40] Mougeot, L. (2005). *Agropolis: The Social, Political and Environmental Dimensions of Urban Agriculture*. London: Earthscan.; Redwood, M. (2008). *Agriculture in Urban Planning: Generating Livelihoods and Food Security*. London: Earthscan.

[41] Allen, A., & Apsan Frediani, A. (2013). Farmers, not gardeners. *City*, *17*(3), 365–381.; Cabannes, Y., & Raposo, I. (2013). Peri-urban agriculture, social inclusion of migrant population and Right to the City. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, *17*(2), 235–250.

creating spaces for communities to organise and define their own community-development strategies.

Inclusion, as a key principle for developing human rights-based policies, but one that goes beyond non-discrimination, requires an active, not reactive, agenda that does not take universalism as a given. This requires a more active inclusion agenda that positively promotes the inclusion and participation of marginalised groups. This active promotion should take the form of affirmative action – targeted strategies that are inclusive of the needs of both the dominant and the marginal groups, but paying particular attention to the situation of the marginal groups.[42]

▪ *Fostering Solidarity Across the Rural-Urban Interface*

The food sovereignty movement is defined by its plurality of cultures, interests, politics and knowledges. The diverse movement was created and is sustained by solidarity between disparate movements in different contexts with shared struggles. More recently, the movement has recognised the strategic and transformative potentials of alliances with other movements, such as identity-based struggles, through what has been termed 'a dialectical convergence'.[43]

Solidarity implies horizontality and mutuality across difference. Solidarity can be *interest-based*, reflecting a convergence of interests or opportunity, or it can be *identity-based*, defined by the self-identification of one group or individual with the struggle of another.[44] As a spatial practice, solidarity holds significant potentials for mobilising and strengthening existing and emerging political struggles. In this way, solidarity is inherently linked to the process of *autogestion* – collective self-management – through which shared interest or sentiment becomes political action.

Informal grassroots solidarity projects, such as farmers' markets or collective kitchens, have already developed in some cities to seek new ways of addressing collective needs by building alternative practices or to react against the absurdity of top-down decisions disproportionately affecting certain minorities. In this context, the urban dimension, crossed by multiple struggles and movements, can prove to be fertile ground for mutual support both between rural and urban food struggles, and between food-related and other urban-based ones. Given the overlap existing among most social justice claims, the exchange with social movements focusing on migration housing, health issues, the commons, and women's struggles, seems to be particularly promising in the view of building resistant local communities.

Recognising the political, social, and economic significance of solidarity, particularly for marginalised groups, contributes to the protection of human dignity. This principle, included under the PANTHER principles, requires that people be treated in a dignified way. An important contribution as it is, it does not acknowledge collective understandings of agency. It says very little about the

---

[42] powell, j. a.(2008) Post-Racialism or Targeted Universalism. *Denver University Law Review 86:* 785

[43] Brent, Z. W., 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.

[44] Brem-Wilson, J. (2014). From "Here" To "There": Social Movements, The Academy, And Solidarity Research. *Journal of Socialist Studies,* 10(1), 111–132.

social creation of 'otherness', about who is responsible for providing the dignified treatment, or about where the threshold of dignity is.

Core ideas from social movements like the commons, *buen vivir*, ecofeminism, or from academia, such as decoloniality or intersubjectivity, can help us understand the principle of solidarity in a way that augments and transcends individualistic understandings of human rights. This is particularly so in the case of rural and urban populations, more often than not pitted against one another for seemingly competing interests that are no other than the interests of the capitalist class, and not those of the peasants, the women, the marginalised, and the oppressed.

In the last few decades, solidarity between producers and consumers, in the form of short supply chains, has come to exemplify how this principle works in practice, going beyond ensuring human dignity. Designing public policies to support agroecology in rural areas through the creation of short chains to support peasant farmers can promote solidarity between urban and rural constituents if policies are devised through inclusive processes that streamline parity of participation. One way to do this is by preserving fertile peri-urban areas for agroecology farming initiatives that can in turn be supported by city-based groups through various models, such as community supported agriculture or consumer cooperatives.

In order to foster solidarity between rural and urban movements, it also is important to build social, economic, and political alliances across the rural-urban interface. To this end, it is important to engage critically with the ways in which policy processes help or hinder such alliances. Rural and urban inhabitants can examine whether an urban policy process relating to short supply chains supports relationship building or prevents it. Does a municipal policy support or constrain small-scale distribution processes? Are corporate food retailers operating in urban areas given preferential accesses to customers? It is important to ask questions such as these when engaging with short supply chains across the rural interface. The centrality of solidarity to both urban and the food sovereignty movement means that this is a useful principle for engaging critically with urban policy processes.

- ### *Creating Space for Autonomy and Self Determination*

Autonomy is a self-reinforcing central pillar of food sovereignty and a key aspect in ensuring the realisation of the right to food. The food sovereignty movement is rooted in the struggles of indigenous peoples for autonomy and in declarations of self-determination in the twentieth century. Today, the movement emphasises peasant autonomy, politically and economically, from the capitalist relations of the global food system. This autonomy has been explored particularly in terms of autonomy over seeds, and autonomous engagement with markets.

Some elements of the food sovereignty movement have framed autonomy as a parallel strategy to engagement with external actors and processes.[45] However, by appealing to anarchist formulations of autonomy, which do not imply isolationism, this distinction becomes unnecessary.

---

[45] Iles, A., & Montenegro De Wit, M. (2015). Sovereignty at What Scale? An Inquiry into Multiple Dimensions of Food Sovereignty. *Globalizations*, 12(4), 481–497.

In Marxist theory, autonomy through *autogestion* was a critical and subversive aspect of class struggle. Through the twentieth century, anarchists have brought together Marx's idea of autonomy with more libertarian notions of freedom and connectivity:

"Anarchist approaches to autonomy have emphasised the unequal power relations involved in everyday activities and interactions and have sought to develop forms of self-management that eschew, subvert, and challenge mechanisms and institutions of governance that structure everyday life."[46]

In this way, autonomy can refer to the intricate informal hierarchies, which variously constrain or enable individual and collective capacities for self-affirmation and strategic engagement with wider political and economic processes. Such autonomy means power to control modes of production, and shape processes of social reproduction. Collective autonomy thus becomes critical for social, economic, and political emancipation.

There is a long history of urban social movements emphasising the centrality of autonomy. For many such movements it is possible to trace influences back to the syndicalist and anarchist movements in Catalonia and Andalucía in the early twentieth century. More recently, urban anti-austerity movements, such as 15M in many Spanish cities, have used autonomy and integration as strategic principles for realising change, through what some scholars have termed 'hybrid-autonomy'.[47]

Despite this reality, or precisely because of it, current legal and policy tools do not provide adequate frameworks for enhancing collective autonomy. The PANTHER principle of empowerment, which requires that everyone be in a position to exert control over decisions affecting their lives, must be interpreted more broadly to comprise progressive formulations of autonomy and autogestion – in order for the principle to address the structural constraints and obstacles to the actual exercise of control over one's life it must be broadened to acknowledge that so-called individual decisions are actually always interconnected to others' decisions over their own lives.

Centralising the principle of autonomy within a progressive understanding of the right to food expands and moves beyond current top-down understandings of empowerment. This understanding of the right to food is anchored on collective self-determination - the rights of peoples to define their own food system and to develop the necessary public policies to this end, thus placing the peoples as the sovereign subject, in lieu of markets, transnational corporations, international organisations or economically-interested nation-states.

Putting the principle of autonomy in context – one of the measures municipalities can take in order to foster autonomy is to promote the collective management of publicly owned unused or abandoned land. These spaces can be

---

[46] Ince, A. (2012). In the Shell of the Old: Anarchist Geographies of Territorialisation. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1645–1666: 1653-4.

[47] Martinez, M.A. (2015). "Between Autonomy and Hybridization: Urban struggles within the 15M movement in Madrid." Paper presented at the RC21 International Conference on "The Ideal City: between myth and reality. Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life" Urbino (Italy) 27-29 August 2015.

used by communities in order to: collectively manage land in urban or peri-urban areas; develop and protect spaces for agriculture-related initiatives that are autonomous from the market, such as seed exchanges or self-training sessions; or to liaise with the market in terms defined by the community collective. Developing mechanisms for unused (or unsustainably used) private land to serve public purposes is among the measures municipalities can take, within their jurisdiction, to also promote agroecology in peri-urban areas. Those organisations active in the food sovereignty movement can demand public policies that maintain, enable, and increase the collective autonomy of the different food system actors, from farmers, to migrant workers, to supermarket employees.

▪ *Re-Territorialising Food Systems beyond the Rural-Urban Binary*

If food sovereignty proposes a radical transformation of societal organisation, this transformation is intimately linked with local spaces and territories. Reterritorialising food systems is a prerequisite for food sovereignty, and therefore for the realisation of the right to food.

After decades of State measures aimed at globalising society and space, cities have become "spaces of global accumulation",[48] and deterritorialisation processes have generalised destructive and demobilising conceptions of rural-urban divides. As a response, social movements have reappropriated the concept of "territories", from a fundamentally State-focused, static one, to a political, strategic, community-centred concept.[49]

Territories are continuously renegotiated across systems and scales. This process creates myriad opportunities and challenges across and between populations in diverse contexts, including rural-urban. Importantly however, demanding that public policies encourage dialogue in fora that explicitly acknowledge power relations can lead to the identification of common struggles, different identities, and eventually common scalar definitions of the territory.

Territorialisation processes must be understood as a continuous political struggle for collective self-determination – rescaling space and governance to serve political goals of social movements. In this context, human rights principles like accountability and transparency must be rescaled, reterritorialised. This translates into, on the one hand, focusing demands for accountability and transparency in local spaces of decision-making and policy processes, in order to counterforce globalisation trends; and on the other, it means that local authorities are bound by these principles from a territorial perspective, not in isolation as single units of government, but in conjunction with social movements and local populations – together with the latter's demands and their definitions of territory.

---

[48] Friedmann, J. (1995). "Where we stand: a decade of world city research." In: P. Knox and P. J. Taylor (Eds.) *World Cities in a World-System*, (pp. 21-47). New York: Cambridge University Press.

[49] See for example, Bizilur, Etxalde, & EHNE Bizkaia (2015). *Sembrando Soberanías para otros modelos de vida en Euskal Herria: Algunas propuestas para la construcción de políticas públicas locales desde la soberanía alimentaria*. June, particularly pages 14-17; EHNE Bizkaia, Emaus, & Mugarik Gabeko Albaitariak (2012). *Políticas Públicas para la Soberanía Alimentaria Barreras y oportunidades. Análisis europeo, estatal y local*, October. *See also* Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo (CLOC) & Vía Campesina Paraguay (2012) *Alimento Sano, Pueblo Soberano.* Campaña por la Soberanía Alimentaria." Cartilla de formación N° 3 — TIERRA Y TERRITORIO, August : 16-19.

Including territorialisation among the principles that should guide the implementation of the right to food through local rights-based food policies can therefore lead to a more accurate and lived understanding of the right to food from the perspective of food sovereignty.

An effective tool to mainstream territorialisation in an urban food policy is public procurement, which includes the purchase of all food served in the canteens of schools, hospitals, and institutional workplaces, as well as food served through other welfare programmes (such as eldercare services), thus representing the largest public restaurant.

Public procurement can be a powerful lever to support agroecology, as it can ensure a constant and structured demand and a reliable income for rural communities. However, precisely because public procurement relies on large amounts of food, often small- and medium-scale producers, when individually considered, can face increased bureaucracy and taxes and may not able to meet the requested demand. Through the effective involvement of rural communities throughout the process of policy elaboration, these obstacles can be acknowledged beforehand, and failing that, public support for cooperative arrangements can also increase the likelihood that small producers can compete for public tenders. Dialogue between public authorities and small and medium producers is indeed the first step to make institutions aware of peasants' specific needs and to find inclusive, just, truly participatory solutions, that increase democratic control and autonomy, for the territorialisation of the food system.

Moving Forward

The aim of this paper has been to problematise the urban in the context of food sovereignty, and to propose a framework for articulating key political considerations of food sovereignty and the right to food in urban contexts. This framework seeks to contribute to an emerging, broader conversation about the role of cities and urban inhabitants in the struggle for food sovereignty and the realisation of the right to food.

The following recommendations serve two purposes. The first is to propose ways to continue and develop this critical conversation. The second is to suggest specific actions that may support the struggle for food sovereignty, by engaging with urban processes.

Engage Critically with the Institutional Context of Urban Policy Processes

Policy processes, in urban and rural contexts, are defined and constrained by the institutional contexts in which they emerge. In order to harness the potential of urban policy processes for food sovereignty and the right to food, movements should examine these institutional contexts, continuously, critically, and systematically.

The institutional context can be understood in terms of local regulations, the national distribution of jurisdictions, institutional capacities, and political will. By looking critically at each of these aspects in turn, movements can better identify strategic opportunities to influence urban policy processes towards better enabling food sovereignty.

Concretely, this type of critical engagement requires work on multiple, simultaneous fronts. The first step in order to make policy claims that politically willing local authorities can implement or support is to better understand the legal context. This is because even when municipalities have the political will, the national distribution of jurisdictions can impede many of their actions in the context of the food system. For example, while local authorities may have jurisdiction over local markets and agricultural produce hubs, it may be up to the region/department/state or even the national State to determine how administrative public contracts are designed and granted, reducing the role of municipalities to a mere facilitator. Considering what local authorities can and cannot do from a jurisdictional perspective is therefore key in demanding and co-developing food systems' local policies. Although much of this information, including public contracts and planning decisions, is public record, local decision-making processes can be opaque and food-related regulations often come from many distinct departments. Connecting with both governmental and non-governmental actors who can shed light on the complex decision-making processes that constitute urban governance can be instrumental in the task of engaging with institutional and political contexts.

Identify Common Struggles Across the Rural-Urban within a Territory

Identifying commonalities and building alliances with urban social movements working towards social, economic, and political transformations is key in building a strong network of solidarity in support of food sovereignty. Whilst the term 'food sovereignty' might be unfamiliar to urban groups and urban policy-makers, it is clear that there exists the potential for significant consensus and convergence between rural and urban social movements.

Common struggles can be thematic. For example, issues relating to land tenure and entitlements affect urban housing as well as access to rural land for agriculture. But common struggles can also be ideological, reflecting identification-with and solidarity-with marginalised groups in any context. While thematic struggles can be strategic and transformative in their own ways, solidarity between distinct, disparate, marginalised groups – such as rural peasants, low-income communities, indigenous groups, and migrant workers – is a first and necessary step towards a politics of emancipation and transformative change.

Ultimately, this transformation can only be achieved through enhanced communication, collaboration and shared endeavour. But the first critical step is for both rural and urban social movements, including the food sovereignty movement, to look beyond thematic issues, and identify common political struggles that affect territories and peoples, regardless of their occupation or location.

Claim Space in Urban Policy Processes

Urban social movements are struggling to claim space in municipal urban policy processes, which range from transparent and open, to private and opaque. Food sovereignty can be promoted by attending and participating in these policy processes, and seeking alliances with those organisations and movements who are familiar with navigating these spaces. This participation can be strategic, for example, by trying to influence specific policy decisions through targeted

advocacy and action. But this participation can also be broader, and more sustained.

By regularly attending and contributing to urban community forums or local authority-led community consultations, for example, the complexities of urban governance can be unravelled, in a way that builds upon and complements the important work already being done by mobilised urban groups. In this way, the food sovereignty movement can better understand how decisions made in urban contexts, sometimes relating explicitly to food, but often affecting food systems incidentally, come to marginalise small-scale food producers around the world. By better understanding these processes, the food sovereignty movement is in a stronger position to shape them.

Conclusion

A holistic, strategic engagement with urban policy processes represents one of the greatest opportunities to enhance claims to food sovereignty and the realisation of the right to food. As this report has argued, whilst urban policy processes range from transparent to inscrutable, in urban contexts we can find countless social movements that are already negotiating these spaces. The food sovereignty movement can promote strength and solidarity by looking for shared politics, principles, and language with mobilised urban groups.

The collective right to food can only be realised when the struggle becomes universal. To this end, the food sovereignty movement can extend its influence to new food actors by engaging with urban groups and processes. Moreover, by deconstructing the rural-urban binary, the movement can better territorialise struggles for food sovereignty in a way that increases the accountability of local governments to people.

Whilst the struggle for food sovereignty is ever-evolving, we can take comfort that there exist myriad opportunities for social, economic, and political transformations, both within and outside of the current food sovereignty movement. To this end, urban policy processes represent one of the most important unclaimed spaces.

Bibliography:

Allen, A., & Apsan Frediani, A. (2013). Farmers, not gardeners. *City*, *17*(3), 365–381.

Bizilur, Etxalde, & EHNE Bizkaia (2015). *Sembrando Soberaníasa para otros modelos de vida en Euskal Herria: Algunas propuestas para la construcción de políticas públicas locales desde la soberanía alimentaria*. June, particularly pages 14-17. Available at: http://base.socioeco.org/docs/politicas_20publicas-3.pdf [accessed March, 2017]

Brem-Wilson, J. (2014). From "Here" To "There": Social Movements, The Academy, And Solidarity Research. *Journal of Socialist Studies,* 10(1), 111–132.

Brent, Z. W., 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.

Brown, A. (2006). Contested Space: Street trading, public space and livelihoods in developing cities. Rugby: ITDG Publishing.

Buckley, M., & Strauss, K. (2016). With, against and beyond Lefebvre: Planetary urbanization and epistemic plurality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 34(4), 617–636: 621.

Cabannes, Y., & Raposo, I. (2013). Peri-urban agriculture, social inclusion of migrant population and Right to the City. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, *17*(2), 235–250.

Committee on Food Security, Civil Society Mechanism (2016). *Connecting smallholders to markets.* An analytical guide. Rome: FAO.

Coolsaet, B. (2016). Towards an agroecology of knowledges: Recognition, cognitive justice and farmers' autonomy in France. *Journal of Rural Studies* 47, 165–171.

Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo (CLOC) & Vía Campesina Paraguay (2012) *Alimento Sano, Pueblo Soberano.* Campaña por la Soberanía Alimentaria." Cartilla de formación N° 3 — TIERRA Y TERRITORIO, August. Available at: http://tierraparavivir.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/cartilla-tierra-y-territorio-cloc-vc-paraguay.pdf [accessed March, 2017]

Cornwall, A., & Schattan Coelho, V. (2007). Spaces for Change: The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas. In A. Cornwall & V. Schattan Coelho (Eds.), *Spaces for Change: The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas* (pp. 1–29). London: Zed Books: 2.

Council of the European Union. (2016). *Establishing the Urban Agenda for the EU 'Pact of Amsterdam'*.

EHNE Bizkaia, Emaus, & Mugarik Gabeko Albaitariak (2012). *Políticas Públicas para la Soberanía Alimentaria Barreras y oportunidades. Análisis europeo, estatal y local*, October.

FIAN International (2016). *Right to Food and Nutrition Watch Keeping Seeds in People's Hands*.

Fraser, N. (1996). *Social justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition and Participation.* The Tanner Lectures on Human Values.

Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking Recognition. *New Left Review* 3: 116.

Fraser, N., and A. Honneth. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange.* London/New York: Verso.

Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review* 36.

Friedmann, J. (1995). "Where we stand: a decade of world city research." In: P. Knox and P. J. Taylor (Eds.) *World Cities in a World-System*, (pp. 21-47). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gaventa, J. (2002). *Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability*. IDS Bulletin, 33(2): 5.

Habitat International Coalition (2015) Fractured Continuity: Habitat II to Habitat III.

Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso; Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.

Iles, A., & Montenegro De Wit, M. (2015). Sovereignty at What Scale? An Inquiry into Multiple Dimensions of Food Sovereignty. *Globalizations*, 12(4), 481–497.

Ince, A. (2012). In the Shell of the Old: Anarchist Geographies of Territorialisation. *Antipode*, 44(5), 1645–1666: 1653-4.

Just Space (2016). *Towards a Community-Led Plan for London: Policy Directions and Proposals*. London: Just Space.

Martinez, M.A. (2015). "Between Autonomy and Hybridization: Urban struggles within the 15M movement in Madrid." Paper presented at the RC21 International Conference on "The Ideal City: between myth and reality. Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life" Urbino (Italy) 27-29 August 2015.

McKeon, N. (2016) *Are equity and accountability a likely outcome when foxes and chickens share the same coop? Critiquing the concept of multistakeholder governance of food security*. FoodGovernance.com, 19th December.

Mitlin, D. & Patel, S. (2005). *Re-interpreting the rights-based approach: a grassroots perspective on rights and development*. ESRC Global Poverty Research Group. Available: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G00482.pdf [Accessed March, 2017]

Molyneux, M. & Lazar, S. (2003). *Doing the Rights Thing: rights-based development and Latin American NGOs*. London: ITDG Publishing.

Moragues-Faus, A., & Morgan, K. (2015). Reframing the foodscape: the emergent world of urban food policy. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(7), 1558–1573.

Mougeot, L. (2005). *Agropolis: The Social, Political and Environmental Dimensions of Urban Agriculture*. London: Earthscan.

Mumford, L. (1968). The Myth of Megalopolis. In *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (pp. 525–567). New York: Harcourt Brace International.

Nyeleni Forum for Food Sovereignty (2007). *Declaration of Nyéléni. Forum for Food Sovereignty*.

Peck, J. (1998). Geographies of Governance: TECs and the Neoliberalisation of "Local Interests." *Space and Polity*, 2, 5–31.

Pimbert, M. (2008). *Towards Food Sovereignty: Reclaiming autonomous food systems*. London: IIED.

powell, j. a.(2008) Post-Racialism or Targeted Universalism. *Denver University Law Review 86:* 785

Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2/3), 99–108: 100.

Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the Right to the Global City: Reimagining the Capitalist World Order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 27(3), 564–590.

Redwood, M. (2008). *Agriculture in Urban Planning: Generating Livelihoods and Food Security*. London: Earthscan.

Sano, H. O. and Feiring, B. (2015). *A Human Rights Review of the Proposed SDG Priority Indicators*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for Human Rights.

Toldo, A. Pettenati, G. & Dansero, E. (2015). "Exploring urban food strategies: four analytical perspectives and a case study (Turin)." In G. Cinà & E. Dansero, *Localizing urban food strategies. Farming cities and performing rurality.* 7th International Aesop Sustainable Food Planning Conference Proceedings, Torino, 7-9 October 2015. (pp. 270-282) Torino, Politecnico di Torino.

United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR). (2005). General Comment No. 16: The Equal Right of Men and Women to the Enjoyment of All Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Art. 3 of the Covenant), 11 August 2005, E/C.12/2005/4.

United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter. (2014). *The transformative potential of the right to food*. A/HRC/25/57.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN Habitat) (2016). *New Urban Agenda Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All.*

Via Campesina (1996). A Future without hunger. Rome: World Food Summit.

Weber, M. (1978 [1922]). The city (non-legitimate domination). In R. Guenther & C. Wittich (Eds.), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (pp. 1212–1374). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Williams, R. (1978). *The Country and The City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2002). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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