

**FOOD SECURITY OR FOOD SOVEREIGNTY: AN INQUEST INTO THE ULTIMATE  
PARADIGM TO PUT AN END TO AFRICA'S PERRENIAL HUNGER**

**MAILUMO, AONDOFA DANIEL**

**Doctorate Candidate,  
Department of Political Science,  
Benue State University,  
Makurdi, Nigeria.  
+2348065394007**

**[danmailumo@yahoo.com](mailto:danmailumo@yahoo.com)**

**&**

**OKOH, AUGUSTINE I. SADIQ**

**Doctorate Candidate,  
Department of Political Science,  
Benue State University,  
Makurdi, Nigeria.  
+2348067810286**

**[sadiqokoh@gmail.com](mailto:sadiqokoh@gmail.com)**

**ABSTRACT**

*Global Hunger Index of 2014 indicates hunger has remarkably improved globally, falling by 39 percent since 1990. Yet, the status of hunger in Africa is 'extremely alarming' as 30 percent of the population is still undernourished. Hunger is intimately tied to vulnerability to stress which is equally linked to food availability and accessibility. Intersecting challenges of Africa's erratic weather patterns, conflict, weak governance and rising population make daunting the task of food security. Coupled with this the vexing problem of finding the ultimate food paradigm to navigate the unequal exchange in food distribution within the continent. Though two concepts compete for attention as the ultimate paradigm for endogenous food production: food security and food sovereignty. Even so, food security is the dominant approach with immense benefits for the different countries are experimenting with these concepts with startling lack of clarity for a food secure future. This prompts us to ask: can Africa confront this paradigm shift from agricultural trenches of food insularity or build new bridges in food rights for the smallholder farmer? The productive tension underlying this food policy complex could prove to be a 'boon' or 'doom' crisis for agricultural productivity. Food security is a case of ideological subsumption aimed at material consumption. Therefore, is creating virtuous cycles wherein smallholder farmers are pushed to either debt or out of business. Food sovereignty builds resilience, and stability to spur inclusive growth through holistic integration of smallholder farmers leading to eco-efficient allocation of resources. To build resilience of the poor, there must be safety nets geared towards pre-empting shocks rather than being mere reactionary measure. A food secured future will require integration of social safety nets into development policy to reduce lag time in meeting challenges when confronted with climate shocks.*

**KEYWORDS:** Food Sovereignty, Family farmer, Food Security, Allocative Justice, Food Justice, Poverty alleviation, Sustainable Development Goals.

## **Introduction**

The year 2014 was celebrated as African Union's year of Agriculture and Food Security. In 2014, African leaders rededicated themselves towards uplifting the living standards of the people by carrying out sweeping transformative actions aimed at improving food security. In Food Agricultural Organization's (2014) projection, Africa will face a gloomy food insecure future in the 2030s. This is due, in part, to agricultural output lagging behind population growth with extreme climate-related events disrupting food production. Between 1965 and 1990 agricultural production grew at an annual rate of 1.7% while there was annual population growth average of 2.8% (Boon, 2014). Sure, food imports and food aid in Africa increased substantially to offset the deficiencies, and that early 1994 represent about 10% of the food consumed. But at the current growth rate, the food gap is projected to increase to more than nine times the present gap by 2020 (Agyare-Kwabi, 2003).

This is because the medium guaranteeing Africa's food secure future carries with it the seeds of agro-ecological degradations. Two concepts compete for attention as the ultimate paradigm capable of spurring endogenous growth: food security and food sovereignty. Different countries are now experimenting with these concepts with startling lack of clarity of how to transition to a food secure future. Within liberal market approach, food security paradigm is perceived as an eco-efficient model capable of improving agricultural Production, and availability while maintaining the bottom-line. It is strictly conceptualized as four components, namely: access, availability, utilization and stability (FAO, 2008). Conversely, food sovereignty takes a different perspective by addressing issues of ownership, control and rights to food by all people at all times.

But can Africa confront this paradigm shift from agricultural trenches of food insularity or build new bridges in food rights for the smallholder farmer? The productive tension underlying this food policy complex could prove to be a 'boon' or 'doom' crisis for agricultural productivity. Hence, reordering Africa's food production priority is a complex factor with serious socio-economic and biogeophysical imperatives favouring depletion of resources, degradation and food crises generally. Despite this, many countries in sub-Saharan Africa have experienced recurring famines and the time in between food crises seems to be shrinking (Saulter, 2014). A new social compass towards increasing agricultural production is therefore required if Africa must not only limit these crises but meet its commitment to the 2030 SDGs of putting an end to poverty. The current lens for bridging the food gap is inadequate because it is fragmented and lacking in clarity for the appropriate policy for transforming agricultural production. Litany of problems such as natural hazards, conflict, agricultural dependency, weak governance, disease, hazards have increased the level of poverty experienced in the continent. Global Hunger Index of 2014 indicates hunger has remarkably improved globally, falling by 39 percent since 1990. In sub-Saharan Africa over 70 percent of the population are engaged in agricultural sector. Yet, the status of hunger in Africa is 'extremely alarming' as 30 percent of the population is still undernourished. Hunger is intimately tied to vulnerability to stress which is equally linked to food security. Africa still lags behind other continents in food production. As such, finding an appropriate food policy to leapfrog food production is one of the defining challenges of African food politics.

This prompts us to ask: What are the linkages of food security and food sovereignty in Africa's food sufficiency provisioning? Can autonomous African communities improve food production without the attendant ills of Eurocentric dissociation of man from nature? What are the prospects of food security translating to food secure future such that ideological subsumption is not matched by material consumption? In answering these questions we note that nature and man are not entities onto themselves but exist in harmony.

To do justice to the issue, the paper is organised into five sections. The preceding section is the introduction. Following hard on it is the second section on theoretical underpinnings. The third section establishes contending issues of food security and food sovereignty in Africa while the fourth section is the fulcrum of the work. Here, we ask the critical question of whether food sovereignty is the solution to Africa's food crisis. In the fifth section, we proffer solutions on how Africa can feed Africa to enable us draw our conclusion.

### **Theoretical Underpinnings**

Africa's food dilemma requires finding urgent solutions that can bring about a change in how food is produced and distributed within the continent. The dominant narrative of food security insists Africa follows some prescribed approach to agricultural productivity. Technology here is seen as guaranteeing for production but will encourage monoculture agriculture and Genetic Modification (GM). So, Large Scale Land Acquisitions (LSLA) or 'land grab' is a contingent parts of this new eco-efficiency device for meeting human preferences in that it aims at transforming the living standards of the host community (Cotula, et al., 2009). Still, the means whereby such efficiency is brought to fruition is through superior technology. This 'humanitarian' framework, as Davis (2006) suggests, is a declensionist colonial environmental narrative, appropriated to help justify and implement the neoliberal goals of land privatization and the intensification of agricultural production in the name of environmental protection.

Food security is part of the ongoing ideological subsumption of Africa's social ecologies to the logic of capital. What the mystificatory slogan of food security vehicles is not redemption from endless ecological crises but only sings 'siren songs' of free market with the motive of recreating conditions for economization of nature (Cotula et al., 2009; Matondi et al., 2011; Monbiot, 2014). Thus, the reinvention of optimism in food security only serves to uphold the sanctity of markets and to also sustain the ideological purity of capital which is facing newer threats in the form of declining profits. So, time and again, this model of offshore agriculture (where mediation of nature is the norm) agribusinesses have effectively dispossessed indigenous farmers, producing hunger and disease and destroying environments directly and by proxy (Wallace and Kock, 2012). The resultant crises are then treated as due cause for expanding dispossession in new enclosures. The means whereby such dislocation is effected is through mystification and lionizing food security.

Needless to say, food security is one such mystificatory slogan aimed at concretizing appropriation of Africa's human and extra human nature. This is what I call eco-cannibalism (Okoh, 2014) in the postulation of eco-cannibal's theory of nature. In this eco-cannibalistic state, fit species (powerful agro-corporations) exploit niches (markets and commodity frontiers) and multiply their survival rate (return margins) while weaker (less efficient hence African States) one's go extinct bankrupt (Likely effects of climate change resulting from agro-ecological degenerations) (Weber, 2013).

Africa is witnessing land grabs with diverse consequences for livelihood assets of the people. Extensive application of artificial fertilizers is creating runoffs, mutation of pest through extensive application of pesticides, through polluting waterways and overloading marine ecosystems with nutrients (Wackernagel & Rees, 1996, Salleh, 2010). For low income countries, adverse mediation of nature has allowed a skewed process of metabolism that is now engendering material subsumption. This puts the lie to the supposition of developed economies altruist intention in the rejuvenation of Africa's social ecologies as an economic artefact of high value. Rather what this has achieved is to warm the flanks of shareholders' interest. In the wake of agroecological degradations, this myth only resonates in the psyche of eco-modernists scholars. Centre right scholars believe technology can ameliorate for the meteoric debauchery of human and non-human nature- A myth now debunked by the agro-ecological degeneration intrinsic to the marketization drive and is as matter fact part of the ongoing economic and ideological subsumption of Africa.

A major framework used to propagate this market-led drive is the food security paradigm. As a major liberal narrative, food security is seeks to extract agro-ecological surplus from developing economies all in the name of altruistic impulse of fostering new growth drivers. But far less clear is the medium for transiting to ending hunger. Though technology will guarantee short term gains from monoculture agriculture and Genetic Modification (GM), it not the ultimate blueprint to end food insecurity. Quite to the contrary, it will reverse gains in food production based on the fact that monoculture and family farming are irreconcilably opposed. Land grab is a contingent parts of this new eco-efficiency device for meeting human preferences in that it aims at transforming the living standards of the host community (Cotula, et al., 2009). The means whereby such efficiency is brought to fruition is through superior technology. This 'humanitarian' framework, as Davis (2006) suggests, is a declensionist colonial environmental narrative, appropriated to help justify and

implement the neoliberal goals of land privatization and the intensification of agricultural production in the name of environmental protection.

Food security is part of the ongoing model of offshore agriculture where mediation of nature is the norm, where agribusinesses have effectively dispossessed indigenous farmers, producing hunger and disease and destroying environments directly and by proxy (Wallace and Kock, 2012). The resultant crises are then treated as due cause for expanding dispossession in new enclosures. The means whereby such dislocation is effected is through mystification and lionizing food security. In this situation, fit species (powerful agro-corporations) exploit niches (markets and commodity frontiers) and multiply their survival rate (return margins) while weaker (less efficient hence African States) one's go extinct bankrupt (Likely effects of climate change resulting from agro-ecological degenerations) (Weber, 2013).

Food sovereignty on the other hand, is a related term but with different connotation. Generally speaking, food sovereignty is a holistic peoplecentric concept developed by the global peasant's movement La via Campesina. In 2007, the concept was concretized and consolidated at the forum for food sovereignty held at the village of Nyeleni in Selingue, Mali. At the forum, representatives of different organizations met to foster harmony between consumption and production of earth's free gifts. Attendance at conference was made up of peasants and family farmers, fisher-folks, landless people, rural workers and environmental and urban movements from around the world. At end of the conference participants published a declaration setting out six principles of food sovereignty.

Food sovereignty is an affirmation of peasant people's food rights. It asserts peasants rights to a clean and healthy environment according to their knowledge. The concept bestows on peasants the right to privatize their agricultural production to suit their families and societal needs. According to its chief advocate, La via Campesina, it aims at promoting a model of peasant or family-farm agriculture based on sustainable production using their local resources in a manner that is in harmony with local culture and traditions (La via Campesina, 2009). Food sovereignty also amplify the right of countries and state unions to define their agricultural commodities. It organizes food production and consumption according to the needs of local communities giving high priority to production for local market.

The declaration of Nyeleni is an integral part of the global discussion on agriculture and food policies. Since the formulation of food sovereignty in Mali some countries like Ecuador enshrined its principles in their constitution. Similarly, different organizations, autonomous communities and peasant movement adopted food sovereignty as their compass to navigate perennial food scarcity crisis. The reason, of course, is due to the very nature of the concept. The concept is not only a peasant movement (bottom up approach) but protects domestic market from dumping of agricultural surpluses and low quality imports from other countries. This entails regulating agricultural and livestock production to maintain local participation in food production. Essentially, the current food regime is tilted towards industrialized agribusiness model planned for vertical integration and dominance of all agricultural activities. States where mercantilist logic is gaining less traction accorded higher priority to food sovereignty than food security. The reason is simple. Food sovereignty seeks to decentralize food production placing control of the food system in the hands of the family farmers. When food is within the control of the poor access to it becomes more widespread. But with the current system tilted towards dominance of all agricultural activities by a select few, the integration of peasant farmers' into the ambit of capital is concretized. Through controlling all facets of the food system agribusinesses also control policies and organs of government.

Furthermore, food sovereignty seeks to redress the imbalance in the present food system skewed towards monoculture farms which is threatening to replace food crops with cash crops. The expectation of food sovereignty concept is to make food a universal human right issue in the true sense of the world. In this way food is extricated from its present day commodification. Placing market value on food means farm implements such as seeds will be scarce commodities.

The race to conquer hunger is already won and lost. Based on the fact that it is depleted from within one can conclude there is a winner. Within the folds of those propagating ideas of ending hunger, cracks have emerged. We experience this crack in the activities of World Bank, World Trade Organization (WTO) and International Monetary (IMF) in that these organizations favour agribusinesses. Yet, monoculture agriculture is detrimental to material wellbeing of the farm family who constitute 80% of sub-Saharan Africa's population. Jeff Furman in the Guardian of 16th April, 2015 decried this model of farming. World Bank ranking process in his opinion as encourages land grabs and environmental degradations. That for 13 years, the World Bank's landmark publication, *Doing Business* ranked countries around the world based on how well their regulatory systems serve corporate interests. But far from merely analyzing the business climate across the globe, the annual report profoundly affected the way countries deal with regulation (Furman, 2015).

Resultantly, more than 70% of sub-Saharan African governments implemented at least one reform to ease the way for businesses – and, not incidentally, moved up in the World Bank's ranking. In Furman's view this has resulted in a global competition to lower public interest regulations, diminish environmental and social safeguards, and reduce corporate tax responsibilities – all in the name of doing business. To a large extent, such manipulation by World Bank negates the very essence of sustainability which food security insists as absence of it will not guarantee allocative efficiency. Neither has the interest of vast majority of the population in these communities integrated into the food regime. What have emerged are pockets of isolated sectoral food policies targeted at material wellbeing of family farmer. Its uttermost feat is globalization which engenders incorporation of farm family into the ambit of capital accumulation. For this explains the general framework of food security runs along lines of eco-efficiency while ensuring that old ecological limits are transcended. In reality, agribusiness transcends myopic reasoning of being concerned with efficiency as output is determined by profitability logic. Thus, profit maximization is the iron rule of capital (Smith, 2011).

### **Contending issues in the Appropriation of Food Concept**

Finding an ultimate food blueprint is a complex issue for many nations because food has capacity to both uplift and marginalize. Some might argue that food security is a political weapon capable of breeding inequality. And as weapon for transformation and change, it can be said to be a political tool. Given this amenability to different change agents, access to food is a challenge as it is also a tragedy. Depending on where one views the paradigm from, it could be a tragedy or challenge. Food is a tragedy because it is increasingly scarce in a continent blessed with abundant natural resources. Different change agents control the nature and form of agro-ecological socialization in Africa. These agents have conflictive motives for their involvement in the food processes. Given this, it is a tragedy as food system can never really rise beyond subsistent level and will be a major factor relegating the poor to the backwoods of history. To understand the food security and food sovereignty dyad and their roles in alleviating hunger we must examine different contentious issues:

#### **i) Tragedy of Trade**

Trade and food are intricately intertwined. Food provides man with mental, physical and intellectual capacity to cope with daily requirements of life. And trade is the vehicle whereby different societies meet their requirements in the form of exchange. Despite this, food production generally is unequal. Different nations have differing capabilities to produce food. Food production entails diverse economic, geological, and social factors. Most African countries produce food they have comparative advantage; where their economic, agricultural and geological factors favour the production of a crop. African states must therefore devise different strategies to identify their food preferences and requirements based on their peculiarities. Yet such strategies must also ensure that all those vulnerable to hunger and malnutrition are adequately protected. Hence, conceptualizing the ultimate food paradigm has trade imperative requiring policies that project national differences and preferences.

#### **ii) Food Rights**

Issues of right to food are not limited to a country's geographical boundary alone but have strong international colourations. What this underscore is food is a human rights issue but this human rights obligation goes beyond the state to include people living outside their state borders. Against this backdrop, trade measures should be cognizant of transboundary ramification of right to food and can be used to enforce the rights of other people adversely affected by impediment to their food supply. It then means states must not ratify trade agreements obliging them to implement measures detrimental to human rights (De schutter, 2011). What this reveals, of course, is that food concept should be such that it is not increasingly economized. In the light of this, an appropriate regulatory framework where food right is prioritized should be captured in food policy. In placing monetary valuation on food, economic forces determine its accessibility and availability. But with a clear social compass such anomalies are expunged.

A good example of this flawed vision is in Cote d' Ivoire. At the onset, peasants in the country grew rice as staple food to feed their families with the balance exchanged in the market for other necessities of life. But the introduction of biofuel changed their cropping system to reflect the new profit yielding cash crop of Jatropha. This is part of the advice given by finance capital for transforming communities towards a greener growth trajectory. However, the rising dependency on a single crop implies that their staple food crop was increasing jettisoned and became a scarce commodity. However scarcity necessitated food imports. As food became increasingly scarce, reliance on their international benefactor was inevitable thereby consolidating and concretising food imports. With declining food sovereignty, the metabolic rift crisis was intensified.

### **iii) Neoliberalization**

Neoliberalization is taking Africa's agro-food system by the storm restructuring food priorities. Neoliberalism has engorged not just the eco-system but peasants and workers alike. However, neoliberalization of food is doubly antagonistic to Africa: It transforms nature just as much as it transforms man. Hence, the transformation of man and nature is also mutually relational. Transformation, here, generates crisis of metabolic rift opening new frontiers for entropy in the agricultural value chain. Effectively, neoliberal's goal for the continent transcends mere altruist inclination to include (re)distributionary impulse. However, redistribution as engine of accumulation is heavily reliant on an army of malnourished and hungry population to strive. Hence it is about profit and depends upon creation of a "surplus humanity" for whom capitalist civilization has nothing to offer (Davis 2004). In the light of this, any blueprint for the future must address root causes of food shortages occasioned by subsumption of nature to man and the consequential metabolic rift.

### **iv) Global Food politics**

Blame is placed on the global food politics in the cap and trade negotiations of WTO for widening inequalities in food production (kyor, 2009). This has not really helped Africa's transition from food poverty to food security. Politics of food subsidy has perpetually relegated sub-Saharan Africa to the status of net importers of food. Insecurity and conflict over food production is gaining grounds nationally and globally as food is also an economic tool. And with food as both economic and political tool, complexities inherent in food distribution and accessibility are thorny issues at WTO. Thus, the treatment of subsidies is a political tool to achieve economic end of controlling African states. Just as appropriation of Africa's food system is through conceptual mystification, WTO serves to reinforce capital's logic of profit.

### **v) Foreign aid**

The continent is considered by many 'a beggar continent' heavily reliant on agricultural aid to navigate extreme weather such as climate change now ravaging the continent. The prevalence of weak structures has not really helped matters. Most states in sub Saharan Africa have weak institutions militating against realization of the goals of transforming the poor. Burgeoned by internal irrationalities, some of the continent's unpatriotic leaders have encouraged and even applauded debauchery of resources for foreign aid (Baxter, 2010). Still, food aid beneficiaries are susceptible to machinations of their national benefactor. Increasing food aids in Africa is tied to creating enabling environment for business from Northern Countries to project their profitability adjuncts on malleable nations. These nations through lax policies have opened their markets to foreign goods and multinational agribusinesses. Resultantly, their food right is imperilled by the dominance of external market forces and their undue reliance on foreign aid.

### **vi) Industrial food production**

The current industrial food policy is tilted towards industrialized agribusiness planned for complete vertical integration and to dominate all agricultural activities. Arising from this, food concepts and trade policies agreed by most states will continually undermine local food production. An explanation for the reason food sovereignty is of higher priority than food security in Africa. With the current system skewed towards vertical integration and dominance of all activities by a select few, the peasant farmers' total control is concretized. An example of such total control is in Madagascar. In Madagascar, negotiations over a 99-year lease of 1.3 million hectares with Daewoo Logistics Corporation of South Korea for maize and palm oil was aborted due to the role the unpopular deal played in the overthrow of the government in 2009 (von Braun and Meinzen-Dick 2009).

**vii) Food imports**

Liberalization of food imports enabled intense competition from imported food which has displaced some of the products of family farmers from their domestic market (Kyor, 2009). The competition emanating from imports has not been fair, in many cases. This is because imports coming from developed countries are usually heavily subsidized, and thus their prices are artificially cheapened (Kyor, 2006). On the other hand, the farmers of developing countries are usually not subsidized. Moreover, the assistance their governments provide have, in many countries, been withdrawn or substantially reduced due to the structural adjustment policies. The tactics of subsidizing agricultural production provides agro-businesses in developed economies with comparative advantage. This has made sub-Saharan Africa with low adaptive capacity to be on a disadvantaged position. By giving much lenient treatments to agricultural sector in developed countries, African countries cannot sell their farm products in the open market. This underscores filling the food policy vacuum.

Given this, displacement of family farmer and their products has become the subject of global concern. Debates on food import and growing food locally warrants reappraisal of food priorities. A good example is in Ghana. In Ghana, government provided significant subsidies on inputs to farmers. As part of the reform, input subsidies were phased out and their sale was privatized. In 1980 the subsidy rate on fertilizer imports was 65%. By 1984, the rate had fallen to 45%; it rose to 59% in 1985; and was phased out to zero in 1990 (kyor, 2006). Consequently, the price of fertilizers increased astronomically after the removal of subsidies on agricultural inputs and consumption was reduced. The current poor agricultural productivity, particularly in food crops, can partly be attributed to this. With desubsidization of agricultural poor peasant farmers who depend on agriculture for sustenance are driven to further degradations to provide for their families.

**vii) Seed Grabs**

Food conceptual crisis is magnified with Monsanto's total stranglehold on seed production. Monsanto is now a major threat to food sovereignty with the introduction of the terminator (suicide) seed. Terminator seeds are kamikaze seeds which cannot be replanted. The seeds are not replantable and as such the small scale farmers must buy new seedling from the big agribusinesses every planting. Yet, seed translates to food which is a matter of human rights.

According to wikileaks, the US State Department has been aggressively promoting the interest of Monsanto in Africa. US State Department in many of their embassies in developing countries promotes the seeds industry's global agenda. Based on this, many proponents of GMO have been sent to African state to promote GM seeds thereby ensuring their integration to local food system. While Africa has long been intransigent in its stance against introducing genetically modified crops, cracks are forming in the opposition, and the world's leading biotechs (DuPont, Monsanto, and Syngenta among them ) are poised to take advantage of the weakening stance and flood the market with seed, fertilizer, and pesticides (Duprey, 2013). But as Duprey (2013) concludes that if Africa does succumb to the siren song of GM crops, control of the food chain will be taken from the hands of the family farmer and placed into those of the agri-giants. No longer will the traditional practices of seed saving from one year to the next be permitted, but farmers will be forced instead to buy new seed from DuPont or Monsanto each year.

In furtherance of America's global seed grabs agenda, President Obama at a meeting of the G8 unveils a 10 year plan to spend 3 billion dollars on Africa's food security. This altruist intention is considered by anti GMO foods proponents as not well intended and misguided. They of the opinion such food security scheme only aim at promoting US agribusinesses whose primary goal is to bring biotechnologies to African countries (Major, 2013).

Food sovereignty corrects this imbalance in the present food system skewed favourably towards monoculture farms which is threatening to replicate conditions of dependency on others for seeds. The expectation of the food sovereignty is to make food universal human rights in the true sense of the word and not the treatment of food as a commodity. By placing market value on food, farm implements such as seeds will become a scarce commodity. Control of seeds is vital to the peasant and is the fulcrum of the food sovereignty concept. With organizations like Monsanto, Syngenta and Yara International controlling 80% of the seed production in Africa and are now patenting of seed, food crisis will be magnified (WDM, 2014).

Given the power dynamics at play, the current conceptual shrinkage does not favour family farmer neither can it really transform the agricultural practices. Instead, the tension will lead to further appropriation of agricultural system. Tension here is between upholding the people's livelihoods against economic interests of agribusinesses, between bio-corporation and the poor farmers. But in this unequal relation, there is already a winner and loser. The loser is the peasant farmers who is closer to nature and who bears the burden of all agroecological deteriorations. Certainly, a system with predefined winner will not engender endogenous growth rather will heighten food scarcity. This prompts to ask: is food sovereignty concept bailout from food shortages for Africa?

### **Is Food Sovereignty Solution to Africa's Food Crisis?**

Large agribusinesses are forcefully taking over vast swathes of arable land in the name of feeding teeming population of hungry people in Africa. Food sovereignty takes a long term view of this total control of the food system by multinational corporations and sees this as detrimental to human health, economic and socio-cultural wellbeing. Food sovereignty is opposed to market-led reforms especially land and economic reforms which displaces the poor for the rich. It is sees imperialism as being on the rise with the financialization of nature. This explains why it is vehemently opposed to progressive exhaustion of Africa's social ecologies in this new form of eco-imperialism which forces poor countries to adopt neoliberal agricultural policies. A classical example of this impediment to food sovereignty is the dislocation of farm family in Sudan. In Sudan, South Korea has acquired 690,000 hectares for wheat growing; the United Arab Emirates have invested in more than 400,000 hectares to grow corn and other crops, while Egypt has secured a similar area to grow wheat (Matondi et al., 2011).

However, solution to Sudan's food crisis is not in the neoliberalization of internal and external economies. Rather, they should seek policies based on the needs of peoples, societies and the environment. This is because there is an overlap between environmental change and food availability. Where unfavourable conditions prevail, food is available but is equally scarce as access is controlled by economic means. To make food abundant for such a community, the environment favourable for farm family to thrive must be created.

Food sovereignty resolves this problem when all people have the right to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods. Food sovereignty transcends cosmetic changes of food security which is simply concerned with short term food supply. But having access to food does not translate to a satisfying food. A fulfilling food is only attainable with knowledge of being able to eat the next meal. Food sovereignty goes beyond this narrow vision to ensure people have the right to define their own food and agricultural system. And by allowing people to determine their food system, they have the incentive to sustain the ecological integrity of their natural resources. In this way, the ordinary folks will determine their own path out of poverty. This will then bring to end harmful policies which put profit before people and the environment.

However, there are risks attached to placing food system in the hands of the ordinary man without some form of control. Government control is necessary in a climate where the totalizing nature of capital prevails. In such a situation, care should be taken the process is not subverted to pay ecological debts of industrial North. Most Northern countries have squandered their environmental wealth on the profligate altar of over-production of affluence goods. By using Africa as springboard to pay their carbon debt, they are now externalizing cost of keeping their consumer society happy to others.



With food insecurity in the world, the promise of food sovereignty is in agreement with the goals of SDGs and is a right step in the right direction for Africa. On the basis of this, ending global hunger by 2030 is actually attainable. But such lofty goal is only attainable if the waste generated in global food system is judiciously diverted to the less privileged world. In a world where one third of the food produced is wasted annually, ending global hunger is rhetoric and part of the unending global food paradox. If the world community is really desirous of ending global hunger as we are made to believe, we need not wait till 2030 to carry out a function which can end with loud action showing not just intent and resolve but by reallocating the over \$750 billion wasted annually on food not placed on table in the high income countries to low income countries. When food sovereignty is implemented, the journey towards ending global hunger will be won.

### **Conclusion**

Infinite growth is not possible in our ecologically finite world (Meadows et al., 1972). For Africa to achieve eco-efficiency in food provisioning there must be a shift of our flawed extractive/production mentality based on eco-modernists vision monoculture agriculture towards pro-environment and post growth values (A society where there is shift from destruction entropic dynamics to equitable and eco-equivalent utilization of earth's resources). This is where the economic ideology of nature is rebalanced such that economic process of competition and optimization is made to have consideration for ecological assets. It will be where we decouple growth from natural capital depletion. It will further mean going beyond current business-as-usual 'brown' resource intensive food provisioning pathway to forge a post-petroleum society. This will provide basis for broader interaction with nature yet is where slip out of the present mantra of growth wherein 'the more is wasted; the bigger the commonwealth' as ideology of bio-corporations is de-emphasized.

The agro-food regime arising from the ashes of this reordering should not be market-led instruments for ecosystem protection. Rather, should prod the continent's consumption and production towards greener technologies. Still, such green development should not be at the expense of the people's material wellbeing. More so, that globalization of food crisis is just another phase of the broad eco-historical process of capital accumulation and penetration of African markets. At its best, it is a massive statement of the failure of liberal market approach which has now appropriated food. Accordingly, shift in the present architecture will require carefully crafted policies realigning food production towards environmental resources goals. This means building resilience of the people to contend with climate related events ravaging family farmer food output. The appropriation of resilience to neoliberal vision of adaptation does not help matters. Rather, adaptation should be decoupled from market led solution towards people oriented goals and policy for nature. Governments will play crucial role in the unfolding reinvigoration of food regime towards family farmers in the years to come. As government is the last bastion of the ordinary man, they must create individual incentives (including negative ones) to align consumption and production decisions with significant economic and environmental ramifications. In this regard, governments should realign institutional incentives to facilitate the achievement of the goal of agricultural development while bringing about equitable production and distribution of food.

To tackle Africa's challenge requires scalable market based solutions for agriculture-based growth. This will require public/private partnership to fashion out solutions to the perennial food shortfall. A model which serves the farm family is the goal of food sovereignty and so should be upheld. Still, such food regime must be cognizant of the socio-economic, cultural and political specificities of each nation thereby prying from large plantation farms dominance of the food chain. The optimum medium for protecting family farmer's livelihood assets is through capacity building.

Women are constituent part of this transformation and thus must have direct access to micro financing to sustain their farming activities. In this vane, asset to financial services in rural areas must improve. Trade is essential yet such trade resulting from renewed regional integration should open new vista in the relationship between states, ushering in an era of African renaissance driven by the pre-eminence of their collective goal for the common peril which eluded the founding fathers.

Africa's future should be based on food sovereignty concept wherein the common total control of his food circumstance is consolidated. When this concept is fully implemented the end of hunger and poverty enshrined in the SDGs will not be another mirage neither will it be merry go another round of broken promise of eliminating food insecurity. But will be model where food is not just conceptualized but is readily

accessible to all. This is more inclined to the brighter side of food provisioning based on eco-efficiency with many nations progressively gravitating towards food justice.

There is imperative for a positive outlook on food as the implications of biomass economy on food for Africa should change with decarbonization process. In this setting, food production's carbon footprint must reflect our commitment not just to nature but also to future generations. This is because the world is neither created for only you, nor is it going to end with you. Hence the goal of any food framework must reflect inter-temporal dimension of food politics. To attain SDGs goal of ending poverty by 2030, Africa's future must be placed firmly in the hands of the family farmers. Charting a pathway to food sovereignty should not exist in silos as food security but in multilayered continental, national and local dialectics. There is no royal road to the future as Marx would say. But a path wherein all people are inclusively involved in the journey to the future should be the goal of development policy. In this regards, the continent must actively strive to construct a course to the future based on the principles of eco-efficiency if there must have a food sovereign future. Africans must distance themselves from formulating economic policies using poverty as clutches to one where policy stands on its own merit.

The above notwithstanding, Africa should note that the continental benefactor's primary objective in the so-called altruist interventions of feeding hungry population has never really changed. What has changed is the name of the game. Though, the referee has shifted the goal post to reflect our current biophysical realities, the game still remains largely influenced by the game changer's ends. In this case, the dominant change agent and constant factor is capital. In place of covert drive for extraction of ecological surplus and metabolic rift in which food is viewed from the shifting mosaic of greed, we now have an overt eco-capitalist epoch dominated by open-ended tackling of food, energy, water, and profit. This epoch is where there is remorseless preoccupation with market as driver of global economy seen largely as the equitable vehicle for transition to global food justice.

But this should not be. There is the need to be mindful that nature is not just a passive observer of our unending tempering with biophysical limits. Rather, in our haste to re-colonize through eco-cannibalizing act, we have now ended up devouring both human and extra-human nature. Technology plays an important role in this destruction for consumption dynamics in the metabolic state. Since there can be no development without destruction, so also there can be no construction (consumption) without destruction. However, construction elevates man but destruction purifies and magnifies man. And in purifying mankind through destruction, we are cut down to our ordinary nature which itself is subordinated to nature. Therefore, the solutions to destruction is constructing a future based on a new framework I term Food Sufficiency Economy. This model combines eco-friendly principles of food sovereignty and sufficiency economy to chart an eco-sufficient path to food secured future for Africa.

## References

- Agyare-Kwabi P. (2003), "Women and Food Security in West Africa". A paper presented at a seminar on Women, Integrated Farming Systems and Food Security in West Africa, held in Accra from 25 – 28 November 2003
- Baxter, J. (2010) "Africa's land and family farms – up for grabs?" Seedling January, 2010
- Bello, W. (2002). Deglobalization: Ideas for a new world economy. London, England: Zed Books.
- Boon, E. K. (2014). Available at: [www.eolss.net/ebooks/sample%20chapter/c16/E1-48-02](http://www.eolss.net/ebooks/sample%20chapter/c16/E1-48-02)  
Accessed on: 12th March, 2015
- Cotula, L., Vermeulen, S., Leonard, R. and Keeley, J., (2009), 'Land Grab or Development Opportunity?' Agricultural Investment and International Land Deals in Africa, IIED/FAO/IFAD, London/Rome (p. 57)
- Davis D. K. (2006). "Neoliberalism, environmentalism, and agricultural restructuring in Morocco". *The Geographical Journal* 172:88-105.
- Duprey, R. (2013) "Monsanto's Next Conquest for GMO Dominance". The Motley Fool, <http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2013/09/14/why-you-should-invest-in-monsanto.aspx>

- De Schutter, O. (2011). "The Green Rush: The Global Race for farmland and the Rights of the Land Owners". Harvard International Law Journal / Vol. 52. No.2 Available at: [www.harvardji.org/wp-content/uploads/.../HILJ\\_52-2\\_De-Schutter.pdf](http://www.harvardji.org/wp-content/uploads/.../HILJ_52-2_De-Schutter.pdf) Accessed on: 12th March, 2015
- FAO (2001), *Handbook for Defining and Setting up a Food Security Information and Early Warning System* (FSIEWS), Rome, Italy.
- Foster, J. B. (2000), *Marx's Ecology*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Furman, J. (2015). "The World Bank's race to the bottom". *The Guardian Newspaper*, Thursday 16 April 2015.
- IPCC- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2014). "IPCC Fifth Assessment Synthesis (longer) Report". Available at: [www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/.../SYR\\_AR5\\_LONGERREPORT.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/.../SYR_AR5_LONGERREPORT.pdf) Accessed on: 2nd November, 2014.
- Kyor, M. (2009). "The Impact of Globalisation and Liberalisation on Agriculture and Small Farmers in Developing Countries: The Experience of Ghana". IFAD. Third World Network.
- Kyor, M. (2006). *Globalization and the South: Some Critical Issues*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Lagarde, C. (2014). "The New Multilateralism for the 21st Century". The Richard Dimbleby Lecture. BBC News of 3rd February 2014. Available at: [www.imf.org/external/np/speechies/2014/0201314.html](http://www.imf.org/external/np/speechies/2014/0201314.html) Accessed on: 3rd February 2015.
- La via Campesina (2009). "Industrial Agrofuel fuels global Hunger and Poverty". *The La Via Campesina Notebooks*. Notebook No. 1 November 2009 Jakarta: La Via Campesina
- Major, M. M. (2013). "African farmers' problems can't be solved by high-tech seeds". Africa Review, <http://www.africareview.com//Opinion/African+farmers+problems+cant+be+solved+by+high+tech+seeds/-/979188/1990948/-/s12tms/-/index.html>
- Marx, K. (1976), *Capital*, Vol. I. B. Fowkes. Trans. New York: Vintage.
- Matondi, P., Havnevik, K. and Beyene, A. (2011). *Biofuels, Land Grabbing and Food Security in Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Monbiot, G. (2014). "Put a Price on Nature? We must stop this neoliberal road to ruin". SPERRI Annual Lecture, hosted by the Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Sheffield. Available at: <http://www.guardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot/2014/jul/24/price-nature-neoliberal-capital-road-ruin>. Accessed on: 12th March, 2015
- Moore, J. W. (2001), "(Re) Discovering Marx's materialism". *Organization & Environment*, 14(2).
- Moore, J. W. (2011), "Transcending the Metabolic Rift: A Theory of Crises in the Capitalist World-Ecology." *Journal of Peasant Studies* (38)1.
- Murphy, S. (2013). "Land Grabs and Fragile Food Systems: The Role of Globalization. Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy". available at [www.iatp.org](http://www.iatp.org)
- Mwaniki, A. (2006). "Achieving Food Security in Africa: Challenges and Issues". Cornell University, U.S. Plant, Soil and Nutrition Laboratory [www.un.org/africa/.../Achieving%20food%20security%20in%20Africa-ch](http://www.un.org/africa/.../Achieving%20food%20security%20in%20Africa-ch)
- Okoh, Augustine. I. Sadiq (2013). *Political economy of climate change in Africa*, German: Lambert Academic Publishing. ISBN:978-3-659-373114. Available at: <http://www.amazon.com/Political-Economy-Climate-change-in-Africa/dp/3659373117>
- Okoh, Augustine I. Sadiq (2014). 'Breaking the Green Economy Theoretical Silence in Africa: Towards an Eco-cannibal's Theory of Nature'. *Journal of economics and Accounting* (SCSR-JEA) Volume 1. Issue 1 (October, 2014) pp 01-11
- Salleh, A. (2010). "From Metabolic Rift to Metabolic Value: Reflections on Environmental Sociology and the Alternative Globalization Movement" SAGE Publications. *Organization & Environment* 23(2) 205 –219

- Saulter, C. (2014), 'Food Security in Africa series: Resilience Strategies in Fragile States' Climate Change and African Political Stability. Research Brief No. 25. Robert S. Strauss Centre for International Security and Law University of Texas, Austin.
- Timmer, C. P. (2012), "Behavioural Dimensions of Food Security". Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. USA.  
Available at <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0913213107>. Accessed on: 12th March, 2015
- Von Braun, J. and Meinzen-Dick, R. (2009). ‘ “Land grabbing” by foreign investors in developing countries: Risks and opportunities’, IFPRI Policy Brief, 13 April
- Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1996). Our ecological footprint. Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society.
- Wallace, R. G. and Kock, R. A. (2012). 'Whose Food Footprint? Capitalism, Agriculture and the Environment', *Human Geography*. 71 Volume 5, Number 1.
- Weber, A. (2013). The Economy of Wastefulness: The Biology of the Commons Available at: [www.boell.de/de/node/2777222](http://www.boell.de/de/node/2777222) Accessed on: 12th March, 2015
- York, R., & Rosa, E. (2003). Key challenges to ecological modernization theory. *Organization & Environment*, 16, 273-288.
- Ziegler, J. (2007). “Special Report on the Right to Food to the UN General Assembly,” 62nd session. Available at:  
[http://www.swissinfo.org/eng/front/detail/UN\\_rapporteur\\_calls\\_for\\_biofuel\\_moratorium.html?siteSect=105&sid=8305080&cKey=1192127505000&ty=st](http://www.swissinfo.org/eng/front/detail/UN_rapporteur_calls_for_biofuel_moratorium.html?siteSect=105&sid=8305080&cKey=1192127505000&ty=st)  
Accessed on: 12th March, 2015.