



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“Global Perspectives on Food Politics and Policy: Examining the Interplay
of the Food Sovereignty and Food and Nutrition Security Discursive
Narratives”

verfasst von / submitted by

Joceline Nayelle Hernandez Marroquin

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master (MA)

Wien, 2022 / Vienna 2022

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / degree programme
code as it appears on the student record sheet:

UA 067 805

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / degree programme
as it appears on the student record sheet:

Individuelles Masterstudium
Globalgeschichte

Betreut von / Supervisor:

ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Martina Kaller

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Kurzzusammenfassung.....	5
Resumen.....	6
Acknowledgements.....	7
List of Abbreviations.....	8
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	10
<i>Research Journey</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Aim and Scope</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Overview</i>	<i>11</i>
Chapter 2: Research Design.....	13
<i>Food and Nutrition Security vs. Food Sovereignty in Global Policy</i>	<i>13</i>
Food and Nutrition Security	14
Food Sovereignty	17
The Food and Nutrition Security Discourse	19
The Food Sovereignty Discourse	23
Chapter 3: Case Methodology.....	27
<i>A Case for the ‘Global-Local Continuum’</i>	<i>27</i>
Political Economy Analysis.....	28
Critical Policy Discourse Analysis	29
Document Analysis	32
<i>Potential Biases.....</i>	<i>33</i>
Chapter 4: Description of the Case.....	34
<i>Salvadoran Food Politics</i>	<i>34</i>
Second Food Regime: From the Green Revolution to the Civil War.....	34
Third Food Regime: The Rise of Neoliberalism and Food Sovereignty.....	36
<i>Post-Colonial Critiques: The Agency of Local Actors in the Food System and Institutionalizing Agroecological Policy at the National Level.....</i>	<i>38</i>
Chapter 5: Analysis.....	41
<i>CONASAN and the Política Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028</i>	<i>41</i>
Beyond Food and Nutrition Security: Examining the ‘National Food and Nutrition Security Policy’	42
<i>Emerging Dimensions and Perspectives in Food Policy.....</i>	<i>44</i>
Agroecological Dimensions and Perspectives	44
Right to Food Dimensions and Perspectives	47

Chapter 6: Findings.....	51
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>51</i>
Bibliography.....	54

Abstract

Understanding food and nutrition security, food sovereignty and the many interpretations formed by various actors provides a basis for understanding the political economy of food on all levels—international, national/regional, and local. Furthermore, examining these political economies of food and how they interlace can aid in understanding the behavior of various actors engaged in the politics of a state. The aim of this thesis is to contextualize the discursive narratives of the food and nutrition security and food sovereignty politics of food at the global level and interlink them to the nation-state of El Salvador. The broad scope of these discourses will be examined in relation to how they appear at the national and local levels of Salvadoran political society, and more specifically in the policy arena.

El Salvador, food and nutrition security, food sovereignty, political economy, food systems, agroecology, the right to food

Kurzzusammenfassung

Das Verständnis der Ernährungssicherheit, der Ernährungssouveränität und deren vielfältiger Auslegungen bietet eine Grundlage für das Verständnis der politischen Ökonomie der Ernährung auf allen Ebenen— global, national/regional und lokal. Darüber hinaus kann die Untersuchung dieser politischen Ökonomien der Ernährung und ihrer Verflechtungen dazu beitragen, das Verhalten der verschiedenen politischen Akteure in einem Staat zu verstehen. Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es, die diskursiven Narrative der Ernährungssicherheit und der Ernährungssouveränität auf globaler Ebene zu kontextualisieren und sie mit dem Nationalstaat El Salvador zu verknüpfen. Das breite Spektrum dieser Diskurse wird in Bezug darauf untersucht, wie sie auf der nationalen und lokalen Ebene der salvadorianischen politischen Gesellschaft und insbesondere in der politischen Arena erscheinen.

El Salvador, Ernährungssicherheit, Ernährungssouveränität, politische Ökonomie, Ernährungssysteme, Agrarökologie, das Recht auf Nahrung

Resumen

Comprender la seguridad alimentaria y nutricional, la soberanía alimentaria y las muchas interpretaciones formadas por los diferentes actores involucrados proporciona una base para comprender la economía política de los alimentos en todos los niveles: global, nacional, regional y local. Asimismo, examinar estas economías políticas de los alimentos y cómo se entrelazan puede ayudar a comprender el comportamiento de varios actores involucrados en la política de un Estado. El objetivo de esta tesis es contextualizar las narrativas discursivas de la seguridad alimentaria y nutricional y las políticas de soberanía alimentaria de los alimentos a nivel global e interrelacionarlas con el estado-nación de El Salvador. Se examinará el amplio alcance de estos discursos con relación a cómo aparecen en los niveles nacionales y locales de la sociedad política salvadoreña, y más específicamente en el ámbito de las políticas.

[El Salvador, seguridad alimentaria y nutricional, soberanía alimentaria, economía política, sistemas alimentarios, agroecología, el derecho a la alimentación](#)

Acknowledgements

To my support system near and far

It is with an immense amount of joy that I dedicate this to all of you. Words cannot express the delight it is to share this accomplishment and thus, close a chapter in my academic career. The support provided not only aided in the creation of my thesis, but also to that of my personal journey through life. Thank you all!

To the friends made through EMGS

You guys are amazing! I'm excited to see where our paths may lead and I am happy to have known each and every one of you, from Leipzig to Vienna. My professional and personal life has been enriched from the experiences gained from this program and have left a lasting impression on my life.

To those who helped in the process of completing this thesis

Specifically, Kira, Jack, Naomi, Valentina, thank you so much for your help, I am forever indebted to you. I appreciate the edits, critiques, and thoughts on this piece of work. Couldn't have done it without your help! A special thank you to my advisor Prof. Martina Kaller, for your patience, understanding, and help in the process of advising, reading and grading of this thesis.

And last but not least

I dedicate a special excerpt to myself. Upon reflection, I have endured much in the last three years that stretched beyond the pages of this thesis. I owe it to myself to recognize how much of a feat it is to write during the most challenging years of my life, let alone in a pandemic that affected so many people. I am proud of not only what I have accomplished but what will proceed after this chapter as a master's student has finally come to an end.

Much Love,
Joceline

List of Abbreviations

AFN/SFS	Alternative Food System/Sustainable Food System
ARENA	Nationalist Republican Alliance
CaC	Farmer-to-farmer
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CERAI	Center for Rural Studies and International Agriculture
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CODESAN	Departmental Council of Food and Nutrition Security
COMUSAN	Municipal Council of Food and Nutrition Security
CONASAN	National Council of Food and Nutrition Security
CONFRAS	Confederation of Federations of Cooperatives of the Salvadoran Agrarian Reform
CPDA	Critical Policy Discourse Analysis
DFID	Department for International Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FECORACEN	Federation of Cooperatives of the Agrarian Reform, Central Region
FIAN	Food First Information and Action Network
FMLN	Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security
FS	Food Sovereignty
ICESR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IPC	International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty
LVC	The Peasants Way
NGO/CSO	Non-governmental Organization/ Civil Society Organization
PEA	Political Economy Analysis
PNSAN	National Strategic Plan for Food and Nutritional Security

PRISMA	Salvadoran Research Program on Development and Environment
UN	United Nations
UNDROP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasant and other People Working in Rural Areas
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme
REDES	Salvadoran Foundation for Reconstruction and Development
UES	Salvadoran Ecological Unit

Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Journey

The importance of food cannot be understated; it is an essential aspect needed for sustaining life, nourishment, and energy. Yet, examining the importance of food within a global context can inherit extended meanings beyond the need for human survival. *Food politics*, in particular, is the “relations of power among groups and individuals at the governmental and non-governmental levels” and references the “political atmosphere, institutions, processes, or content that either deter or promote food security or food insecurity.”¹ By focusing on the multitude of relations between actors, different narrative voices on a variety of issues and sub issues are revealed as pertaining to the global currents. This thesis primarily focuses on the narrative voices of *food and nutrition security* (FNS) and *food sovereignty* (FS) on the global issue of food insecurity and attempts to interlink them to the sub issue of food policy in global food politics.

Aim and Scope

So then, how does one proceed to contextualize these discursive narratives in food policy, let alone food politics? Global research often engages with various disciplines; for example, history and historical context presents as one necessary dimension relevant to global analysis.² Through examining the histories of FNS and FS as concepts, this thesis reveals corresponding discourses as having emerged independently and dependently from these concepts; more specifically, actors present at the different food political scales (i.e. global, regional/national, and local) are also shown to inform and reinterpret FNS and FS to best fit their discursive narrative. Therefore, while the broader aim of this thesis to contextualize the discursive narratives of FNS and FS, a more pointed question developed to further address its relation to food policy is: *What are the different discursive narratives from actors (across different food political scales and academic/non-academic disciplines) in response to food insecurity and how do they appear to influence, implement, and interact with food policy?*

From a global standpoint and because food insecurity is such a multifaceted issue, Eve Darian Smith and Philip McCarty’s *global transdisciplinary framework* is implicitly and explicitly used

¹ Luke Amadi and Fidelis Allen, eds., *Global Food Politics and Approaches to Sustainable Consumption: Emerging Research and Opportunities* (Hershey: IGI Global, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.4018>.

² Darian-Smith and McCarty, *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies*, 24.

throughout this thesis. In accordance with this framework, this research attempts to: 1) explain FNS and FS discourses using existing theories and methodologies to understand the complexities of food insecurity (using the principles and methods of transdisciplinary scholarship, e.g., decentering, different forms of triangulation, etc.), 2) explore the dimension between food insecurity, discursive narratives, and food policy (e.g. make connections at the historical, temporal, and spatial levels of food politics), and 3) describe how actors are shaping, performing, and being influenced by these narratives in food policy in response to food insecurity (and more precisely, while using the history of Salvadoran food politics and policy as a point of connecting the global with the local).

Overview

Certain sub issues, namely how to best approach the lack of access to food and achieve food security in the global *food system*, have arose and are debated by a multitude of perspectives.³ In Chapter 2, both non-academic and academic perspectives are mostly divided into either part of the FNS or FS discourse. The literature addressing FNS and FS is composed of work from many scholars of various fields, including sociology, geography, political economy, just to name a few. In addition to these scholarly sources, literature from governmental and non-governmental actors were used, e.g., multilateral institutions (FAO, UN), internationally recognized grassroots and civil society actors (LVC, FIAN).

Chapter 3 presents the case methodology used and discusses the benefits, limitations and potential biases in the research, before shifting to a discussion around policymaking and implementation in El Salvador in Chapter 4. This is because when looking at policy in the food system, perspectives become less abstract, providing a more narrowed outlook on the “local-global continuum” of the “dynamic and multidimensional interplay” on the issue of food insecurity.⁴ Using a combination of theories and methodological approaches addressed in the previous chapter, the aim in this chapter is to link a historical dimension of neoliberal food policy in the global food system to the

³ Amadi and Allen, iii; Hannah Wittman, “Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?,” *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 2 (2011): 87–105, <https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2011.020106>; Devon Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review,” *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 5, no. September (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.686492>; Lucy Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses,” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4, no. 2 (2014): 168–81, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820614537161>.

⁴ Darian-Smith and McCarty, *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies*, 12.

nation-state of El Salvador. Additionally, a postcolonial critique on the historical food political background is discussed. Furthermore, context on the most current Salvadoran governmental food policy is provided, as it demonstrates use of and is informed by FNS and FS principles.

The contextual overview of El Salvador food politics and policy provided in the last chapter is used as a bridge for reintegrating the local/national/regional levels with the global context in Chapter 5. Two subthemes—the right to food and agroecology—are highlighted. Although the analysis on El Salvador’s food political history and current policy is supposed to focus on the use of FNS and FS to construct its own narrative on how best to approach food insecurity, these two subthemes are also worth mentioning as they can be situated on the wider arena of global food politics and policy. Ultimately, rights-based and agroecological perspectives and approaches, often rooted in FS principles, emerge at the forefront for ensuring food security and access to food. The appearance of these perspectives is not only found in the policies of El Salvador but also in the wider region of Latin America. Lastly, Chapter 6 recounts and connects the premise of the research and emerging critiques and perspectives to the global issue of food insecurity.

Chapter 2: Research Design

Food and Nutrition Security vs. Food Sovereignty in Global Policy

Food and nutrition security (FNS) and *food sovereignty* (FS) discourses are fixed to their particular political, environmental, social, and economic histories at varying food political scales; multilateral, civil society, and grassroots actors create discursive narratives according to relevant geographical and historical context, and are apparent in the political economy of development and underdevelopment.⁵ For the purposes of this chapter, various literary sources were compiled in order to provide a comprehensive background on the subject of FS and FNS. These sources—ranging from academic scholars in different disciplinary fields to non-academic, governmental and non-governmental actors—focus on the global, national/regional, and local actors’ understandings of FS and FNS as concepts.

Additionally, the theoretical perspectives of said actors and prominent scholars in the field of food politics are discussed, specifically from the time of the 1940s/50s up until today. Along with providing context on the FNS and FS discursive narratives on a global level, a global framework requires analysis of the interconnections and engagement in the “holistic, transgressive, and interdependent qualities of global issues.”⁶ By highlighting important historical definitions of FNS and FS coined by different actors, discursive histories were also revealed as not only forming independently from one another, but also converging. Discussion on the divergences and convergences are briefly mentioned and further discussed in later chapters. Once again, it is important to establish that the discursive narratives below are summarized in such a way to inform the audience of how FNS and FS came to be.

⁵ Lucy Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses,” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4, no. 2 (2014): 168–81, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820614537161>, 170.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

Food and Nutrition Security

The most commonly used and widely accepted definition as a response to food insecurity is from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Stated at the World Food Summit of 1996, *food security*'s "multidimensional nature" was articulated as:

*... when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences in order to lead a healthy and active life.*⁷

However, how did food security become interchangeable with *food and nutrition security*? To understand the concept of FNS, one must first investigate the relevant epistemological changes to the concept. These changes coincide with the socio-political challenges and practices of the time and are associated with various other elements such as poverty reduction, food production and availability. For example, Georg Bokeloh et al. argues the history of FNS as a concept has evolved through a sequence of definitions and paradigms stretching over a 50-year span. Stemming from the United Nations (UN) Conference on Food and Agriculture in Hot Springs, Virginia in 1943, the concept of "a secure, adequate and suitable supply of food for everyone" was internationally accepted; as a result, bilateral agencies from various donor countries were created in the 1950s and commenced the selling of their agricultural surplus commodities overseas.⁸ It was not until the 1960s that food aid was acknowledged as a hinderance to countries' ability to self-develop and be self-sufficient.⁹ The introduction of "food for development" as a concept was therefore institutionalized and utilized by organizations. Of these organizations, the World Food Programme (WFP) was proposed as the first multilateral food aid program in 1961; today it is known as the food-assistance brand of the UN, with a focus on combating hunger and food insecurity.

This concept then reformulated in the mid- 1970s, when the World Food Conference of 1974 defined "food security" in relation to food supply:

⁷ Food and Agricultural Organization, "Policy Brief: Food Security," *FAO Agriculture and Development Economics Division (ESA)*, vol. 43, 2006, 1; Gustavo Gordillo and Jeronimo Obed Mendez, "Food Security and Sovereignty," 2013, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ax736e.pdf>, iv.

⁸ Georg Bokeloh, Maria Gerster-Bentaya, and Lioba Weingaertner, "Achieving Food and Nutrition Security: Actions to Meet the Global Change, A Training Course Reader," *InWEnt- Internationale Weiterbildung GGmbH*, vol. Gerage (Feldafing, 2010), 23.

⁹ Ibid.

Availability at all times of adequate world food supplies of basic food stuffs to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption and to offset fluctuations in production and prices.

This marked the first ever reference to food security as a proper term in global politics.¹⁰ In essence, it applied not only to those nation-states at a national level, but also at an international level, especially as the world was recovering from a food crisis in the early 1970s due to a shortage in the world grain market. The FAO then emerged in 1983 with a targeted analysis on access to food, influencing a change in definition based on the inequality between the demand and supply chain within the food security system. “Food security” was then defined as:

*Ensuring that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to the basic food that they need.*¹¹

Because of better coordination among organizations and agencies, in addition to a series of new agricultural advancements in technology and farming methods (known as the Green Revolution), there was an increase in food production and a shift in understanding of FNS; the 1983 definition (based on an analysis of the food situation) was further revised to include the individual and household level, as well as the regional and national levels of aggregation.¹² Other definitions proposed by various organizations at the time were also emerging, in addition to being analyzed and theorized by researchers of and experts on the topic. One such definition often referred to was proposed by the World Bank (WB) in 1986 in a report on poverty and hunger. This definition focused on the elaboration of food insecurity as either chronic or transitory, and is best summed up as the “secure access at all times to sufficient food for a healthy life.”¹³

¹⁰ Food and Agricultural Organization, 1.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Food and Agricultural Organization; Bokeloh, Gerster-Bentaya, and Weingaertner, “Achieving Food and Nutrition Security: Actions to Meet the Global Change, A Training Course Reader.”

¹³ Food and Agricultural Organization, “Policy Brief: Food Security”, 1.

Finally, returning to the widely cited definition from the World Food Summit of 1996, the definition of food security addresses four “pillars” of food security:

1. *Availability: Sufficient food supply of appropriate quality.*
2. *Access: Adequate resources (including infrastructure and economic resources) to actually acquire appropriate and nutritious foods (i.e., the presence and functioning of appropriate entitlements).*
3. *Utilization: The ability to actually consume and benefit from an adequate diet, which is strongly affected by overall health status, clean water, appropriate sanitation, and health care (i.e., nonfood inputs in food security).*
4. *Stability: Consistency in access to adequate, nutritious food and nonfood resources—in other words, the avoidance of or resilience to natural, financial, or social shocks as well as stability in food security throughout seasonal or gradual changes.*¹⁴

These pillars highlight the dimensions for understanding food security. However, critiques on the etymology of food security surfaced; in some manner, a focus on nutrition i.e., aspects of caring practices and health services and healthy environments became necessary.¹⁵ Thus, the gradual implementation of nutrition as a key factor in defining FNS evolved over time. “Nutrition security”, in essence, refers to the adequate nutritional status (i.e., protein, energy, vitamins, minerals) for all household members at all times; this essentially encompasses more elements than the term food security.¹⁶ While food security is still a term widely used today, FNS includes the importance of both food security and nutrition security, as food insecurity and malnutrition are seen as threats to be combated in food politics. Despite the apparent overlap, food security is merely a necessary precondition for—rather than congruent with—nutrition security.¹⁷

¹⁴ Sasmpson et al., 3; Food and Agricultural Organization, “Policy Brief: Food Security.”, 1.

¹⁵ Bokeloh, Gerster-Bentaya, and Weingaertner, “Achieving Food and Nutrition Security: Actions to Meet the Global Change, A Training Course Reader.”, 25.

¹⁶ Bokeloh, Gerster-Bentaya, and Weingaertner.

¹⁷ Devon Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review,” *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 5, no. September (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.686492>, 3.

Food Sovereignty

The concept of *food sovereignty* (FS) was first introduced by the transnational social movement *La Via Campesina* (LVC) in 1996. The seven principles of LVC's 1996 declaration provide a basis for understanding the concept of FS:

*... food is a basic human right, (2) land reform must give ownership and control to those who work it and return territories to indigenous peoples, (3) food sovereignty is the sustainable care and use of land, water, and seeds in order to preserve biodiversity, (4) the basis of food sovereignty is farming people's right to freely use and protect genetic resources they have developed... (5) national agricultural policies must prioritize production for domestic consumptions and food self-sufficiency, (6) multilateral institutions and financial speculation undermine food sovereignty... and (7) food must not be used as a weapon.*¹⁸

Mostly credited to this movement, different scholars point to its conceptualization as the first to address the concerns of grassroots and civil society actors on how best to obtain food security.¹⁹ Also seen as a critique of the global food system at the time, other major players in the global policy arena brought attention to FS. Some events coincided with the World Food Summit in 1996 and 2002 and include a counter-summit known as the NGO/CSO Forum on Food Sovereignty.²⁰ Arguably another notable conference in which actors from grassroots social movements, non-governmental/civil society organizations (NGOs/CSOs), and multilateral organizations participated in was the 2007 Nyéléni conference in Sélingué, Mali. At this conference, the various entities were brought together to shape a common global agenda so as to realize FS.²¹

¹⁸ Jarosz, "Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses", 173.

¹⁹ Scott Y. Lin, "The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 30, no. 5 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-017-9694-3>, 670; Hannah Wittman, "Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?," *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 2 (2011): 87–105, <https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2011.020106>, 87; Jeffrey Ayres and Michael J. Bosia, "Beyond Global Summitry: Food Sovereignty as Localized Resistance to Globalization," *Globalizations* 8, no. 1 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2011.544203>, 48.

²⁰ Hans Morten Haugen, "Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?," *Nordic Journal of International Law* 78, no. 3 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1163/090273509X12448190941048>, 264; Wittman, "Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?", 88; Ayres and Bosia, "Beyond Global Summitry: Food Sovereignty as Localized Resistance to Globalization", 48.

²¹ Nyéléni, "Nyéléni 2007 Forum for Food Sovereignty," *Nyéléni 2007 Forum for Food Sovereignty*, 2007, 1-76, 6.

Despite historically varying in interpretation, it is largely accepted as a concept defined by grassroots and NGO/CSO efforts. This is because no inter-governmental forum has agreed upon how to interpret the concept.²² As previously discussed, LVC has seven principles: a focus on food as a basic human right, the need for agrarian reform, protection of natural resources, reorganization of food trade to support local food production, reducing multinational concentration of power, fostering peace, and increasing democratic control of the food system.²³ LVC quite literally interprets FS as a direct response to FNS, with the former being a better approach towards food at the local, national, and international levels. When focusing on FS as interpreted through NGO and CSOs, some of their approaches critique the food security model of the 1996 World Food Summit:

*We propose a new model for achieving food security that calls into question many of the current assumptions, policies and practices. The model we propose is based on decentralization, answering to the challenges of the current model based on the concentration of wealth and power that now threatens global food security, cultural diversity and the very ecosystems that sustain life on the planet.*²⁴

Additionally, the same NGO/CSO actors from the counter-summit presented three new topics to discuss in preparation for the World Food Summit of 2002:

- (2) *We need a rights-based approach to hunger and malnutrition issues. The aim should be to place the right to adequate food at the center of any activity for the implementation of the WFS objectives by holding states accountable and by addressing the responsibilities of non-state actors. (2) Subsidized exports, artificially low prices, and WTO-legalized dumping of food are characteristics of the current agricultural trade model. This has a negative impact on traditional family farming and indigenous communities. (3) The current model of industrial agriculture, intensive animal husbandry methods and*

²² Haugen, “Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?”, 264.

²³ La Via Campesina, “Food Sovereignty Now! A Guide to Food Sovereignty,” *European Coordination Via Campesina*, 2018, 1–3; Haugen, “Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?”, 264.

²⁴ Gordillo and Obed Mendez, “Food Security and Sovereignty”, 3.

*overfishing are destroying traditional farming and fishing patterns, and the variety of ecosystems that sustain the planet's production. Agroecological models should become the dominant production model to help sustain the cultural and biological diversity of the planet, as well as create a sustainable use of terrestrial and marine ecosystems.*²⁵

Other similar forums, such as the Nyéléni conference, conceptualize FS as a right. This is particularly interesting due to the nature of the participants, which included grassroots and NGO/CSO actors but also some governmental actors. FS was defined in the Forum as:

*.. the right to food security— the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through socially just and ecologically sensitive methods. It entails peoples' right to participate in decision making and define their own food, agriculture, livestock and fisheries systems.*²⁶

In addition to viewing FS as a right, this interpretation seemingly correlates with the concept of the right to food (discussed later in this chapter).

The Food and Nutrition Security Discourse

The global discourse of FNS, mainly upheld by actors at the multilateral and governmental levels, emerged through the establishment of neoliberal globalization policies and as a response to the global food and price crises.²⁷ At that time, actors at the global and regional level needed to find solutions for how to develop a secure global food system on the premise of good governance. *Food systems*, in essence, focus on a broad range of actors and their “interlinked value-adding activities”; these activities can be “the production, aggregation, processing, distribution, consumption and disposal of food product” originating from “agriculture, forestry or fisheries” and the wider parts of the “economic, societal and natural environments” to which they belong.²⁸ Publications that highlighted food systems also highlighted the importance of *good governance* at both the

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Nyéléni, “Nyéléni 2007 Forum Food Sovereignty”, 13.

²⁷ Jarosz.

²⁸ FAO, “Sustainable Food Systems - Concept and Framework,” *Fao*, 2018, 1–8, <http://www.fao.org/3/ca2079en/CA2079EN.pdf>.

multilateral and national levels.²⁹ According to the UN, good governance is made up of 8 major characteristics: participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and law-abiding. Some scholars point out that good governance is premised “upon increasing local production triggered by investments in productivist agriculture at the international and national levels.”³⁰

The historic use of the term FNS by institutions such as the FAO and WB developed over time in response to critical junctures in global food politics; these institutions started to create policy addressing the need for FNS. As argued by Marissa L. Markowitz, these types of policy implementations were responsible for creating the parameters within the food system, especially when it came to food security.³¹ For example, because of the 1974 food crisis, there was a shift in how food insecurity was dealt with. As such, the problem of hunger was seen not only as a political issue, but as a technical issue to be resolved by experts. For example, the FAO identified insufficient production as the preeminent threat to FNS, thus incorporating food production into the FNS discourse.³² From understanding food insecurity as a production problem due to the world food crisis in the early 70s, FNS evolved to consider other elements for a functional global food system. Another aspect of the FNS discourse is the use of Amartya Sen and his essay on famine and poverty. Cited in a 2006 policy brief by the FAO, Sen and his theory of famine are viewed as a complementing factor for the FNS discourse of the 1980s; Sen’s theory denotes the effect of “personal entitlements” on food access.³³ This is where a change in tone can be seen when considering how to understand FNS. From understanding FNS as a production problem due to a food crisis in the 70s, the concept (and therefore the discourse) evolves to include equality as a principle for obtaining food. At the time, the rising prices of wheat and disastrous harvests led to the belief that production needed to increase, food reserves needed to be established, and food

²⁹ Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses”, 172.

³⁰ Food and Agricultural Organization, “State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012” (Rome, 2012) and Robert Paarlberg, *Governance and Food Security in an Age of Globalization. Food, Agriculture and the Environment., Discussion Paper No.36. Int. Food Policy Res. Inst., Washington DC., 2002* in Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses”, 172.

³¹ Marissa L. Markowitz, “Agriculture and the Food System: A Short History and Country Case Study in Mongolia,” *Capstone Collection* (University of Leicester, 2013).

³² Lin, “The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory”, 673.

³³ Amartya Sen, “Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation.,” *Oxford University Press*, 1981 in Food and Agricultural Organization, “Policy Brief: Food Security.”

surpluses needed to be transferred to areas with a food deficit.³⁴ When considering the global outlook on how the FNS discourse was to be achieved during this time, institutions and organizations hinged on the belief that access to food was affected by many forms of food insecurity (i.e., relating to Sen's theory of chronic and transitory poverty).

In the 80s, the FAO and other multilateral agencies such as the WB began focusing on policies to equalize the access to food. Referring to Lucy Jarosz, these policy-based institutions conceptualized FNS by emphasizing it as an individual or a group's ability to produce or purchase food.³⁵ The insights provided by these reports and documents describing FNS were very influential during that time period. Aside from the FAO focusing on the access to food in terms of equal opportunity, the WB and its 1986 report *Poverty and Hunger* conceptualized FNS even further. Jarosz cites the importance of this report due to the WB's interpretation of FNS; by WB's standards, FNS is inherently a part of mainstream development issues because of how they should be addressed.³⁶ Neoliberal practices such as structural adjustment programs, integration into markets, and etc., were believed to be integral in combating development issues, and also, FNS discursive practices. Jarosz goes on to redefine what is meant by the WB's interpretation of FNS; it is a lack of individual purchasing power "so that adequate personal income, markets, and the workings of the globalized food system ensure food security rather than state-led entitlements or other arenas of exchange or entitlements."³⁷ Following Jarosz's redefinition, an argument can be made that actors included FNS as an element for producing policies as a development strategy (i.e. to engage in agricultural technology and practices that promote productivity). During this time the discourse around FNS clearly included strategies for an agro-technologically advanced and productive food system.

However, the global food political agenda and its understanding of food insecurity proved to be one-dimensional. Relying on the idea of power imbalances, Lisa C. Smith and Lawrence Haddad argue the discourse of FNS does not clearly indicate ways to address 'critical aspects of human empowerment, recognition of rights, and reinforcement of community capacities... to make

³⁴ Jarosz, "Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses", 171.

³⁵ Jarosz, 171.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ World Bank: Issues and Options for Food Security, "Poverty and Hunger" (Washington D.C., 1986) in Jarosz, "Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses", 171.

progress in achieving FNS outcomes.’³⁸ This excerpt from Smith and Haddad delineates how there are existing power imbalances in the discourse, while also being unclear in how to address these imbalances. Jennifer Clapp and Marc J. Cohen’s analysis of global food crises points to how the “fragmented” and “incoherent” global governance of food and agriculture led to an equally fragmented global food system, inevitably resulting in a volatile global food crisis in 2008.³⁹ According to Cohen and Clapp, “the dynamics of global and regional food and grain prices” became more unstable due to the “financialization and speculation surrounding food and farmland.” The same policies developed by multilateral institutions in the mid to early 90s were in fact detrimental, and this was offset by the dwindling investment in agriculture since the 1980s.⁴⁰ Thus, problems hindering the ability for a functional global food system were evident, despite attempts by global actors to enact FNS-based policies. Markowitz argues that the World Trade Organization, WB, and International Monetary Fund (IMF), under the guise of “neoliberal policies” in the 80s and early 90s, were responsible for calling for the abolishment of small-scale farms (as they were a development hinderance) and the enforcement of state-backed programs (i.e. major cuts on public agriculture subsidies from which farmers depended upon). This left marginalized small-scale and rural farmers debt-ridden and dependent on new systems of food production.⁴¹ These problems, having affected many local and regional actors such as agrarian farmers and rural peasants, eventually gave rise to new perspectives that strayed away from traditional FNS policies.

Another defining element in the FNS discourse is the focus on food as an inherent right. The *right to food* is seen by the discourse as an obligation that state governments pertain to in order to actualize human rights. This concept was first established in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and then incorporated into the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESR).⁴² The ICESR, in particular, has been used as a reference guide for how to interpret the right to food. Though vaguely worded, these provisions, specifically found in Article 11 and

³⁸ “Reducing Child Undernutrition: Past Drivers and Priorities for the Post-MDG Era,” *World Development* 68, no. 1 (2015): 180–204, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.11.014> in Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review”, 3.

³⁹ Jennifer Clapp and Marc J. Cohen, *The Food Crisis and Global Governance, The Global Food Crisis* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2009).

⁴⁰ Ibid, 5.

⁴¹ Markowitz, “Agriculture and the Food System: A Short History and Country Case Study in Mongolia,” 12-13.

⁴² Gordillo and Obed Mendez, “Food Security and Sovereignty”, 4.

12, refer to this right as an obligation.⁴³ Article 11 addresses the everyone's right to an adequate standard of living, including food and the right to be free from hunger. In Article 12, it addresses the right of everyone to enjoy the highest standard of physical and mental health. Within this particular document, Hans Morten Haugen suggests it is obvious to hold member states responsible for ensuring individuals' access to food, and for strengthening this access to resources. When people are unable to realize this on their own, member states are not only obliged to provide this right directly through food but also through promoting self-reliance and food security.⁴⁴ Through this example the legal dimension of the right to food becomes an evident part of the discussion; how it converges with both the FNS and FS discourse narratives is briefly seen in the policy document analysis and is identified as a new perspective in Chapter 5.

The Food Sovereignty Discourse

As a concept within the *food sovereignty movement* (FSM), the discourse of FS is interpreted by the wide variety of civil society and grassroots actors as involving many facets including but not limited to the recognition of food as a right (seen in public discussions and conferences) and the adoption of agroecological approaches and alternative agrarian systems as they grow and develop. In turn, the discourse is made up of very influential theory-based propositions by the FSM, concerning local, regional, and global agrarian food politics. For example, LVA's conference in Tlaxcala is where an international coalition of peasant, farmer, rural women's, and indigenous people's movements met with the intent to discuss their similar concerns surrounding the impact of an increasingly globalized agrarian food system on their livelihoods, communities, and ecologies.⁴⁵ As a response to FNS, the LVC and many other movements discuss varying versions of FS. First "built upon" the foundations of national sovereignty in consideration of agriculture, LVC views the "liberalization of trade and its economic policies of agricultural adjustment" as the reason for the destruction of "local productive capacities and rural societies."⁴⁶

Other literature explaining the discursive history of FS notes how specific elements, through a Marxist, political economic lens, led to its creation. According to Christopher Bacon, one way in

⁴³ Haugen, "Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?", 265.

⁴⁴ Sampson et al., "Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review", 3.

⁴⁵ Wittman, "Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?", 88.

⁴⁶ La Via Campesina, "II International Conference Of The Via Campesina Tlaxcala, Mexico, April 18-21," La Via Campesina, 1996, <https://viacampesina.org/en/ii-international-conference-of-the-via-campesina-tlaxcala-mexico-april-18-21/>.

which FS can be analyzed is by focusing on the “historic political economic processes” used to “shape the social spaces of vulnerability” in relation to hunger; these spaces change over time as these historic processes influence local institutions that “shape household access to land, water, markets and credit.”⁴⁷ Applying such a lens to the global food crisis of the early 70s reveals the ways in which an outlook on food insecurity shifted. This is important because applying a critical lens to this historic shift reveals the problematic fissures of the FNS discourse. More precisely, Jarosz states that historical geographers can point out how “the contradictions of capitalist development and its articulations with diverse forms of commodity production” are essential to explaining and understanding the 1970s.⁴⁸ These capitalist dimensions can therefore be explained as the set of the neoliberal policies of the time, following the regional structures produced through this neoliberal, FNS discourse. Contradictory to the FS narratives previously discussed in this chapter, these structures were determined to be a barrier and contributed to the destruction of self-sufficient local and regional food systems. This is most evident in the FSM’s call for a global food governance structure that supports democratic standards for the development of self-sufficient local/regional entities.

Referring to the seven principles, LVC considers small farmers and peasants, including their role in the development of sustainable agrarian local and national systems, as essential. As some scholars point out, LVC’s conceptualization of FS and its declaration were meant to be introduced as an “agrarian citizenship”; local and regional communities would be better suited to solve “issues of long-term ecological unsustainability” through the cultivation of food crops within their localities rather than a reliance on the exportation of crops.⁴⁹ This interpretation is a direct critique of the neoliberal policies enacted by actors of the FNS discourse of the time. One scholar, Naomi Millner, goes so far as to theorize the emergence of FS as postcolonial critique of the global food system. She and other scholars describe the organization of LVC as an experiment in developing postcolonial “knowledge practices”; as part of the FSM, forums of dialogic knowledge (such as

⁴⁷ Christopher M. Bacon, “Food Sovereignty, Food Security and Fair Trade: The Case of an Influential Nicaraguan Smallholder Cooperative,” *Third World Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1002991>, 474.

⁴⁸ Ben Wisner, Den Weiner, and Phil O’Keefe, “Hunger: A Polemic Review,” *Antipode* 14, no. 3 (1982): 1–16 in Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses.”

⁴⁹ Hannah Wittman, “Reworking the Metabolic Rift: La Via Campesina, Agrarian Citizenship, and Food Sovereignty,” *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36, no. 4 (2009) in Naomi Millner, “Food Sovereignty, Permaculture and the Postcolonial Politics of Knowledge in El Salvador,” in *Postcolonialism, Indigeneity and Struggles for Food Sovereignty: Alternative Food Networks in Subaltern Spaces*, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686769>, 84-85.

LVC's 1996 conference) center on various forms of traditional knowledge and skill, "with full recognition of the non-compatibility of these systems to each other."⁵⁰ In this regard, these knowledge practices are performed by specialized actors at the regional and local level, in accordance with their particular contexts. These may, for example, present as agroecological practices found deeply rooted within local/national agrarian food systems. Agroecological scientific methods are predicated on the traditional agrarian techniques of rural indigenous and peasant farmers (these techniques in different regions of Latin America are further discussed in Chapter 5).

Other scholars discuss different theories as a way to navigate different FS discursive accounts. For example, the concept of *food regime*, first popularized by Harriet Friedmann and Philip McMichael and based in Marxist ideology, theorized the organization of the global food system into three time periods. As an organizational concept, food regime theory recognizes "three similar historical periods in international agricultural development"; these periods are pre-World War I, from the 1940s to the 1970s, and from the 1980s to the present.⁵¹ Since then, there have been many interpretations and reinventions of the food regime theory. Hannah Wittman discusses how the idea of FS has been reincorporated into the familiar framework of a food regime, introducing new interpretations used by scholars to understand the popularity of FS and the FSM. For instance, by using a food regime approach, the theoretical perspective lends itself to detailing how FS, albeit an unconsolidated food regime, can be seen as a "new alternative paradigm"; this paradigm then creates new economic, environmental and equity-related approaches to "agricultural production, consumption, and trade."⁵² For example, the following table presents FS as an "alternative food regime", comparing the food sovereign model and the corporate/neoliberal food regime paradigm:

⁵⁰ Peter M. Rosset and Maria E. Martínez-Torres, "La Via Campesina: The Birth and Evolution of a Transnational Social Movement," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): in Millner, "Food Sovereignty, Permaculture and the Postcolonial Politics of Knowledge in El Salvador", 85; Michel P. Pimbert, *Transforming Knowledge and Ways of Knowing for Food Sovereignty* (London: IIED Press, 2006).

⁵¹ Peter Atkins and Ian Bowler, "Food Regimes as an Organizing Concept," in *Food in Society: Economy, Culture, Geography*, vol. 4, 2001, 1;

⁵² Wittman, "Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?", 90.

	Corporate/Neoliberal Food Regime	Food Sovereignty Regime
Feeding the World	Food access/security through intensive production based on principle of comparative advantage and distributed through market mechanisms.	Food access/security through prioritizing local agricultural production and protecting local markets from dumping/subsidized food imports.
Role of Agriculture in Advancing National Development	Increase positive trade balances through increased exports of agricultural commodities. Economically successful communities will invest in infrastructure to improve community well-being (e.g., hospitals, schools).	Sustainable agriculture as part of a diversified economy will improve national well-being through improving food security and ensuring a healthy environment. Fair trade will spur economic growth.
Role of Technology in Advancing Agricultural Development	Increases in productivity come through scientific innovation, adoption of technology, and modern management. Problem solving based on a compartmentalized approach to problems of soil fertility, disease, pest infestation, etc.	Farmers must become efficient and competitive through diversifying production, using alternative technologies, and minimizing use of external inputs. Problem solving is based on a holistic approach to adoption of appropriate technology, including agroecology.
Environmental Stewardship	Protected areas, national parks, and environmental regulations are sufficient, as long as they do not harm the potential for the expansion of agricultural export crops.	Agriculture and environmental policy cannot be separated; sustainable agriculture protects biodiversity and leaves space for conservation areas.

*Table 1: Food Sovereignty: An Emerging Alternative Food Regime?*⁵³

The FS discourse however, does not remain uncriticized. Kees Jansen summarizes recent critiques on not only the FS framework but also the different dimensions associated with the framework. Drawing on a few authors, Jansen heeds attention to the narratives held by the FSM as one-sided; the adoption of agroecological techniques as an alternative to industrialized agrarian food systems as ‘misplaced optimism’; and the overall labeling of poor rural farmers as ‘peasants’ and ‘repeasantization’ as one-dimensional and vice versa.⁵⁴

⁵³ Wittman, 91.

⁵⁴ Kees Jansen, “The Debate on Food Sovereignty Theory: Agrarian Capitalism, Dispossession and Agroecology,” *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2015, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.945166>.

Chapter 3: Case Methodology

A Case for the “Global-Local Continuum”

It is important to note that by focusing on policymaking and how certain actors develop, model, and/or implement strategies for ensuring food security, one can start to understand the effects these policies have on a particular *food system*. To recapitulate, a food system focuses on a broad range of actors and their “interlinked value-adding activities”; these activities can be “the production, aggregation, processing, distribution, consumption and disposal of food products” originating from “agriculture, forestry or fisheries” and the wider parts of the “economic, societal and natural environments” to which they belong.⁵⁵ In the broader context of global food politics, food systems have been largely influenced by governance and policy implementation. This is where an analysis of the status of food security through the examination of policies in developing countries is crucial.⁵⁶ Using another theory, *food regimes*, also has its benefits. Through a combination of Friedmann, McMichael, and Wittman’s work on food regime theory, the historical elements of food security and politics can be organized in such a way as to help recontextualize food policy on a global, regional/national, and local scale. Therefore, El Salvador’s food political history and recent governmental policy is examined in the next chapter in order to further contextualize national food policy.

Additionally, the methodologies used in the construction of the research are discussed, namely: *political economic analysis* (PEA) (i.e., to examine Salvadoran politics during the rise of neoliberalism), *critical policy discourse analysis* (CPDA) and *document analysis* (i.e., to examine policies for a national food system in CONASAN’s National Plan). The next section explains the benefits and limitations of each method when analyzing policy, and more specifically when centered on the issue of food insecurity and access to food.

⁵⁵ FAO, “Sustainable Food Systems - Concept and Framework.”

⁵⁶ Marissa L. Markowitz, “Agriculture and the Food System: A Short History and Country Case Study in Mongolia,” *Capstone Collection*, 2013, 12.

Political Economy Analysis

Drawing from the definitions of political economy, political economy analysis (PEA) is the concern “with the interaction of political and economic process within a society”; this entails a focus on “the distribution of power and wealth [of] different groups and individuals”, as well as the “processes that create, sustain, and transform these relationships overtime.”⁵⁷ Simply put, in addition to recognizing the power relations between actors, PEA aims to understand how political actors influence the economy. Furthermore, it acknowledges that these interactions “run both ways” and PEA maintains interest in both.⁵⁸ PEA has links to the theories and practices of notable 18th and 19th century political theorists including Adam Smith and Karl Marx. The origins of PEA as a long-standing method of practice can be traced to political science, demonstrated by the likes of Elinor Ostrom and her focus on the relationship between people and ecosystems.⁵⁹ However, the rise of PEA can also be attributed to the study of development. For example, the Department for International Development (DFID), an institution based in the United Kingdom, has been successful in using PEA.⁶⁰ Publications using political economy analysis to understand the relationship between food and public policy are noteworthy; a growing interest in the political economy of food (related to development) directs attention to both the political and institutional factors shaping the impact of public policy.⁶¹

The characteristics of PEA ultimately focus on power dynamics revealed through the beneficiaries and losers of a particular policy. As stated by SOAS University of London, focusing on these balances and imbalances can provide “important clues as to which groups or individuals support the continuation of the policy” in addition to “which groups might be drawn into a coalition seeking to change it.”⁶² PEA is seen uses tools of an economic nature for analyzing political development. In this regard,

⁵⁷ Sarah Collinson, “Power, Livelihoods and Conflict: Case Studies in Political Economy Analysis for Humanitarian Action,” *HPG Report*, 2003, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003205845-1>, 10.

⁵⁸ “2.1 Defining Characteristics of Political Economy Analysis,” SOAS University of London, n.d., https://www.soas.ac.uk/cedep-demos/000_P527_PEPP_K3736-Demo/unit1/page_13.htm#.

⁵⁹ Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action, Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511807763>.

⁶⁰ Alan Whaites, “The Beginner’s Guide to Political Economy Analysis (PEA),” 2017, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/nsgi-publishes-political-economy-analysis-beginners-guide>.

⁶¹ Michael R. Reich and Yarlini Balarajan, “Political Economy Analysis for Food and Nutrition Security,” *HNP Discussion Paper*, 2012, http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSPContentServer/WDSP/IB/2013/04/24/000442464_20130424145444/Rended/PDF/769210WP0Polit00Box374391B00PUBLIC0.pdf, 5.

⁶² “2.1 Defining Characteristics of Political Economy Analysis.”

Michael Reich and Yarlini Balarajan point out the different multilateral institutions using political economy as a tool. They compare the definitions of the DFID, WB, and the OECD Development Assistance Committee, noting the overarching theme of development studies; yet, they also describe the need for “more explicit recognition of the role of politics and political analysis in development” in order to improve the “effectiveness of the development process.”⁶³ DFID notes that political behavior is shaped by interests, ideas, and institutions and that PEA uses tools to analyze these behaviors on a country/macro-level, sector-level, or in a problem-driven analysis.⁶⁴ For the purpose of this thesis, a problem-driven analysis is conducted to understand the issues of access to food, as well as how different actors in the Salvadoran policy arena react to these issues.

Critical Policy Discourse Analysis

Harkening back to the discursive traditions influenced by Michel Foucault’s concepts of knowledge and power, this thesis uses a newly formed discourse analysis based in Critical Policy Studies (CPS). Evolving from various social theories, there are many existing forms of discourse analysis used in the social scientific disciplines.⁶⁵ In critical policy discourse analysis (CPDA), there is a “theoretical and methodological synergy” between critical discourse analysis (CDA) and CPS.⁶⁶ CDA, first introduced by Norman Fairclough in 1995, provides different opportunities to conduct analysis. The CDA model is made up of three inter-related process of analysis linked to three inter-related dimensions of discourse; the three dimensions are:

- 1) *the object of analysis (including verbal, visual or verbal and visual texts).*
- 2) *The processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/ speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects.*

⁶³ Erika Boak, “Education in Fragile Situations: A Review of Political Economy and Conflict Analysis Literature and Tools” (Reading, 2011); Alice Poole, “How-To-Notes: Political Economy Assessments at Sector and Project Levels” (Washington, DC, 2011); Anne-Mieke van Breukelen, “drivers of Change: Understanding the Forces for Poverty Reduction” (The Hague, 2007) in Reich and Balarajan, “Political Economy Analysis for Food and Nutrition Security.”

⁶⁴ “2.1 Defining Characteristics of Political Economy Analysis.”

⁶⁵ Sally Hewitt, “Discourse Analysis and Public Policy Research,” *Center for Rural Economy Discussion Paper Series No. 24*, 2009, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62407-5_37.

⁶⁶ Jane Mulderrig, Nicolina Montesano Montessori, and Michael Farrelly, “Introducing Critical Policy Discourse Analysis,” *Critical Policy Discourse Analysis*, no. February (2019): <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788974967.00006>, 1.

3) *The socio-historical conditions which govern these processes.*⁶⁷

Fairclough states different dimensions require different kinds of analysis: text (description), processing (interpretation), and social (explanation).⁶⁸ This is where CPS has been integrated into policy analyses. As a well-established approach to policy research, CPS has a “strong analytical focus on discourse”, in addition to a “rich contextualization of the social settings” where policy is implemented and interpreted.⁶⁹

CDA and CPA as individual analyses work on the assumption that language conceptualizes policy issues in critical ways, simplifying both “the complex terrain of political action” and the “landscape of possibility for government intervention.”⁷⁰ Merging similar CDA and CPA components results in three key approaches used in CPDA: discourse-historical, dialectical-relation, and socio-semantic. Although they may share properties for forming a CPDA, Mulderrig et al. state that these approaches are far more successful in contributing to CPS, best outlined in the table below:

⁶⁷ Hillary Janks, “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool” (University of Witwatersrand, n.d.), <https://www.uv.es/gimenez/Recursos/criticaldiscourse.pdf>; Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London: Longman, 1995).

⁶⁸ Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*.

⁶⁹ Mulderrig, Montessori, and Farrelly, “Introducing Critical Policy Discourse Analysis”, 2.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

	Discourse-historical	Dialectal-relational	Socio-semantic
Origin	Examination of anti-Semitic discourses in the 1986 presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim in Vienna	Lancaster University based in dialectical-relational theory; influenced by critical theory, Marxism, Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics; ties to cultural political economy	The development of a taxonomic model for linguistic and visual modes of communication by Theo Van Leeuwen
Analysis	argumentative, discursive strategies; global content analysis; close textual	social and ideological conditions to discursive practices of normative and explanatory critiques	Social practices in representations of linguistic and visual modes of communication
Importance	historical contextualization, triangulation of data, practical application of results	internalize elements of social practice to offer explanatory critique; suggest a basis for transformation in interdisciplinarity, transdisciplinary engagement with various disciplines	offer categories (e.g. personalization v. functionalism) to bridge gap between linguistic and sociological agency; goes beyond surface-meaning of choice offered by linguistic categories to uncover more implicit aspects of representation
Examples of Usage	right wing discourse and discrimination, ethnographic methods	formalization of social practices (e.g. actions, relations, objects, social subjects and values) in social events based in genres, discourse, styles; development of theoretical and methodological framework for different disciplines	representation of participatory social practices in English-language discourse

Table 2 Critical Policy Discourse Analysis Approaches⁷¹

One of the limitations present in using CPDA is its relative newness to the field of policy research. The bulk of the information reviewed is from a recent publication introducing the concept and

⁷¹ Mulderrig, Montessori, and Farrelly, 9-10.

demonstrating its use in a variety of academic research.⁷² Despite the newness of the concept, CPDA presents as a useful methodological approach founded upon other well-established disciplines and does fit within other transdisciplinary modes of scholarship (e.g. Global studies).

Document Analysis

Document analysis is another method used in this thesis. It is a methodology used for reviewing and evaluating documents such as organizational and institutional reports.⁷³ Once reviewed and examined, the data should be interpreted in order to “elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge.”⁷⁴ It is important to combine document analysis with other forms of qualitative methods. In this thesis, the document analyzed is an institutional report and from the Salvadoran government with a focus on food security and policy. However, this is not the only evidence subjected to analysis. As Glenn Bowen points out, a thematic analysis acts as a “form of pattern recognition”, allowing also for analysis of emerging themes in the data presented.⁷⁵ In the context of this thesis, the data discovered in the Salvadoran policy document meshes with the discursive legacies of FNS and FS. The codes and themes apparent in the specific document (i.e. the National Policy) should then integrate other forms of data discovered by different methods.⁷⁶

However, one limitation of this thesis is the number of documents used for the case methodology. This presents a challenge, as one policy document is examined and must be able to link national discursive narratives of FNS and FS with the global. Therefore, in the context of policy and to obtain the most information possible, the READ approach is used. Dalglish et. al describe the four steps foundational to this approach: 1) preparation of the materials, 2) extraction of data, 3) analyzation of the data, and 4) distillation of the findings. This approach, “in consideration of epistemological and theoretical issues such as the socially constructed nature of documents and their role in modern bureaucracies”, is supposed to capture the most out of documents and “ensure rigour” in document analysis.⁷⁷

⁷² Mulderrig, Montessori, and Farrelly.

⁷³ Glenn A. Bowen, “Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method,” *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 27–40, <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>.

⁷⁴ Anselm Strauss and Juliet M Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. (Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc, 1990) in Bowen, “Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method.”

⁷⁵ Strauss and Corbin, *Basics Qual. Res. Grounded Theory Proced. Tech.*

⁷⁶ Bowen, “Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method.”

⁷⁷ Sarah L. Dalglish, Hina Khalid, and Shannon A. McMahon, “Document Analysis in Health Policy Research: The READ Approach,” *Health Policy and Planning* 35, no. 10 (2020): 1424–31, <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa064>.

Potential Biases

It goes without saying that research always has the potential for certain biases. Researcher biases, such as confirmation bias, can present in different ways. In this thesis, the potential biases stem from the previous knowledge of the said concepts assessed in the research. Not only does the researcher have a personal connection to El Salvador, but also has had exposure to the discursive narratives of the FSM. In order to combat these external elements, the researcher spent time collecting different data in the hopes of presenting an unbiased thesis to the academic community. Focusing on the historical implications of FNS and FS, and their convergences in consideration of their oppositional differences is one element for avoiding said biases. In addition, analyzing the language, practices, and context of a highly publicized, governmental document that promises inclusivity of all actors presents the opportunity for an equitable outlook on the Salvadoran national policy arena.

Another potential bias to be addressed in the formulation of this thesis is the frequent use of Western-based literature. It is the duty of a researcher and a scholar to diversify the means by which they obtain information. While researching the topic of this thesis, the researcher collected data in the form of policy briefings, web page content, working papers, journal articles, etc. Attempts were made to include texts from various scholars of different disciplines, non-governmental/governmental entities and multilateral institutions in both English and Spanish. However, the researcher's academic career is mainly centered on the attendance of institutions located in the Global North. The researcher was challenged in the form of translating texts found exclusively in Spanish and had restricted or almost no access to first account narratives of those most affected by food insecurity.

Chapter 4: Description of the Case

Salvadoran Food Politics

In Latin America, the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s and 1990s gave way to the creation of a food system based on corporate-based, neoliberal practices for securing and maintaining access to food. Explanation for this occurrence in El Salvador requires analyzing the responses from political actors at the state, regional, and local levels of the time. Again, usage of Friedmann and McMichael's theory on food regimes is used as an organizational framework for this history, as is Wittman's own understanding of food politics as neoliberal/corporate. Categorized under the Second Food Regime, the impact of the globally-expanded methods of the Green Revolution in El Salvador are complementary to the rise of postwar neoliberalism, and thus a neoliberal/corporate Third Food Regime. The following section uses a PEA analysis to not only provide insight on a history of Salvadoran and Latin American politics, but also link these regional and national dimensions to understand the neoliberal/corporate food system and the different discursive narratives and perspectives in an effort to address food insecurity.

Second Food Regime: From the Green Revolution to the Civil War

The Green Revolution of the 1940s brought about a series of new agricultural advancements in technology and farming methods. While working in Mexico, American agronomist and Nobel Peace Prize winner Norman Borlaug conducted research to develop disease resistant high-yield varieties of wheat.⁷⁸ Due to the successful incorporation of these new varieties of wheat into Mexican production and the corresponding increased exportation of wheat, these green revolution technologies went on to be practiced by governments around the world. At the same time, this is where these technologies intertwine with the development of a corporate food regime. Because of the increased levels of production and growth of agricultural productivity brought on by the adoption of green revolution technologies in the 60s and 70s, actors favoring a corporate food regime saw this as a successful approach to food insecurity.⁷⁹ On a regional level, the agricultural sector of Latin America also saw dramatic changes through the adoption of green revolution

⁷⁸ Amanda Briney, "'History and Overview of the Green Revolution,'" ThoughtCo., 2020, <https://www.thoughtco.com/green-revolution-overview-1434948>.

⁷⁹ Jody Harris et al., "The Political Economy of Food," *IDS Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (July 31, 2019): 1–160, <https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2019.112>.

technologies. As one of the “most promising” sectors of the region, production became large-scale and export-oriented; as a result, the regional agrarian system, once diverse, started to suffer, also leaving behind rural farmers and peasants in the process.⁸⁰ Through the use of PEA, power imbalances are seemingly apparent in the Latin American regional food system. This is because governmental-political actors across the region were more concerned with addressing food insecurity by implementing measures to increase food productivity, with little to no regard for the impact these measures had on local/rural/peasant societies and the environment. Originally intended to reduce poverty, green revolution approaches failed to do so and instead encouraged the growth of inequalities, resulting in lasting effects still seen in the region.⁸¹ This is also where the emergence of a regional FS regime can be seen, as rural-social political actors started social movements around the region as a reaction to such imbalances, eventually forming the basis of the global, transnational FSM.

So how does the global success of the Green Revolution in the 60s and 70s converge with the rise of neoliberalism in the post-war nation state of El Salvador? As previously mentioned, the region’s relationship with green revolution approaches was not perceived well by political and non-political actors of the agrarian sector. In the case of El Salvador, certain mentalities inherited during the Green Revolution consequently influenced the State to employ an agroexport model of development to increase overall food production. The subsequent social inequalities, paired with the exploitation of the rural poor and a militarized, authoritarian political system that specifically denied these actors from decision-making, resulted in the culmination of a civil war in 1979.⁸² Using a PEA helps in the confirmation of this theory, as does the literature of different scholars. For context, there is research to support the link between violent conflict and food security. Tilman Brück et al. describes three explanations for the food price-conflict: consumer grievances [higher prices create increased economic restraints/ sentiments of (perceived) relative deprivation]; the impact of international food prices at the national level (many fragile and conflict-affected countries tend to be net importers of food); and the breakdown of state authority and legitimacy (when the state fails to provide food security).⁸³ The state of El Salvador during the 70s and 80s

⁸⁰ Walter Pengue, “A Short History of Farming in Latin America,” *Seedling (GRAIN’s Quarterly Magazine)*, no. April (2004): 5–11.

⁸¹ Harris et al., “The Political Economy of Food”, 16.

⁸² Chris van der Borgh, “The Politics of Neoliberalism in Postwar El Salvador,” *International Journal of Political Economy* 30, no. 1 (2000), <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911916.2000.11644005>.

⁸³ Tilman Brück et al., “The Relationship Between Food Security and National Security” (Berlin, 2012), 16.

fits within all three categories of the food price-conflict link. Liisa L. North uses a historical analysis to explain the pathway to the civil war, dating as far back to the liberal revolutions of Central America during the second half of the nineteenth century.⁸⁴ Though this section mainly focuses on the time period from late 50s to the late 70s, a pattern in placing economic success over the social costs is notable in early Salvadoran history (analysis of this part of history under a post-colonial lens and critique will follow in the next chapter).

Returning to the 60s and 70s, El Salvador experienced steady economic growth and urbanization (following the characteristics of the Second Food Regime). On a global level, this Food Regime is best described as the “intensive capitalist extension” through the adoption of new technologies in order to increase turnover and generate better profitability for retailers; additionally, it introduced new actors (e.g. private capitalist companies) focused on maintaining a new industrialized agrarian food system through way of export subsidies or aid.⁸⁵ North explains El Salvador’s economy as having revitalized during the Second World War and, through the modernized policies of the military dictatorship, as going through significant structural economic and socio-political transformation.⁸⁶ However, oligarchic positions and their particular interests in agriculture, alongside the adoption of green revolution technologies that prioritize production and regime, were detrimental to the local and rural communities. In particular, Alexander Segovia claims the most important changes are “the move from and agricultural economy to a service and trade economy...; from rural society to an increasingly urban and transnational society; and from a closed and authoritarian political system to a more democratic system.”⁸⁷ In essence, El Salvador’s adoption of green technologies and focus on production is evidence of an alignment with the Second Food Regime. Acting as a turning point for not only the adoption of post-war neoliberal reforms, the civil war also ties into the shift of a neoliberal/corporate Third Food Regime.

Third Food Regime: The Rise of Neoliberalism and Food Sovereignty

During the intervening time between the 1979 civil war and the peace processes of 1994, two main parties emerged. Chris van de Bourgh identifies the *Alianza Democrática Nacionalista* (ARENA)

⁸⁴ Liisa L. North, “El Salvador: The Historical Roots of the Civil War,” *Studies in Political Economy*, 1982, 59.

⁸⁵ Jurica Kis, “The Historical Development of ‘Food Regimes’ and Their Influence on the World’s Economy” (Munich, 2008).

⁸⁶ North, “El Salvador: The Historical Roots of the Civil War,” 65.

⁸⁷ Alexander Segovia, “The Relationships between Food Security and Violent Conflicts,” *FAO Agricultural Development Economics Working Paper*, 2017, file:///C:/Users/Dr Sarbhan/Downloads/a-i7918e.pdf.

and *Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional* (FMLN) as the main political parties since 1994; consequently, the neoliberal reforms adapted by both parties “affected postwar Salvadoran political culture.”⁸⁸ Segovia states that the war is best characterized as a “traditional armed conflict” and because of its long duration, many facets of food security were affected both nationally, regionally, and locally.⁸⁹ In postwar El Salvador, the relationship between violence and food security remained. Categorized as indirect factors, these were in turn exacerbated by international actors promising to help in the restructuring of a war-torn state. This is where another convergence existed between international actors and national political actors, in addition to the added background of civil war and postwar Salvadoran history merging with the Third Regime. The role of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the WB and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and their conditions for supporting the Salvadoran government were essentially based in the adoption of neoliberal-economic reforms. These reforms proposed in the 80s had vastly different outcomes to those of the 90s: the USAID proposed a nationalization of the banks, and a nationalization of the export of important commodities. These proposals were detailed as “problematic from the start”, as political actors from ARENA were more interested in supporting the “landlord classes”, privatized banks, and “banned the state monopoly on traditional agricultural exports.” Aid provided by WB and IDB in the 90s was also influential in reinforcing similar neoliberal policies, such as “reform of the state, judicial system, and fiscal administration, and investment in social sectors.”⁹⁰

The complex relationship between international assistance and the effects it had on the agrarian sector are shaped by the motivations of ARENA. Segovia makes this point by stating that the interests of the government are what inevitably influenced the trajectory of the agrarian food system and its relationship with food security. These policies were responsible for: the “decrease in lending to the farming sector in general” and specifically the peasant sector due to the privatization of banks; the “drastic reduction in lending” and technical assistance to the sector and “elimination of price floors for basic grains” because of the dismantling of state institutions; the elimination of barriers to trade and a decrease in tariff protections as a result of the liberalization of foreign trade and signing of free trade agreements; and a “macroeconomic policy with a clear

⁸⁸ van der Borgh, “The Politics of Neoliberalism in Postwar El Salvador.”

⁸⁹ Segovia, “The Relationships between Food Security and Violent Conflicts”, 10.

⁹⁰ van der Borgh, “The Politics of Neoliberalism in Postwar El Salvador”, 41.

anti-agricultural and anti-export bias.”⁹¹ There are other factors indirectly influencing El Salvador to consider, including but not limited to climate change and rises in international food prices, however these factors go beyond the scope of this paper despite their increasing relevance. On a crucial note however, the presence and influence of El Salvador’s political actors during this period are best summed up as “weak and non-existent” in regions where it is most important and as amplifiers of “the negative effects of conflict and violence” because their political motivations and discourses were mainly centered on maintaining power.⁹² However, like in other Latin American countries, rural social movements were formed as an act of resistance to governmental policies that did not serve the interests of the people. In El Salvador, these movements are not first recognized as part of the FSM, but rather as general struggles against long-lasting military-controlled governments. The political party of FMLN was first formed by a troubled coalition of five factions of a political movement against a repressive military rule before it became a political contender.⁹³ However, the motivations of those in the armed resistance can be linked with those of the FSM movement. Millner’s post-colonial critique and research on AFNs shows their emergence in multiple locations in the 90s, as a result of the *campesino-a-campesino* developments (CaC) against green revolution technologies in the 60s; it was during the 80s that the CaC model of “organizing agricultural production” was utilized to a large degree at the same time of the civil war.⁹⁴ Guerilla militia adhered to the side of rural actors, as their support and struggles against unequal access to land (and thus unequal representation in the state) were central to those fighting in the civil war. These acts of resistance, not necessarily attributed to the FSM at the time, eventually formed the basis for future social movements towards FS in El Salvador.

Post-Colonial Critiques: The Agency of Local Actors in the Food System and Institutionalizing Agroecological Policy at the National Level

Though the primary focus of the chapter was on the historical-political convergence between El Salvador, Latin America and the food system, it is important to note different post-colonial critiques on agrarian structural change and emerging perspectives from local actors. Specifically in regards to discussing the interactions between dominant food systems and indigenous actors,

⁹¹ Segovia, “The Relationships between Food Security and Violent Conflicts.”

⁹² Segovia.

⁹³ Paul D. Almeida, “Social Movements, Political Parties, and Electoral Triumph in El Salvador,” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 42, no. 6 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714839.2009.11722215>.

⁹⁴ Millner, “Food Sovereignty, Permaculture and the Postcolonial Politics of Knowledge in El Salvador.”

political economy approaches (i.e. PEA) are rooted in post-colonial knowledge; this is because the history of the dominant food system is “synonymous with the history of colonialism and consolidation of power.”⁹⁵ Drawing from the literature of Maria Wilson and, more specifically Millner, their focus lies in analyzing the importance of post-colonial identity, history, and geography of food systems. Wilson believes the post-colonial and indigenous identities of agrarian actors are important because of their distinct reasons for “contesting, subverting,” and even co-opting “industrial capitalist foodways”; their particular “demands, values, and beliefs” result in analyzing the “different openings and closures for food sovereignty and agency” through a post-colonial lens of “structural and epistemic ‘violences’ of colonialism.”⁹⁶ This critique can be applied to the context of Salvadoran actors; for example, examining the connection between the Salvadoran civil war and food system might reveal different dimensions to the role of indigenous agrarian and rural actors. Millner argues the importance of recognizing the role of indigenous actors in influencing the adoption of alternative modes in agriculture. She focuses on permaculture as an emerging form and practice for developing an AFN in El Salvador, revealing the complexities of the “post-colonial politics of knowledge.”⁹⁷

In general, post-colonial critiques on state-level food systems also offer valuable insight by adding a unique perspective to help describe the “gaps” in the structural analysis of agricultural production.⁹⁸ The PEA of El Salvador during the Second Food Regime revealed the state’s food policies as coinciding with the ideology of the dominant, neoliberal food system. This led to negative implications for the state and its agrarian-based food system, resulting in the reactionary belief that the country should return to traditional agricultural techniques (led by civil society and local actors and rooted in post-colonial ideology). In a case study by Adriana Murguia Gonzalez et al. uses Foucauldian dispositif to track the progression of competition between certain actors in public policy and their endeavor for power and resource wealth.⁹⁹ These actors are the FMLN

⁹⁵ Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986) in Harris et al., “The Political Economy of Food”, 48.

⁹⁶ Marisa Wilson, “Introduction: Sovereign Food Spaces? Openings and Closures,” *Postcolonialism, Indigeneity and Struggles for Food Sovereignty: Alternative Food Networks in Subaltern Spaces*, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686769>, 2.

⁹⁷ Millner, “Food Sovereignty, Permaculture and the Postcolonial Politics of Knowledge in El Salvador.”

⁹⁸ Harris et al., “The Political Economy of Food.”

⁹⁹ Adriana Murguia Gonzalez et al., “Policy Pitfalls and the Attempt to Institutionalize Agroecology in El Salvador 2008-2018,” *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 44, no. 8 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2020.1725216>.

governments of 2009 and 2014, the Confederation of Federations of Cooperatives of the Salvadoran Agrarian Reform (CONFRAS) and the Federation of Cooperatives of the Agrarian Reform, Central Region (FECORACEN), who cooperated with each other on an initial pursuit of an agroecological-based political project, the National Family Plan.¹⁰⁰ From the years of 2008 to 2018, these were some of the earliest attempts to construct public policy alluding to interest in SFSs/AFNs. Unfortunately, through the use of this policy, the FMLN governments continued to “undermine CONFRAS’ negotiations for favorable agroecology and food sovereign practices” while remaining in power.¹⁰¹ When applying a post-colonial lens to this historical event, the underlying issue of power is one dimension associated with the failed attempt at implementing an agroecological-centered policy. Though different Salvadoran governments did start to embrace food sovereign and agroecological elements by enacting policies on the national level, the proposed policy changes inevitably did not suit the interests of powerful parliamentary actors in the government; this exposed the asymmetrical relationship of the FMLN governments and CONFRAS (a group of actors identifying with the peasant and rural FSM). In summary, a post-colonial lens added to the PEA of a global issue like food insecurity in food policy reveals other important topics of discussion (i.e., the food system) but also the power dynamic between and agency of different actors “for a better accounting” of diverse worldviews, scalar relations (i.e., local, national/regional, global), “embodied and historic experiences, and “intersectionality to devise more sustainable and equitable food systems.”¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 1036.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 1046.

¹⁰² Harris et al., “The Political Economy of Food, 50.”

Chapter 5: Analysis

CONASAN and the Política Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028

In order to address food insecurity and its related issues, the Salvadoran government created the *Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional*– the National Council for Food and Nutrition Security (CONASAN). Established in 2009 by former President Mauricio Funes, CONASAN is an institution meant to take a “comprehensive and intersectoral approach” to food and nutrition security; this means formulating, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of policies, laws, and interventions on the issue of food and nutritional security.¹⁰³ This is, of course, in conjunction with various institutions at the national level. CONASAN is made up of four governmental institutions: the Ministry of Health (*Ministerio de Salud– MINSAL*), the Technical Planning Secretariat of the Presidency (*Secretaría Técnica de Planificación de la Presidencia– STPP*), the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (*Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería– MAG*), and the Secretariat for Social Inclusion (*Secretaría de Inclusión Social– SIS*). In addition to these institutions, CONASAN also has an executive direction and technical committee formed by other governmental bodies. This organizational structure is known as COTSAN, the Technical Committee in Food and Nutrition Security (*Comité Técnico en Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional*). On the official website for CONASAN, there is available information regarding its overall “philosophy”; this includes the institution’s mission statement, vision, principles, and acting role. According to the mission statement, CONASAN promises to be the “governing and vigilant body” for all matters concerning food nutrition and security in the country.¹⁰⁴ For the analysis in the next chapter, the document is examined through the use of the READ approach in document analysis and CPDA’s three key approaches (discourse-historical, dialectical-relational, and socio-semantic).

¹⁰³ Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional, “Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028,” *OBSANR*, 2018, <https://www.mides.gob.pa/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Plan-SAN-Panamá-2017.pdf>.

¹⁰⁴ CONASAN, ““Filosofía,”” n.d., <http://www.conasan.gob.sv/filosofia/>.

Beyond Food and Nutrition Security: Examining the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy

There are an apparent nine different areas pointing to the direction of concern for CONASAN, ranging from food insecurity and a sustainable environment, to human rights and gender equity. The National Policy was created as a way to encompass all of these concerns into one plan. The document states that the first time FNS was first reflected upon and referenced to was in 1943 at the UN Conference on Food and Agriculture, where the government of El Salvador described the plight of agricultural workers as being food insecure and unable to obtain food because of a gap between the wages and ability to purchase goods and foodstuffs.¹⁰⁵ Many policies and laws were formed as a result of this initial event. However, the direct connection this National Plan has to other documents is seen in the *Plan Estratégico Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional* (PNSAN). According to the National Policy, the PNSAN, created in 2011, was a precursor to the formulation of the premise for the National Policy. It was used by the National Policy as a plan for deciphering the link between the actions of different actors and FNS in order to formulate a solution for the food and security problem.¹⁰⁶ Referring to Scott Y. Lin, there are elements of a State's FNS policy that are influenced by the international sphere of actors such as FAO and WB.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, it is important to note that this policy is majorly funded by FAO, WFP, and the *Programa Salvadoreño de Investigación sobre Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente* (PRISMA). The discursive narratives of FAO and WB have been discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. However, PRISMA, is a new actor involved and can be best categorized as a local actor/NGO/CSO, because it is based in El Salvador. Detailed on its website, PRISMA is a research organization that promises to help countries develop and obtain a system of governance that promotes equity, sustainability, and inclusion.¹⁰⁸ The financial participation of this internal actor seems promising for the National Plan, as their vision corresponds to a fair and sustainable food system. However, it still remains under the influence of two external actors whose agendas do not explicitly mention FS, although they do promote its principles.

¹⁰⁵ Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional, "Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028", 18.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Lin, "The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory."

¹⁰⁸ PRISMA, "Sobre PRISMA," Programa Regional de Investigación sobre Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente, n.d., <https://www.prisma.org.sv/>.

In the policy document under “Marco Conceptual”, the definitions for the right to food, FNS, and FS are of interest. For FNS, the definition aligns with that of FAO’s “Food Security” definition; for the right to food definition, the document defines it similarly to that of a human right, as delineated in the articles of the ICESR, Declaration of Rights, and even the UNDROF; for FS, however, the document defines this in terms of how the State itself can reach FS with respect to finding a method for “reducing external dependency.”¹⁰⁹ Interestingly enough, how FS is described in the National Policy does not explicitly make reference to the right of its own people to obtain FS and refers to FS as a duty of the State. Seeing FS as “a national sovereignty” concern allows the State to claim that FS should be addressed at the state level, rather than the community/local level. Put differently, a “state’s prerogative that cannot be given to peoples or communities of peasants and other people working in rural areas.”¹¹⁰ Meanwhile, local level actors’ definition of and solutions for addressing FS run contrary to a National Policy favoring state-level intervention. The *Fundación Salvadoreña para la Reconstrucción y el Desarrollo* (REDES) notes that it is contradictory to talk about food sovereignty if relying on the agrochemical practices of modern day Salvadoran agriculture (this is because these policies resulted in: El Salvador as a food importer and dependent on food, mass unemployment in rural areas and migration from rural to urban areas influencing unfavorable prices, problems in agriculture and food production, population health, health problems related to contaminated land, etc.). *La Unidad Ecológica Salvadoreña* (UES) believes FS is threatened/ reduced by neoliberal reforms that have stimulated private initiative—through the elimination of regulations in the economy, commercial and financial openness, price liberalization and the privatization of public companies and assets—and that FS and FNS are inherently intertwined principles.¹¹¹ Despite the rhetoric of the National Plan promoting FS, other voices on the local level have certain beliefs for how to obtain FS.

The historical background of the Salvadoran government reveals the complications in its ability to follow through with these demands, as a full turn towards food sovereignty means reevaluating these highly neoliberal, globalized food systems already put in place. In practice,

¹⁰⁹ Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional, “Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028.”

¹¹⁰ Geneva Academy, “The Rights to Food Sovereignty and to Free, Prior and Informed Consent,” *Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights*, n.d.

¹¹¹ Redes, “Situación de La Soberanía Alimentaria En El Salvador,” n.d.; La Unidad Ecológica Salvadoreña, “Soberanía Alimentaria,” UNES, n.d., <http://www.unes.org.sv/soberania-alimentaria/>.

CONASAN's National Policy is seemingly trying to mirror the rhetoric of the State with that of the local actors. For example, the National Plan has been formulated by the narratives of not just the government and civil society sector, but also the indigenous and rural communities (detailed in the section called ““Determining Factors””).¹¹² Both FS and the right to food are seen in this document as including actors of the local level, with 600 members of the community contributing to the development of the National Policy. These members with diversified agendas, including the indigenous and rural local society, were invited to voice their perspective on how to best approach the issue of food insecurity during conferences as part of the making of this National Plan. Because it is a plan currently still in motion, how the National Plan will actually perform in the next years since its enactment in 2018 is yet to be determined.

Emerging Dimensions and Perspectives in Food Policy

In an effort to bridge the data and analysis on El Salvador's food political history and policy with the global-scale context, discussion must take place on the emerging dimensions and perspectives that appeared at the national/regional and local scales. In particular, an emphasis is placed on the *right to food* and *agroecology*. These concepts bring forth new intersecting avenues for discussing and decentering the global issue of food insecurity, e.g., sustainable food systems, the need for addressing the climate crisis, legality of language in global policy, etc.

Agroecological Dimensions and Perspectives

Agroecology is best defined as:

*The applications of ecological concepts and principles to the design and management of sustainable agroecosystems, with a minimal dependence on high agrochemical and energy inputs, emphasizing complex agricultural systems in which ecological interactions and synergisms between biological components provide mechanisms for the systems to sponsor their own soil fertility, productivity and crop production.*¹¹³

¹¹² Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional, “Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028,” 33.

¹¹³ Miguel A. Altieri and Clara I. Nicholls, “Scaling up Agroecological Approaches for Food Sovereignty in Latin America,” *Development* 51, no. 4 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2008.68>, 473.

Including agroecology, as defined above, into one's understanding of the global issue of food insecurity points to the fact that there is no one particular method best suited for all communities/food systems. Instead, agroecological processes must be tailored to the specific context and conditions of a given community or food system (at every scale). For example, an FNS-based actor such as FAO describes agroecology as a concept based on bottom-up and territorial processes developed to offer investigated approaches to local problems with people in mind.¹¹⁴ Simultaneously, actors' part of the FSM adapt agroecological principles and processes in their endeavor for FS, as implementation of agroecological approaches by members of LVC are seen throughout Latin America. That being said, contextualizing the global issue of food insecurity through agroecological approaches can "decenter" the narrative of the nation state, as food insecurity is a problem affecting "the borders of all nations" and presenting across the world in varying degrees (i.e., local, regional, global).¹¹⁵

El Salvador and the Future of Public Policy

The state of El Salvador, despite its previous experiences in agroecological practices, is still interested in projects pertaining to agroecology and agriculture at the state level. Another vital aspect of agroecological interventions which must be reckoned with is the role of climate change. In fact, research suggests El Salvador and the surrounding region of Central America it is a hotspot for climate variability.¹¹⁶ Climate variability in the region has been known to cause intense and extreme fluctuations in climate, leading to hurricanes and droughts in El Salvador. This is particularly significant due to El Salvador's agricultural production being largely impacted by climatic events and also given the prevalence of the inappropriate use of land and deforestation.¹¹⁷ In order to combat such issues, the government has experimented with projects at the regional level that pertain to the issues of climate variability, agriculture and food security. The link between food security and climate change is taking on ever great importance on the global stage, in addition to its ongoing importance on the national, regional, and local levels.

¹¹⁴ Food and Agricultural Organization, "The 10 Elements of Agroecology: Guiding the Transitions to Sustainable Food and Agricultural Systems," *FAO*, 2018, 15, <http://www.fao.org/3/I9037EN/i9037en.pdf>; Food and Agricultural Organization, "Overview: What Is Agroecology?," n.d., <https://www.fao.org/agroecology/overview/en/>.

¹¹⁵ Eve Darian-Smith and Philip McCarty, *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies, Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 41 (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2018), 45-47.

¹¹⁶ G. O. Magrin et al., "Climate Change and Climate Variability in the Latin American Region," *Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 2007, <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007AGUSM.U33B..02M/abstract>, 2.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

Research conducted on all three issues investigates the ways for a sustainable food system to adapt and for the worst effects of climate change on the food system to be mitigated. As one report shows, both research organizations and academic sectors of Salvadoran society are collaborating on efforts to guarantee basic grains, corn, beans, rice and sorghum for food security purposes.¹¹⁸ For example, the *Centro de Estudios Rurales y de Agricultura Internacional* (CERAI) is in the process of carrying out an ambitious plan since the start of 2020. This plan, as detailed in their policy proposal, aims to focus on the territory of food sovereignty and agroecology, with respect to rural development predicated on a fair and just economy.¹¹⁹ The University of El Salvador and the different departments are also interested in agroecological approaches. The Department of Agronomic Sciences, with the approval of the Secretary of Scientific Research, held a symposium detailing and promoting ways for adapting sustainable farming practices in relation to the climate crisis and the protection of the environment.¹²⁰ Even the recent administration, headed by President Nayib Bukele, has addressed the issue of agroecology, agriculture, and food sovereignty. Last year in June 2021, the Ministry of Agriculture began executing a “Master Plan to Rescue Agriculture” by way of modernizing technologies, strengthening the institutional framework on agriculture and reinforcing food security in the country, on the premise of creating two trusts: “Coffee Rescue” and “Food Sovereignty and Agriculture Rescue.”¹²¹ Bukele’s government has been particularly notable because of the unorthodox ways in which he has lead the country, drawing both critique and praise from the international community. However, on the subject of fair and sustainable food systems, the government of El Salvador and other regional actors are in the interest of proposing innovative ways to combat food insecurity with the climate crisis looming in the background.

Regional Experiences in Agroecology

Agroecological approaches have a historical relevance not just to El Salvador but also the region of Central America. The Salvadoran government’s attempt at institutionalizing agroecological

¹¹⁸ CCAFS.

¹¹⁹ CERAI, “Plan Estratégico: El Salvador 2020-2024,” 2020.

¹²⁰ El Universitario, “V Simposio de Investigación Científica de La Facultad de Ciencias Agronómicas Inicia El Próximo 25 de Agosto,” Acontecer UES, 2021, <https://eluniversitario.ues.edu.sv/v-simposio-de-investigacion-cientifica-de-la-facultad-de-ciencias-agronomicas-inicia-el-proximo-25-de-agosto/>.

¹²¹ IICA Institutional Communication Division, “MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE OF EL SALVADOR PRESENTED MASTER PLAN TO RESCUE AGRICULTURE AT IICA HEADQUARTERS: ‘WE’RE GOING TO ACHIEVE EXTRAORDINARY GOALS THIS YEAR,’” The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, 2021, <https://iica.int/en/press/news/minister-agriculture-el-salvador-presented-master-plan-rescue-agriculture-iica>.

practices was not as successful, especially when considering the apparent and evidential power imbalances at play in the implementation of the state's policy (refer to the *Postcolonial Critiques* section in Chapter 4). However there have been successes in other parts of the region. Altieri posited that the region has been going through an “agroecological revolution”, by way of describing how different Latin American countries have had success in “rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty, and empowering peasants.”¹²² The CaC movement, in particular, is practiced regionally throughout Central America and is seen as the first peasant-driven process; Altieri noted in 2011 that almost 10,000 families in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala practiced CaC.¹²³ Some of these countries even had and still have the support of their governments, and in some cases, through legal legislation, with rural social movements at the forefront for initiating these changes.¹²⁴

“Right to Food”—Dimensions and Perspectives

Simply stated and previously mentioned in Chapter 2, the right to food is seen as an obligation that state governments pertain to in order to actualize human rights.¹²⁵ Referring once more to Haugen and his analysis of ICESR and the Declaration of Rights, it is obvious to point out member states are responsible for ensuring individuals are not deprived of access to food, as is to strengthen this access to resources, i.e., as in FS; when people are unable to realize this on their own, member states are obliged to provide this right directly through food but also help to promote self-reliance and food security.¹²⁶ However, there is also evidence of set guidelines on addressing the right to food adopted by several multilateral organizations. Endorsed by both the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and adopted by the FAO soon thereafter in 2004, the *Right to Food Guidelines* are a set of policy recommendations to member states and relevant stakeholders highlighting a national food security plan founded on “human rights principles” as a practical tool

¹²² Miguel A. Altieri and Victor Manuel Toledo, “The Agroecological Revolution in Latin America: Rescuing Nature, Ensuring Food Sovereignty and Empowering Peasants,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38, no. 3 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.582947>, 593.

¹²³ Altieri and Toledo.

¹²⁴ Altieri and Nicholls, “Scaling Up Agroecological Approaches for Food Sovereignty in Latin America,” 477.

¹²⁵ Gordillo and Obed Mendez, “Food Security and Sovereignty”, 4.

¹²⁶ Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review”, 3.

for implementing the right to adequate food.¹²⁷ In 2009, the CFS sought reform following the world food price crisis of 2007-08, leading to the ability for CSOs to actively participate in discussions on the global governance of food and agriculture systems internationally; these reforms were proposed and supported by governments such as Argentina, Brazil, and El Salvador.¹²⁸ And, as recently as 2018, the Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), an international NGO, viewed the UN's *Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and other People Working in Rural Areas* (UNDROP) as applicable to the recognition of the right to food, nutrition, and to food sovereignty.¹²⁹

Food as an "Inherent Right"

Seemingly so, the FSM defines food as a basic human right (refer to LVC's seven pillars in *Food Sovereignty* in Chapter 2). FS and right to food concepts inform each other, despite the FSM being driven by various actors at the local level, while the right to food is "directed by governments and intergovernmental process."¹³⁰ Take for example, a 2020 report by FIAN, *Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition, and to Food Sovereignty*. In this report, FIAN argues that the recognition of "food as a right" concurs with various articles in UNDROP; for example, two related but different rights ("the right to adequate food and nutrition" and "to food sovereignty") are recognized in Article 15.¹³¹ This report also alludes to viewing the fulfillment of these rights as a state obligation. This is a similar conclusion to what Haugen revealed in his research; to reiterate once more, the Declaration of Rights and ICESR documents contain relevant language implicitly reinforcing FS.¹³² These examples provide evidence on the merging of FNS and FS global discursive narratives and, to a certain degree, the validation of FS perspectives.

Other examples include the 2001 declaration *Our World is Not for Sale*, in which LVC proposed that governments should "promote sustainable, family-farm based production rather than industry-

¹²⁷ Food and Agricultural Organization, "Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security" (2005), <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1037969X0402900105>.

¹²⁸ La Via Campesina, "Food Sovereignty Now! A Guide to Food Sovereignty", 9.

¹²⁹ Florence Kroff and Angélica Castañeda Flores, "Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition, and to Food Sovereignty," 2020.

¹³⁰ Sampson et al., "Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review", 4.

¹³¹ Kroff and Castañeda Flores, "Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition, and to Food Sovereignty."

¹³² "Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?"

led, high input and export-oriented production”. They argue that this is because governments are ultimately responsible for the promotion of market policies and food safety and quality criteria “appropriate to the preferences and needs of people.”¹³³ The *Six Pillars of Food Sovereignty* at the Nyéléni Forum in 2007 also acknowledged the right to food concept while subscribing to common food sovereign principles. Nonetheless, the forum did more to emphasize this “right” than the FAO and other multilateral organizations’ definition of a right. It articulated the broader rights of local and regional actors in FSM to influence “the formal and informal institutions that govern food systems.”¹³⁴ Framing FS as such leads to perceiving it as more suited to facilitating the access to food and for ensuring the right to food.

It is not unrealistic to suggest that the multilateral institutions propagating an FNS agenda may soon find themselves converging with that of the FSM, although the FSM remains the more comprehensive and encompasses more elements than the FNS perspective. Some documents using unclear language (e.g., Declaration of Rights and ICESR) implicitly validate the idea behind FS strategies; in fact, without even realizing it, these FNS-based policies authenticate the global FSM movement.¹³⁵ If FNS-based policy plans use rights-based approaches to create laws at a national/regional level, actors at the global level should implement FS principles into policy. In the global context, this means the bottom up process of the FSM can therefore be legitimized. Additionally, a policy plan based in FNS also may not be aware of perpetuating imbalances when addressing issues related to “land and resource control access.”¹³⁶ Yet, the discursive narratives of FS already address this imbalance as a core principle which must be combated. This is done by focusing on the agency of an actor at all temporal and spatial scales. Turning to a more regional, multilateral example in Latin America, the *Parlamento Latinoamericano y Caribeño* (Latin American and Caribbean Parliament) has called for a legal framework on not only FS but also the

¹³³ La Via Campesina, “Statement Network ‘Our World Is Not For Sale’ (OWINFS),” La Via Campesina, 2001; Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses”, 174.

¹³⁴ Priscilla Claeys, “Food Sovereignty and the Recognition of New Rights for Peasants at the UN: A Critical Overview of La Via Campesina’s Rights Claims over the Last 20 Years,” *Globalizations* 12, no. 4 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.957929>; Nadia C.S. Lambek et al., *Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies and the Law*, *Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies and the Law*, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7778-1>; M. Jahi Chappell, *Beginning to End Hunger: Food and the Environment in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, and Beyond*, *Beginning to End Hunger: Food and the Environment in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, and Beyond*, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2325548x.2019.1615320> in Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review.”

¹³⁵ Haugen, “Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?”

¹³⁶ Ibid, 176.

right to food.¹³⁷ This actor (i.e. as an actor focusing on the global food system and policies) has been shown to use notable multilateral declarations (i.e. UNDROP) that furthers its alignment with the FS ideology and movement. Specifically, when trying to exercise the right to food, other countries in Latin America have either drafted laws to “guarantee and promote” its full effectiveness or have at least launched initiatives regarding the right to food (i.e. El Salvador’s National Policy).¹³⁸ However drawing from documents such as the ICESR and Universal Declaration of Rights to promote FS does have its drawbacks. Haugen expresses that this could be either through the misrepresentation and interchangeability of the term “rights”, which could obscure the true meaning of the “right to food”. This could also take the form of a powerful actor coopting the meaning of certain “rights” to serve their own economic goals or to defend the status quo.¹³⁹ This critique in particular requires more research, especially through in depth analysis on the epistemological use of “rights” in various global policy documents in a socio-political context.

¹³⁷ Latin American and Caribbean Parliament, “Framework Law on the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty,” 2018.

¹³⁸ Ibid, 10.

¹³⁹ Haugen, 291.

Chapter 6: Findings

The literature of this thesis points to the FNS and FS discourses meeting at various historical points, despite veering off in different directions at other times. This is because, as described in the research, FNS discursive narratives do not fundamentally note the imbalances in relationships between producers of one scale versus another. A good example of this is how the major players of global food politics (FAO, LVC, FIAN, etc.) influence regional/national/local policy contexts. Their individual discursive response to how to discuss the importance of the interventions, responsibility, and accountability of the “state” for ensuring food rights becomes essential for understanding “the relationality and opposition between the discourse in specific places.”¹⁴⁰ Though this specific point is crucial to note, the time and research it takes to analyze every major player’s discursive response would go far beyond the scope of this research. This is why the researcher had to be selective in choosing which specific perspectives and discourses to consider, as the responsibility of this thesis is simply to discuss how the discursive narratives on food policy play out in a specific case on a national scale (i.e. El Salvador). The different perspectives on agroecology and the right to food were also critical points of discussion as they were dimensions emerging from the rescaling of the original global issue of food insecurity.

Conclusion

To reiterate, this thesis uses a *global transdisciplinary framework* as the basis for situating food insecurity as a global issue. Furthermore, this global framework allows for the ability to see the transgressive and integrative boundaries between the temporal, spatial, and historical; the interconnectedness and interdependence between the “economic, political, legal, and cultural realms” of society. It also lends itself to analyzing global issues as “multilevel and multidimensional” and identifying “impulses of influence in [a] mutually constitutive network” in order to understand the world and the decentered, distributed, and deterritorialized processes of global issues across space and time.¹⁴¹ By using this global framework to historically contextualize the concepts discussed in Chapter 2, the research was able to identify two existing discursive narratives in academic and non-academic literature, i.e. FNS and FS.

¹⁴⁰ Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses”, 176.

¹⁴¹ Eve Darian-Smith and Philip McCarty, *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies*, *The Regents of the University of California* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1395901>, 47-53.

The task at hand, however, was to critically think about FS and FNS as far from being oppositional to each other and to do away with the binary structure. Some of the compiled literature addressed FS and FNS as singular, mutually exclusive concepts, while other literature exposed FS and FNS as a far less binary discursive structure. Through the use of the global approach, however, one can begin to see the literature as a point for exploration of different understandings (and in this case, the divergences and convergences between FS and FNS). The use of transdisciplinary scholarship proved to be beneficial for further understanding these discursive histories and narratives without losing sight of the global issue of food insecurity. It was no surprise to discover that the histories of these discourses often converge and diverge from each other; history shows the FS discourse was essentially born from FNS. Up until the 1980s, the FNS discourse rode on the perspective that food aid and increased productivity in the cultivation of food elicited results (thus, inevitably following neoliberal standards). In an attempt to address and conceptualize FNS as multifaceted, the FAO created the four pillars of FNS (food availability, food access, utilization, and stability). According to some scholars, this is where a shift towards viewing food as a human right is evident, a perspective elaborated in the previous chapter.¹⁴² This is best explained from a theoretical standpoint, as scholars begin to see access to food as having two critical dimensions. For example, Devon Sampson et. al interpret the dimensions as emphasizing either “asset-based agency” or “institution-based agency.” Specifically, when interpreting the FNS dimension of an institution-based agency, the argument at play is that there should be more focus on aspects such as human empowerment, recognition of rights, and reinforcement of community capacities in order to achieve the outcomes articulated by FNS.¹⁴³ Another perspective, agroecology, was also evident in the convergences and divergences of the FNS and FS discourse in global policy, and was mentioned within the policy arenas of the Salvadoran and Latin American experience.

Agroecology and the right to food, as “various perspectives at multiple levels and across spatial and temporal dimensions” on food insecurity, are potentially beneficial for understanding different food policy approaches for combating food insecurity. Further research could be conducted on both perspectives, including but not limited to an examination of: various actors (in response to

¹⁴² Wittman, “Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?”, 91; Jarosz, “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses”, 172; Haugen, “Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?”

¹⁴³ Sampson et al., “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review”, 3.

these perspectives) at more specific scales, the viability of agroecological methods and rights-based approaches (and corresponding conceptual, theoretical, and methodological frameworks), and the intersecting dimensions between agroecology and the right to food.

Though much literature cites FS as a critique of the FNS discourse, existing convergences and divergences between the concepts are made apparent. What is more, the broad application of a global transdisciplinary framework to the historical issue of food insecurity revealed certain challenges in implementing a comprehensive global food policy. Theoretically, nation states following certain global/multilateral FS principles and have the ability to choose how and to what capacity to address food insecurity within their borders. Yet, the national sovereignty of participating states becomes eroded by the implementation of neoliberal measures such as structural adjustment programs; national initiatives that once sought to preserve local and regional food self-sufficiency become obsolete in light of these neoliberal policies. More concretely however, using existing theories on the subject of food politics can help to provide an outlook on the validity of FNS/FS. Again, the global transdisciplinary framework can be applied here because of the large variance between discursive narratives (e.g., academic, governmental, multilateral) of food politics, giving way to new topics of discussion through the introduction of new perspectives such as agroecology and the right to food.

Bibliography

- SOAS University of London. “2.1 Defining Characteristics of Political Economy Analysis,” n.d. https://www.soas.ac.uk/cedep-demos/000_P527_PEPP_K3736-Demo/unit1/page_13.htm#.
- Alan Whaites. “The Beginner’s Guide to Political Economy Analysis (PEA),” 2017. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/nsgi-publishes-political-economy-analysis-beginners-guide>.
- Almeida, Paul D. “Social Movements, Political Parties, and Electoral Triumph in El Salvador.” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 42, no. 6 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714839.2009.11722215>.
- Altieri, Miguel A., and Clara I. Nicholls. “Scaling Up Agroecological Approaches for Food Sovereignty in Latin America.” *Development* 51, no. 4 (2008): 472–80. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2008.68>.
- Altieri, Miguel A., and Victor Manuel Toledo. “The Agroecological Revolution in Latin America: Rescuing Nature, Ensuring Food Sovereignty and Empowering Peasants.” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38, no. 3 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.582947>.
- Amadi, Luke, and Fidelis Allen, eds. *Global Food Politics and Approaches to Sustainable Consumption: Emerging Research and Opportunities*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.4018>.
- Atkins, Peter, and Ian Bowler. “Food Regimes as an Organizing Concept.” In *Food in Society: Economy, Culture, Geography*, 4:1–13, 2001.
- Ayres, Jeffrey, and Michael J. Bosia. “Beyond Global Summitry: Food Sovereignty as Localized Resistance to Globalization.” *Globalizations* 8, no. 1 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2011.544203>.
- Bacon, Christopher M. “Food Sovereignty, Food Security and Fair Trade: The Case of an Influential Nicaraguan Smallholder Cooperative.” *Third World Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1002991>.
- Boak, Erika. “Education in Fragile Situations: A Review of Political Economy and Conflict Analysis Literature and Tools.” Reading, 2011.
- Bokeloh, Georg, Maria Gerster-Bentaya, and Lioba Weingaertner. “Achieving Food and Nutrition Security: Actions to Meet the Global Change, A Training Course Reader.” *InWEnt- Internationale Weiterbildung GGmbH*. Vol. Gerage. Feldafing, 2010.
- Borgh, Chris van der. “The Politics of Neoliberalism in Postwar El Salvador.” *International Journal of Political Economy* 30, no. 1 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911916.2000.11644005>.
- Bowen, Glenn A. “Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method.” *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>.

- Breukelen, Anne-Mieke van. ““drivers of Change: Understanding the Forces for Poverty Reduction.”” The Hague, 2007.
- Briney, Amanda. ““History and Overview of the Green Revolution.”” ThoughtCo., 2020. <https://www.thoughtco.com/green-revolution-overview-1434948>.
- Brück, Tilman, Negar Habibi, Charles Martin-Shields, Astrid Sneyers, Stojetz, and Stijn van Weezel. “The Relationship Between Food Security and National Security.” Berlin, 2012.
- CCAFS. “Estado Del Arte En Cambio Climático, Agricultura y Seguridad Alimentaria En El Salvador,” 2014. http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/ccafs/El_Salvador_2014.pdf.
- CERAI. “Plan Estratégico: El Salvador 2020-2024,” 2020.
- Chappell, M. Jahi. *Beginning to End Hunger: Food and the Environment in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, and Beyond. Beginning to End Hunger: Food and the Environment in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, and Beyond*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2325548x.2019.1615320>.
- Claeys, Priscilla. “Food Sovereignty and the Recognition of New Rights for Peasants at the UN: A Critical Overview of La Via Campesina’s Rights Claims over the Last 20 Years.” *Globalizations* 12, no. 4 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.957929>.
- Clapp, Jennifer, and Marc J. Cohen. *The Food Crisis and Global Governance. The Global Food Crisis*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2009.
- Collinson, Sarah. “Power, Livelihoods and Conflict: Case Studies in Political Economy Analysis for Humanitarian Action.” *HPG Report*, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003205845-1>.
- CONASAN. ““Filosofía,”” n.d. <http://www.conasan.gob.sv/filosofia/>.
- Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional. “Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional 2018-2028.” *OBSANR*, 2018. <https://www.mides.gob.pa/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Plan-SAN-Panamá-2017.pdf>.
- Dalglish, Sarah L., Hina Khalid, and Shannon A. McMahon. “Document Analysis in Health Policy Research: The READ Approach.” *Health Policy and Planning* 35, no. 10 (2020): 1424–31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa064>.
- Darian-Smith, Eve, and Philip McCarty. *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies. Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Vol. 41. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2018.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.
- FAO. “Sustainable Food Systems - Concept and Framework.” *Fao*, 2018, 1–8. <http://www.fao.org/3/ca2079en/CA2079EN.pdf>.
- Food and Agricultural Organization. “Overview: What Is Agroecology?,” n.d. <https://www.fao.org/agroecology/overview/en/>.
- . “Policy Brief: Food Security.” *FAO Agriculture and Development Economics Division (ESA)*. Vol. 43, 2006.
- . “State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012.” Rome, 2012.

- . “The 10 Elements of Agroecology: Guiding the Transitions to Sustainable Food and Agricultural Systems.” *FAO*, 2018, 15. <http://www.fao.org/3/I9037EN/i9037en.pdf>.
- . Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (2005). <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1037969X0402900105>.
- Geneva Academy. “The Rights to Food Sovereignty and to Free, Prior and Informed Consent.” *Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights*, n.d.
- Gordillo, Gustavo, and Jeronimo Obed Mendez. “Food Security and Sovereignty,” 2013. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ax736e.pdf>.
- Harris, Jody, Molly Anderson, Chantal Clément, and Nicholas Nisbett. “The Political Economy of Food.” *IDS Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (July 31, 2019): 1–160. <https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2019.112>.
- Haugen, Hans Morten. “Food Sovereignty -An Appropriate Approach to Ensure the Right to Food?” *Nordic Journal of International Law* 78, no. 3 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1163/090273509X12448190941048>.
- Hewitt, Sally. “Discourse Analysis and Public Policy Research.” *Center for Rural Economy Discussion Paper Series No. 24*, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62407-5_37.
- Institutional Communication Division, IICA. “MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE OF EL SALVADOR PRESENTED MASTER PLAN TO RESCUE AGRICULTURE AT IICA HEADQUARTERS: ‘WE’RE GOING TO ACHIEVE EXTRAORDINARY GOALS THIS YEAR.’” The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, 2021. <https://iica.int/en/press/news/minister-agriculture-el-salvador-presented-master-plan-rescue-agriculture-iica>.
- Janks, Hillary. “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool.” University of Witwatersrand, n.d. <https://www.uv.es/gimenez/Recursos/criticaldiscourse.pdf>.
- Jansen, Kees. “The Debate on Food Sovereignty Theory: Agrarian Capitalism, Dispossession and Agroecology.” *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.945166>.
- Jarosz, Lucy. “Comparing Food Security and Food Sovereignty Discourses.” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4, no. 2 (2014): 168–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820614537161>.
- Kis, Jurica. “The Historical Development of ‘Food Regimes’ and Their Influence on the World’s Economy.” Munich, 2008.
- Kroff, Florence, and Angélica Castañeda Flores. “Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition, and to Food Sovereignty,” 2020.
- Lambek, Nadia C.S., Priscilla Claeys, Adrienna Wong, and Lea Brilmayer. *Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies and the Law. Rethinking Food Systems: Structural Challenges, New Strategies and the Law*, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7778-1>.
- Latin American and Caribbean Parliament. “Framework Law on the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty,” 2018, 1–44.

- Lin, Scott Y. "The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 30, no. 5 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-017-9694-3>.
- Magrin, G. O., C. Gay Garcia, D. Cruz Choque, J. C. Gimenez-Sal, A. R. Moreno, G. J. Nagy, C. Nobre, et al. "Climate Change and Climate Variability in the Latin American Region." *Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 2007. <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007AGUSM.U33B..02M/abstract>.
- Markowitz, Marissa L. "Agriculture and the Food System: A Short History and Country Case Study in Mongolia." *Capstone Collection*. University of Leicester, 2013.
- Millner, Naomi. "Food Sovereignty, Permaculture and the Postcolonial Politics of Knowledge in El Salvador." In *Postcolonialism, Indigeneity and Struggles for Food Sovereignty: Alternative Food Networks in Subaltern Spaces*, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686769>.
- Mintz, Sidney. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Mulderrig, Jane, Nicolina Montesano Montessori, and Michael Farrelly. *Introducing Critical Policy Discourse Analysis. Critical Policy Discourse Analysis*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788974967.00006>.
- Murguía Gonzalez, Adriana, Omar Felipe Giraldo, Mateo Mier Y Terán-Giménez Cacho, and Luis Rodríguez Castillo. "Policy Pitfalls and the Attempt to Institutionalize Agroecology in El Salvador 2008-2018." *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 44, no. 8 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2020.1725216>.
- North, Liisa L. "El Salvador: The Historical Roots of the Civil War." *Studies in Political Economy*, 1982.
- Nyéléni. "Nyéléni 2007 Forum for Food Sovereignty." *Nyéléni 2007 Forum for Food Sovereignty*, 2007, 1–76.
- Ostrom, Elinor. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511807763>.
- Paarlberg, Robert. *Governance and Food Security in an Age of Globalization. Food, Agriculture and the Environment. Discussion Paper No.36. Int. Food Policy Res. Inst., Washington DC.*, 2002.
- Pengue, Walter. "A Short History of Farming in Latin America." *Seedling (GRAIN's Quarterly Magazine)*, no. April (2004): 5–11.
- Pimbert, Michel P. *Transforming Knowledge and Ways of Knowing for Food Sovereignty*. London: IIED Press, 2006.
- Poole, Alice. "How-To-Notes: Political Economy Assessments at Sector and Project Levels." Washington, DC, 2011.
- PRISMA. "Sobre PRISMA." Programa Regional de Investigación sobre Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente, n.d. <https://www.prisma.org.sv/>.

- Redes. “Situación de La Soberanía Alimentaria En El Salvador,” n.d.
- Reich, Michael R., and Yarlani Balarajan. “Political Economy Analysis for Food and Nutrition Security.” *HNP Discussion Paper*, 2012. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSPContentServer/WDSP/IB/2013/04/24/000442464_20130424145444/Rendered/PDF/769210WP0Polit00Box374391B00PUBLIC0.pdf.
- Rosset, Peter M., and Maria E. Martínez-Torres. “La Via Campesina: The Birth and Evolution of a Transnational Social Movement.” *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 149–75.
- Sampson, Devon, Marcela Cely-Santos, Barbara Gemmill-Herren, Nicholas Babin, Annelie Bernhart, Rachel Bezner Kerr, Jennifer Blesh, et al. “Food Sovereignty and Rights-Based Approaches Strengthen Food Security and Nutrition Across the Globe: A Systematic Review.” *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 5, no. September (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.686492>.
- Segovia, Alexander. “The Relationships between Food Security and Violent Conflicts.” *FAO Agricultural Development Economics Working Paper*, 2017. <file:///C:/Users/DrSarbhyan/Downloads/a-i7918e.pdf>.
- Sen, Amartya. “Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation.” *Oxford University Press*. 1981.
- Smith, Lisa C., and Lawrence Haddad. “Reducing Child Undernutrition: Past Drivers and Priorities for the Post-MDG Era.” *World Development* 68, no. 1 (2015): 180–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.11.014>.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet M Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc, 1990.
- Unidad Ecológica Salvadoreña, La. “Soberanía Alimentaria.” UNES, n.d. <http://www.unes.org.sv/soberania-alimentaria/>.
- Universitario, El. “V Simposio de Investigación Científica de La Facultad de Ciencias Agronómicas Inicia El Próximo 25 de Agosto.” Acontecer UES, 2021. <https://eluniversitario.ues.edu.sv/v-simposio-de-investigacion-cientifica-de-la-facultad-de-ciencias-agronomicas-inicia-el-proximo-25-de-agosto/>.
- Via Campesina, La. “Food Sovereignty Now! A Guide to Food Sovereignty.” *European Coordination Via Campesina*, 2018, 1–28.
- . “II International Conference Of The Via Campesina Tlaxcala, Mexico, April 18-21.” La Via Campesina, 1996. <https://viacampesina.org/en/ii-international-conference-of-the-via-campesina-tlaxcala-mexico-april-18-21/>.
- . “Statement Network ‘Our World Is Not For Sale’ (OWINFS).” La Via Campesina, 2001.
- Wilson, Marisa. “Introduction: Sovereign Food Spaces? Openings and Closures.” *Postcolonialism, Indigeneity and Struggles for Food Sovereignty: Alternative Food Networks in Subaltern Spaces*, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686769>.

- Wisner, Ben, Den Weiner, and Phil O’Keefe. “Hunger: A Polemic Review.” *Antipode* 14, no. 3 (1982): 1–16.
- Wittman, Hannah. “Food Sovereignty: A New Rights Framework for Food and Nature?” *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 2 (2011): 87–105.
<https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2011.020106>.
- . “Reworking the Metabolic Rift: La Via Campesina, Agrarian Citizenship, and Food Sovereignty.” *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36, no. 4 (2009): 805–26.
- World Bank. “Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security.” Washington D.C., 1986.