
THE RIGHT TO FOOD: LEGAL, POLITICAL AND HUMAN IMPLICATIONS FOR A FOOD SECURITY AGENDA

● Su-ming Khoo

This article understands food security as a “wicked problem” and suggests that the rights-based approach addresses some of the impasses by shifting the key concern from food to hunger, and placing the human person at the centre of development. The 2004 FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food provide clarification on the rights-based approach and point to how the right to food can be incorporated into government strategies and institutions. A landmark legislative example from India illustrates how the rights approach can empower a range of detailed programmatic actions on hunger, which in turn reinforce other socio-economic rights. The conclusion reflects on how the right to food and the right to development bring important substantive dimensions to the current agenda for policy coherence in development assistance and cooperation.

“Unless the right to food is placed at the very center of the efforts of the international community to address the structural causes which have led to the global food crisis, we will repeat our past mistakes.”

Olivier De Schutter, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food¹

1. Introduction

The 2008 global food crisis has put the spotlight on food security, however various reports² indicate that it reflects persistent structural problems and long term trends. World hunger and food insecurity are “normal”,³ with worsening trends over the past decade, although the perfect storm of financial, economic and food price shocks spiked the trend in 2008, pushing the numbers of hungry people beyond the 1 billion mark. This landmark retrogression has reinvigorated pleas for a new approach to food security, and for rights-based approaches to be adopted.

What does a right to food approach add to our understanding of food security – a concept that is already perhaps too complex and already reported to have close to two hundred definitions.⁴ The world has gone through many phases and fashions in addressing problems of malnutrition.⁵ The history of the concept, reviewed below, shows it to be a “wicked problem”.⁶ Differing goals are at stake and social complexity leads to policy fragmentation.⁷ “Wicked” does not mean ethically deplorable here – it means a problem that cannot be definitively solved because there are competing ideas about what the problem and solution are. Food security is a wicked problem because incompatible policy solutions are presented in relation to food, rights, aid and international co-operation.

A rights-based approach does not represent a narrowing of focus within the existing food security concept, but rather requires fundamentally “un-thinking” it, shifting the focus of concern from food to the human person and their situation within the political economy of hunger. This encompasses entitlements, nutrition, government policy and public action, the role of information, living standards and the status and roles of women and marginalised groups.⁸

Shaw sees the broadening of the concept of food security as a reflection of evolving views of development theory and practice towards more humanistic conceptions.⁹ This article examines the evolution of the wicked problem and suggests that the rights-based approach can lock it down,¹⁰ providing a coherent framework of norms, obligations and practical measures to realise the human right to adequate food including drinking water.¹¹ Section 3 discusses the obligations of governments with reference to the 2004 FAO *Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food*.¹² Section 4 presents a landmark example from India, illustrating how social mobilisation has made the right to food

justiciable and led to detailed programme action on hunger, which also reinforces other socio-economic rights. Section 5 concludes with some reflections on the right to food and the current agenda for policy coherence in development assistance and co-operation.

2. Evolution of the right to food and food security concepts

The evolution of the concepts of the right to food and food security reflects the uneasy accommodation that is the hallmark of a wicked problem. Hunger competes with other political and economic goals, while the realist quest for “power over” contradicts principles of internationalism, humanitarianism and universal rights.

The problem of hunger was a fundamental driving force behind the concept of universal human rights, influenced by Roosevelt’s 1941 “Four Freedoms” speech which stated that freedom from want was one of four essential freedoms.¹³ An international governing body (eventually the Food and Agriculture Organization – FAO) was proposed “to consider the goal of freedom from want in relation to food and agriculture”. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) declared in principle the right of every person to “...a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being...including food”, and that mothers and children are entitled to “special care and assistance”.¹⁴

However, competing policy concerns strongly influenced the interpretation of the issues. The new science of nutrition linked food and health and attempts were made to foster international co-operation to promote these common goals. Yet international policies and actions on food and hunger developed largely as a by-product of the domestic agriculture and trade policies of the major food-exporting countries, notably the United States, which continues to be the world’s largest donor of food aid today.¹⁵ The dominant powers had reacted to economic depression in the 1930s by subsidising agriculture and attempting to control trade.¹⁶ The presence of grain surpluses and the overwhelming need to dispose of these abroad drove concessional food trade and aid policies that became stubborn structural problems, which failed to address hunger.¹⁷

In 1960 the FAO launched the Freedom From Hunger Campaign, and began to compile comprehensive information about food and agriculture. From 1962, *The State of Food and Agriculture* (SOFA) reports appeared and FAO commissioned studies on broader topics such as food production and population growth, science and technology, the role of external aid and investment and military spending. This provided starting points for a holistic approach to policy that supported the spirit of indivisible and positive rights, being not only concerned with food and agricultural production, but also health, education, and other development issues.¹⁸ Later studies carried this through.¹⁹

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) treaty²⁰ transformed the 1948 UDHR principles into regulations with binding value, with 156 states ratifying the treaty.²¹ However the United States did not ratify it and consistently opposed the idea of binding obligations for socio-economic rights. Article 11 of the ICESCR treaty acknowledges the “essential importance of international co-operation based on free consent”, even as it states that an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, is a universal human right. The policies indicated by Article 11 included technical and scientific improvements to production, conservation and distribution of food, disseminating nutritional knowledge, and developing or reforming agrarian systems to increase efficiency. The different problems of food importing and exporting countries remained major concerns and paragraph 11.2 advocates “an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to need”.

Food security is a younger, more heterogeneous concept than the right to food, emerging in the context of the 1972 global food crisis and 1974 World Food Conference (WFC).²² A combination of structural problems – a decline in grain reserves, steep price increases, raised oil prices and failing commitments to humanitarian food aid – contributed to fears of worldwide food shortages and famine, with hunger killing an estimated half a million people in 1972-4, despite expanded world agricultural output.²³ A policy team from the United States, funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, competed with FAO to set the agenda for the policy response, culminating in the 1974 World Food Conference (WFC).²⁴ Participating countries essentially looked to their national interests, while a non-governmental organisation (NGO) platform lobbied for the centrality of rights and nutrition-based principles.²⁵ Three elements went forward as global policy priorities: increasing food

production, improved conservation and distribution, and a global system of food security, which meant developing a famine information and early warning system. Two elements were unsuccessful – developing countries’ demands for a better deal in trade and proposals to establish a global system of food reserves. The FAO Council’s International Undertaking on Food Security defined food security in terms of accelerated food production, a disputed mechanism for managing cereal stocks and focus on food aid. Demands from developing countries for fundamental structural reforms – stabilisation of commodity prices and better terms of trade and financing did not succeed, despite the demands at the UN General Assembly for a New International Economic Order.²⁶ One commentator observed that “the developed countries committed themselves to little action and seemed dedicated to the kind of preponderance in controls they inherited from a recent colonial past”.²⁷

Donor countries use food aid to dispose of surpluses, create export markets and buy political influence.²⁸ The concept of food security tried to reconcile different interests and demands of food surplus and deficit countries and agenda-setting was dominated by the United States, which was the leading power, the largest grain exporter and the largest donor of food aid. Shaw’s history of FAO²⁹ shows the major powers repeatedly obstructing attempts to formulate a coherent multilateral world food policy from the very inception of FAO. At each global meeting, there were concerted attempts to direct policy responses towards hunger, for example with FAO’s 1960 Freedom From Hunger campaign, but the wording of Article 11 of the ICESCR captures the tension between the “fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger” and the policy focus on controlling food surpluses and deficits, partly driven by the big powers’ self-interested aid and trade objectives.

From the 1970s to the 1990s new theory and evidence began to challenge the policy consensus based on the three priorities of increasing food production, controlling trade and increasing food aid. Critiques of aid and trade emerged pointing out the obvious lack of fit between humanitarian needs and donor policies.³⁰ The early 1980s saw the emergence of entitlement theory which questioned the technical focus on increasing production.³¹ Low levels of food production did not cause hunger and famines *per se*, but a failure of entitlement mechanisms such as high prices, lack of employment, subsistence crises and lack of welfare provision (safety nets). However the broader neoliberal policy context was deeply hostile to state

provision of entitlements and this was a lost decade for development, dominated by the International Monetary Fund (IMF)/ World Bank structural adjustment policies. African famines in the mid-1980s highlighted the salience of hunger and deprivation in the face of structural adjustment. This was particularly noted in the *Adjustment with a Human Face* report,³² which decried the failure of development policy to address human suffering and basic needs.

The right to food is a more distinct and encompassing concept compared to food security which should not be regarded as a means to food security, but as a distinct goal in itself. However, Mechlem suggests that the concepts of the right to food and food security moved closer together in the 1990s.³³ The analysis within food security has become more disaggregated, individual-focused and more aware of problems of vulnerability and discrimination. The concept of food security became more permeable to poverty, hunger and malnutrition concerns as a new, post-Cold War paradigm of human security emerged. Human security redefined the concept of security as relating to human development, not military defence of state territory, as explained in the UNDP's 1994 *Human Development Report*. Human security refers to "the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive environmental, economic, food, health, personal and political threats".³⁴

The 1990s also marked a return to earlier concerns linking food with health through nutrition, redefining food security as only one component of a wider goal of adequate nutrition or nutrition security comprising adequate food, adequate care and adequate prevention and control of diseases.³⁵ This reflected the concern to "put people back into development" as set out in the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development. At least three important shifts had taken place since the emergence of the food security idea in the 1970s. There was a shift in analysis from the international level of analysis to the more disaggregated levels of nation, household and individual. The crude quantitative concern with global stock and flows of staple foods was gradually supplemented with qualitative factors such as food quality, safety and micronutrients, and non-food factors such as adequate care, while health and hygiene practices were understood to be relevant for food security.³⁶

Asbjørn Eide and others published the first work outlining the right to food in the early 1980s³⁷ but according to the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, the right time (*kairos*) for the right to food did not arrive until the 1996 World Food

Summit.³⁸ Yet the Rome Declaration at the conclusion of the 1996 Summit still presented a “cumbersome and unclear formulation” that was a compromise between right to food proponents and those who rejected the notion, particularly the United States. The Plan of Action that followed the Summit thus required clarification of the content of the right to adequate food and freedom from hunger, as stated in the ICESCR, whilst suggesting that the right to food could be understood “*as a means to achieving food security for all*”.³⁹

In 1999, the Economic and Social Rights Committee, the expert committee tasked with elaborating the full meaning of the ICESCR treaty provisions, followed up the World Food Summit’s Plan of Action with General Comment 12, by urging state parties to take “immediate and urgent steps” to ensure “the fundamental right to freedom from hunger and malnutrition”.⁴⁰ It clarified the right to food in relation to hunger and malnutrition and helped to define how the right could be included in the implementation of other cross-cutting international agreements, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Johannesburg Sustainable Development agreement (2002), and the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (1981). For example, Articles 24 and 27 of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child recognise the right of every child to sufficient nutrition and an adequate standard of living and oblige states to take appropriate measures. All states in the world are parties to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, with two exceptions: the United States and Somalia.

In 2000, the Human Rights Commission appointed a Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Jean Ziegler, on the premise that “the right to food should be used as an instrument to deal with a totally unacceptable situation” of global hunger and malnutrition. His task was to facilitate the development of a coordinated, rights-based approach involving governments, FAO, other UN bodies and NGOs. Ziegler’s position drew strongly upon Eide’s work as well as the work done by NGOs, especially the FoodFirst Information and Action Network (FIAN), World Alliance for Nutrition and Human Rights (WANAHR) and the International Jacques Maritain Institute. These NGOs had worked together since the 1996 World Food Summit to produce an International Code of Conduct on the Human Right to Adequate Food in 1997.⁴¹ The 2002 World Food Summit: Five Years Later meeting moved more decisively towards a rights basis and FAO began to initiate a governmental

process and formulate a set of guidelines for the right to food.⁴² The 2004 FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food and the establishment of the Right to Food Unit in the FAO Secretariat gave impetus to rights-based policy programming.

3. Obligations for the right to food: the role of governments and the approach taken by the FAO Voluntary Guidelines, 2004

In 2004 the FAO Council adopted the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (Right to Food Guidelines).⁴³ The Guidelines recommend national actions, inviting states to legislate for the right to food.⁴⁴ States can legislate for the right by developing national framework law and use that to guide the implementation of specific strategies, policies and programmes. While the Guidelines principally address states, they include considerations about the role of non-state actors such as transnational corporations and NGOs. The Guidelines are voluntary and not binding, but they have moved the debate in a practical direction. Human rights principles are translated into concrete recommendations for action. The Guidelines explicitly advocate for more equitable policies and programmes and they promote cross-sectoral coordination and “a holistic and comprehensive approach to hunger and poverty reduction”.⁴⁵

Kent⁴⁶ argues that the obligations of states to people outside their jurisdictions is unclear and Ziegler’s comments of 2004 showed that there had been a divisive debate regarding the Guidelines on a number of outstanding issues relating to trade, aid and embargoes.⁴⁷ The Right to Food Guidelines advocate the importance of good governance, sustainable development, poverty and hunger eradication and the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food as part of indivisible human rights. They provide comprehensive suggestions for monitoring, designing and implementing food security policies and how they can be progressively improved. They recommend greater coordination between relevant ministries, technical departments and commissions so as to implement effective, integrated cross-sectoral initiatives. Accountability and transparency of government

decision-making processes and promotion of the democratic freedoms of opinion and expression, information, media, assembly and association are seen as enhancing the right to food. The participation of households, families, farmers' organisations, agribusiness, civil society organisations and others in the policy-making process is argued to be essential at all levels.⁴⁸

4. India: justiciability and the mobilisation of the right to food

Justiciability means the possibility for people to seek accountability and remedies if their right to food is violated. Ziegler has noted that India provides one of the best examples of the justiciability of the right to food.⁴⁹ India has good institutional democratic foundations⁵⁰ and the Indian Constitution is informed by non-binding Directive Principles that are strongly favourable to socio-economic rights. The Constitution recognises all human rights, prohibits discrimination, recognises the right to life as directly justiciable (Art. 21) and defines the right to food as a directive principle of state policy (Art. 47).

Dréze reminds us that Indian democracy has “one minor flaw, namely that most people are unable to participate in it due to economic insecurity... [i]n short, Indian democracy is trapped in a vicious circle of exclusion and elitism”.⁵¹ Yet he also has reasons for optimism as “the tools of participation are getting more diverse” and there is concerted public awareness, social mobilisation and legal action taking place on the right to food.⁵² The Supreme Court of India has found that the government has a constitutional obligation to take steps to fight extreme hunger and poverty and ensure a life of dignity for all people.⁵³

In April 2001 a landmark case emerged regarding the right to food with broad implications for economic and social rights.⁵⁴ A livelihoods and hunger crisis sparked by several years of drought in Rajasthan led the People's Union for Civil Liberties, Rajasthan and Colin Gonsalves of the Human Rights Law Network to petition the state government for remedies. The Supreme Court accepted the petition and extended its judgment to all parts of the country, issuing an interim order that sought enforcement of eight central government schemes that already existed to alleviate hunger. These included employment, grain-based social security mechanisms for the destitute, the public distribution system,

midday meals for schoolchildren. An Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) for health, nutrition and education, provided minimum daily food to children under six, pregnant women and lactating mothers and adolescent girls through child care centres (*anganwadi*). The range of interventions is too broad to survey in detail here so only one scheme will be discussed in this section – the midday meal programme for all government and government-aided primary schools, which was to provide freshly cooked meals to all children in these schools on all working days, totalling at least 200 days a year.⁵⁵ In other schemes covered by the interim order, such as the safety nets for the destitute, public distribution of subsidised food and the ICDS scheme, social mobilisation has worked together with judicial enforcement to fulfil the right to food, guaranteeing that legislated facilities were open, functional and available to those who needed them. Great attention has been paid to issues of discrimination and marginalisation and information provision has proved crucial in order for grassroots organisations to make welfare provision more accountable, prod them into action and remedy problems as they arise.

By 2005, with sustained pressure from the courts, the media and civil society, schools across India were providing freshly cooked midday meals. The programme was seen to provide an important socialisation function to enable broad social change as the cooks and assistants were recruited from low-status groups, while children are obliged to eat together, regardless of caste. The scheme thus entitles poor people to food through employment as well as through schooling, with preference to the most marginalised and discriminated groups: Dalits, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.⁵⁶ Quality norms and detailed understanding of what a reasonable programme of action means have progressively emerged, overseen and monitored by court commissioners. For example, there were proposals in 2007 to replace freshly cooked hot meals with fortified biscuits, but this was strongly opposed by the court and overturned on the basis that biscuits were nutritionally inferior and less culturally appropriate than a hot meal consisting of a diversity of unprocessed foods.⁵⁷

Dréze notes that the right to food is more complex than the right to education or the right to information because food entitlements are linked to both culture and nutrition, yet these considerations are central to the fundamental right to life and human dignity.⁵⁸ The Indian case shows that there is more to the right to food than the law, since the realisation of the right through the 2001 interim order depended on action across

detailed policy programmes, pushed by advocacy and wider socio-political mobilisation. This case illustrates how courts have been used to advance the right to food, with positive impacts on other areas such as discrimination, unemployment and destitution, including the passing of the 2005 National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. The rights-based approach has transformed existing welfare schemes into legal entitlements, enabling consistent monitoring and evaluation of the schemes and mobilising people to claim their entitlements to adequate food.

India's case highlights how even the combination of strong economic growth and exemplary justiciability do not easily eradicate hunger. It is noted that India is now “an economic powerhouse” but is still “a nutritional weakling”.⁵⁹ It is the largest democracy in the world but it has not sufficiently addressed the situation of the poorest and hungriest. Sen's famous assertion that famines do not occur in democracies may be correct, yet India contains the largest number of people facing chronic hunger in the world – a third of all the undernourished children in the developing world (some 46% of the under-3s), despite its robust legal framework, noble directive principles and economic growth.

A recent collection of studies on undernutrition in India points to the need for a new emphasis on the politics and governance of nutrition presenting five recommendations for strengthening nutrition governance.⁶⁰ These are: opening up the space for public debate on social policy alternatives, improving cross-departmental working at state and national levels, national audit and operational standard setting for nutrition performance, strengthening efforts to promote the status of women and generating more and better data on nutrition status and making that data available to change agents.⁶¹

5. Conclusion

The current Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier De Schutter, states:

The right to adequate food is not a slogan. It imposes obligations on states and non-state actors alike which are grounded in international law. Putting it at the center of our response to the global food crisis...leads us to fundamentally rethink the nature of the challenge we are facing, and what it requires to make progress towards addressing it.⁶²

Wicked problems have no single answer, though they can be tamed by locking down the problem definition and specifying the parameters for success.⁶³ The major lesson of the 2008 food crisis is that a coherent, collective policy approach is needed and that it must be oriented towards long-term, global sustainability and justice. Distributional issues need to be discussed and goals specified more clearly, identifying the most vulnerable and designing strategies to reach them. Investment in agriculture is essential to boost food production, requiring public sector support; the international community should contribute to official development assistance in this respect.⁶⁴

Efforts to work on such coordinated global policies may at last be finding footholds at national and multilateral levels. A recent high level panel on what Ireland and the EU can do to speed up progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), held in Dublin in April 2010, identified three main actions: delivering finance, tackling policy incoherence and adopting a human rights-based approach to the MDGs.⁶⁵ Irish Aid stated its commitment to spend 20% of its aid budget on hunger and affirmed support for an EU agenda for hunger and food security. The European Commission's DG for Development, Olivier Luyckx, drew attention to the EU's "Spring Package", a 12 point action plan for the EU outlining a unified approach for the world's largest aid donors, which has an explicit agenda of policy coherence for aid effectiveness. This could possibly be financed in part by a microscopic levy of 0.005% on global financial transactions that could raise up to \$30 billion a year for development funds. Complementing these policy developments on international assistance, FAO and World Bank have recently completed the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAAKSTD), which recognises that the right to food can be used to re-orient agricultural development. Its findings emphasise the promotion of small-scale agricultural systems and local government, support for co-operatives, farmer organisations and local business associations and unions to support small-scale farming and ensuring greater and more effective involvement of women.

Whether the right to food is seen as a means to achieve food security or whether it is the key to redefining food security, food is a primary area of convergence between human rights practice and rights-based approaches to development. During the Cold War, human rights and development appeared as two distinct islands, with socio-economic issues comprising "a vast channel that put great distance between human rights and

development”.⁶⁶ However, that situation began to change in the 1990s as development has taken on human rights concepts,⁶⁷ while human rights advocates have begun to address socio-economic rights more seriously.⁶⁸ In security thinking, the concept has redefined human security to put the human being at the centre, refocusing security concerns on how poverty, hunger, disease and environmental degradation threaten the vital core of human existence.⁶⁹

Three interrelated themes provide common ground for development and rights:

1. recovery of the principle of indivisibility in human rights;
2. democratisation of development to remove discrimination and enable people to participate; and
3. humanising human rights with an emphasis on dignity and what is humanly desirable and acceptable.

While governments hold the primary obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food, the obligations of corporations involved in food and agriculture are also important.⁷⁰ Even in the direst humanitarian emergencies the need to appear in public without shame must be taken into account.⁷¹ Hunger and deprivation also have manifestly gender dimensions which require broader socio-cultural transformation as well as targeted economic and welfare policies.⁷² The right to development integrates these dimensions of the right to food because it is a vector of interdependent and indivisible rights,⁷³ with food being one of three complementary immediate action areas (food, health and education) for realising all human rights. This approach affirms the principle that the human being is the rightful subject of development and principles of justice and equity must apply, ensuring meaningful participation in, and benefits from, development, particularly in respect of marginalised, discriminated and disadvantaged individuals and groups.⁷⁴

Endnotes

- ¹ De Schutter (2009), p.39
- ² FAO (2009a); De Schutter (2009); Trócaire (2010)
- ³ Laing (2010)
- ⁴ Shaw (2007), p.384, citing Smith et al. (1993)
- ⁵ Kent (2008), p.203, citing Jonsson (2007)
- ⁶ Rittel and Webber (1973), p.155
- ⁷ Conklin (2006)

- ⁸ Dréze and Sen (1995)
- ⁹ Shaw (2007), p.385
- ¹⁰ Conklin (2006), p.21
- ¹¹ See Ziegler (2001), p.58
- ¹² FAO (2004)
- ¹³ Eide (2008)
- ¹⁴ United Nations (1948), Art. 25
- ¹⁵ Marchione and Messer (2010), p.10
- ¹⁶ Shaw (2007), pp.6-7
- ¹⁷ Clay and Stokke (2000); Marchione and Messer (2010)
- ¹⁸ Shaw (2007), p.84
- ¹⁹ For example, Dréze and Sen (1989); Dréze, Sen and Hussain (1995)
- ²⁰ ICESCR, (1966)
- ²¹ Rae, Thomas and Vidar (2007), p.266
- ²² Shaw (2007), pp.115ff; Mechlem (2004)
- ²³ Shaw (2007), p.118
- ²⁴ Ibid., pp.124-5
- ²⁵ Ibid., p.143
- ²⁶ United Nations (1974)
- ²⁷ Shaw (2007), p.148, citing Ward (1975)
- ²⁸ Shaw (2007); Wallerstein (1980)
- ²⁹ Shaw (2007)
- ³⁰ For example, Wallerstein (1980)
- ³¹ Sen (1981); Dréze and Sen (1989)
- ³² Cornia, Jolly and Stewart (1987)
- ³³ Mechlem (2004), p.640
- ³⁴ Owen (2004), p.383
- ³⁵ Oshaug and Haddad (2002); Mechlem (2004), p.636
- ³⁶ Mechlem (2004), p.637
- ³⁷ Eide *et.al.* (1984)
- ³⁸ Ziegler (2001), p.23
- ³⁹ Mechlem (2004), p.641, her emphasis
- ⁴⁰ UNCESCR (1999)
- ⁴¹ Ziegler (2001), pp.3, 10, 11
- ⁴² Ziegler (2004), p.25
- ⁴³ FAO (2004); Ziegler (2008), p.59
- ⁴⁴ See also FAO (2009b)
- ⁴⁵ FAO (2004), p.2, section 4
- ⁴⁶ Kent (2008), p.204
- ⁴⁷ Ziegler (2004), p.27
- ⁴⁸ FAO (2004)
- ⁴⁹ Ziegler (2008), p.67
- ⁵⁰ Dréze (2005)
- ⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁵² Ibid. p.59
- ⁵³ Ziegler (2008), p.67
- ⁵⁴ Guha-Khasnobis and Vivek (2007), p.322
- ⁵⁵ For discussion of other interim order measures see Guha-Khasnobis and

- Vivek (2007); Haddad and Zeitlyn (2009).
- ⁵⁶ Guha-Khasnobis and Vivek (2007), pp.311-2
- ⁵⁷ See www.righttofoodindia.org/mdm/mdm_comrs.html
- ⁵⁸ Dréze (2005), p.54
- ⁵⁹ Haddad and Zeitlyn (2009)
- ⁶⁰ Ibid. p.2
- ⁶¹ Ibid. p.7
- ⁶² De Schutter (2009), p.42
- ⁶³ Conklin (2006), pp.21-2
- ⁶⁴ Conceição and Mendoza (2009)
- ⁶⁵ Trócaire (2010b)
- ⁶⁶ Jones and Stokke (2005), p.1
- ⁶⁷ See for example UNDP (2000); Khoo (2005)
- ⁶⁸ Amnesty International (2005)
- ⁶⁹ Owen (2004)
- ⁷⁰ Brady (2008); De Schutter (2010)
- ⁷¹ De Herdt (2008)
- ⁷² Sethuraman and Duvvury (2007)
- ⁷³ Sengupta (2002), p.870
- ⁷⁴ Centre for Development and Human Rights (2004); Sengupta (2002); on discrimination see Ziegler 2010)

References

- Amnesty International (2005), *Human Rights for Human Dignity – A Primer on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, London
- Brady, M.(2008), “Holding corporations accountable for the right to food”, in George Kent (Editor), *Global Obligations for the Right to Food*, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield
- Clay, Edward and Stokke, Olav (2000), “Food and human security: retrospective and an agenda for change” in Edward Clay and Olav Stokke (Editors), *Food Aid and Human Security*, London: Frank Cass
- Centre for Development and Human Rights (2004), “The rights to food, education and health”, Chapter 2 in *The Right to Development: A Primer*, New Delhi: Sage/ CDHR
- Conceição, Pedro and Mendoza, Ronald U. (2009), “Anatomy of the global food crisis”, *Third World Quarterly*, vol.30, no.6, pp.1159-82
- Conklin, E. Jeffrey (2006), *Dialogue Mapping: Building Shared Understanding of Wicked Problems*, Chichester: Wiley
- Cornia, Giovanni Andrea, Jolly, Richard and Stewart, Frances (1987), *Adjustment with a Human Face*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- De Herdt, Tom (2008), “Social policy and the ability to appear in public without shame” in Comim, Flavio, Qizilbash, Mozaffar and Alkire, Sabina (Editors), *The Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- De Schutter, Olivier (2010), *Agribusiness and the Right to Food: Report presented to the Human Rights Council*, [A/HRC/13/33] 5/03/2010

- De Schutter, Olivier (2009), “The right to food: fighting for adequate food in a global crisis”, *Harvard International Review*, Summer, pp.38-42
- Dréze, Jean (2005), “Democracy and the right to food” in Alston, Philip and Robinson, Mary (Editors), *Human Rights and Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dréze, Jean and Sen, Amartya (1995), Introduction to Dréze, Jean. Sen, Amartya and Hussein, Athar (Editors), *The Political Economy of Hunger*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Dréze, Jean and Sen, Amartya (1989), *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Eide, Asbjørn (2008), “The human right to food and contemporary globalization”, *World Hunger Notes*, 11 October
http://www.worldhunger.org/articles/08/hrf/a_eide.htm
- Eide, Asbjørn. W., Goonatilake, S.; Gussow, J., Omawale, (Editors, 1984), *Food as Human Right*, Tokyo: United Nations University
- Food and Agriculture Organization (2009a), *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009: Economic Crises – Impacts and Lessons Learned*, Rome
- Food and Agriculture Organization (2009b) *Guide to Legislating for the Right to Food*, Rome http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi09/guide_on_legislating.pdf
- Food and Agriculture Organization (2004), “Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security”, Rome <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/009/y9825e/y9825e00.pdf>
- Guha-Khasnobis, Basudeb and Vivek, S. (2007), “The rights-based approach to development: lessons from the right to food movement in India” in Basudeb Guha-Khasnobis, Shabd Acharya and Benjamin Davis (Editors), *Food Insecurity, Vulnerability and Human Rights Failure*, Houndmills: Palgrave, pp.308-27
- Haddad, Lawrence and Zeitlyn, Sushila (Editors, 2009), “Lifting the curse: overcoming persistent undernutrition in India”, *IDS Bulletin*, vol.40, no.4
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ICESCR (1966) <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cescr.htm>.
- International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (2009), *Agriculture at a Crossroads; IAAKSTD Global Report*, Washington: Island Press
- Jones, Peris and Stokke, Kristian (2005), *Democratizing Development: The Politics of Socio-economic Rights in South Africa Development and Human Rights*, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff
- Jonsson, Urban (2007), “Child malnutrition: from the global protein crisis to a violation of human rights” in Hettne, Björn (Editor), *Sustainable Development in a Globalized World: Studies in Development, Security and Culture*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kent, George (2008), “Reflections”, in George Kent (Editor), *Global Obligations for the Right to Food*, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, pp.203-28
- Kho, Su-ming (2005), “The Millenium Development Goals – a critical discussion”, *Trocaire Development Review*, 2005

- Laing, T. (2010), “Crisis? What crisis? The normality of the current food crisis”, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol.10, no.1, pp.87-97
- Marchione, Thomas J. and Messer, Ellen (2010), “Food aid and the world hunger solution: why the US should use a human rights approach”, *Food and Foodways*, no.18, pp.10-27
- Mechlem, Kerstin (2004), “Food security and the right to food in the discourse of the United Nations”, *European Law Journal*, vol.10, no.5, pp.631-48
- Oshaug, Arne and Haddad, Lawrence (2002), “Nutrition and agriculture” in *Nutrition: A Foundation for Development*, Geneva: ACC/SCN, 2002
- Owen, Taylor (2004), “Human security – Conflict, critique and consensus: colloquium remarks and a proposal for a threshold definition”, *Security Dialogue*, no.35, pp.373-87
- Rae, Isabella, Thomas, Julian and Vidar, Margret (2007), “The right to food as a fundamental human right: FAO’s experience” in Guha-Khasnobis, Basudeb, Acharya, Shabd and Davis, Benjamin (Editors), *Food Insecurity, Vulnerability and Human Rights Failure*, Houndmills: Palgrave
- Rittel, Horst and Webber, M. (1973), “Dilemmas of a general theory of planning”, *Policy Sciences*, vol. 4, pp.155-169
- Sen, Amartya (1981), *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sengupta, Arjun (2002), “On the theory and practice of the right to development”, *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol.24, pp.837-89
- Sethuraman, Kavita and Duvvury, Nata (2007), “The nexus of gender discrimination with malnutrition – an introduction”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, November, pp.49-57
- Shaw, D. John, (2007), *World Food Security: A History since 1945*, Houndmills: Palgrave
- Smith, Marisol, Pointing, Judy and Maxwell, Simon (1993), *Household Food Security, Concepts and Definitions: An annotated Bibliography*, Development Bibliography no. 8, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex
- Trócaire (2010a), *Food For All: An Agenda for Addressing Root Causes of Hunger*, Policy Report, March, Dublin
- Trócaire (2010b), *Countdown to 2015: How can Ireland and the EU help save the Millennium Development Goals?* April, Dublin
- UN Development Programme (2000), *Human Development Report 2000: Human Development and Human Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- United Nations (1948), *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*
<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>
- United Nations (1974), *Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order*, UN Doc A/RES/S-6/3201, 1 May
- United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1999), General Comment 12, *The Right to Adequate Food*, E/C.12/1999/5, 12 May
- Wallerstein, Mitchell B. (1980), *Food for War– Food for Peace: United States Food Aid in a Global Context*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

- Ziegler, Jean (2010), *Preliminary Study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on Discrimination in the Context of the Right to Food*, 22 February, A/HRC/13/32
- Ziegler, Jean (2008), *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food*, 10 January, A/HRC/7/5
- Ziegler, Jean. (2004), *The Right to Food*, A Note by the Secretary-General, A/59/385
- Ziegler, Jean (2001), *The Right to Food: Report by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food*, 7 February, E/CN.4/2001/53