

Foodocracy and the Politics of Radical Care in *The Black Soil*¹

Om Prakash Dwivedi

Bennett University, India

Abstract

The paper examines the extractive forces that systematically erode the life conditions of the citizens of Perumalpuram village. Deprived of any rights, even the right to be identified as humans, the villagers are treated as wasted lives, good enough only to work without any monetary benefit, on the farms owned illegally by the village head, Sarkaraisamy, also known as the Master. Focussing on the food shortage and lack of affective bonds, the paper advocates a turn from governmentality to carementality, the base of which is the creation, recognition, and promotion of foodocracy and networks of care. It identifies foodocracy as a reformative movement, exposing the structural inequity and disfranchisement and leading to enhanced vulnerability in Perumalpuram and the surrounding regions. That foodocracy should not be limited to this village but become a zeitgeist in the global fight for equal access to food is the central argument of this paper. That is to say, this paper underlines the need to make foodocracy a global movement for collective survival.

Keywords: foodocracy, networks of care, radical movement, *The Black Soil*, carementality, extractive capitalism

Introduction

Capitalism exists in different forms and manifestations. It goes without saying that it is predatory in nature as it situates the human body in terms of labour and value. The extension of our capitalist network has resulted in the dilution and mitigation of our networks of care. As one understands, capitalist networks are staunchly opposed to structures of care and social welfare since these are seen as resources through which they can derive their profit and maintain their status quo. Rapacious, predatory, and self-serving as these are, the capitalist structures are always in the mode of 24*7 accumulation, thus evading and erasing channels of

communication and interactions. It is, therefore, not a surprise to understand that the communication modes it understands and explicitly points out are the productivity of the working class and the promotion of commodity cultures.

There is an extremely rigid division between work and life to the extent that work never ends and life hardly witnesses any balance. That is to say, life is to be found in experiences of continuous trauma, suffering, and loss, while death is always already a given fate. The capitalist structures ensure that the fragility of life is squeezed to impairment by brutal work and undemocratic conditions. In the wake of such radical conditions, the boundaries of life and death blur, even merging into each other. This predicament is precarious, nonetheless, a fact of our brutal times, underpinned by cycles of persistent extraction and endless self-accumulation of capitalists. Such an undemocratic and ruthless structure is what Nancy Fraser terms “cannibal capitalism” (2022) resulting in “a general crisis of the entire societal order in which all those calamities converge, exacerbating one another and threatening to swallow us whole.” (2022, xv) Fraser’s concept of “cannibal capitalism” is very apt as it makes us see the processes through which “capitalism’s signatory process of expropriation, [and] exploitation” are part of quotidian life. This leads us to a condition of radical life that teems with structural inequality and injustice.

This ruthlessness has long been a customary signature of extractive capitalism, not just limited to the neoliberal age. The paper examines the extractive forces that systematically erode the life conditions of the citizens of Perumalpuram village. Deprived of any rights, even the right to be identified as humans, the villagers are treated as wasted lives, good enough only to work without any monetary benefit, on the farms owned illegally by the village head, Sarkaraisamy, also known as the Master. Focussing on the food shortage and lack of affective bonds, the paper advocates a turn from governmentality to carementality, the base of

which is the creation, recognition, and promotion of foodocracy and networks of care. It identifies foodocracy as a reformative movement, exposing the structural inequity and disfranchisement and leading to enhanced vulnerability in Perumalpuram and the surrounding regions. That foodocracy should not be limited to this village but become a zeitgeist in the global fight for equal access to food is the central argument of this paper. That is to say, this paper underlines the need to make foodocracy a global movement for collective survival.

Foodocracy and the Right to Exist

The 2023 data of the World Health Organization reveals the darker side of our human world, “Around 735 million people currently facing hunger, compared to 613 million in 2019.” (WHO online) The reasons, of course, differ for this steep rise in hunger data. However, one cannot deny that the feudal nature of the state and the accentuating power of neoliberal ideologies continue to be enveloping factors. Hence, it is no surprise to see underdeveloped nations being worst hit by the hunger factor. For example, Africa “remains the worst-affected region with one in five people facing hunger on the continent, more than twice the global average.” (WHO online). Likewise, the same data goes on to highlight the brutal face that impairs the growth and development in such nations with “millions of children under five continue to suffer from malnutrition: in 2022, 148 million children under five years of age (22.3 percent) were stunted, 45 million (6.8 percent) were wasted, and 37 million (5.6 percent) were overweight.”

With rhapsodizing rhetoric of growth and development, the WHO data and ground reality of many global south countries expose the hypocrisy of our globalized world. How else does one justify the “deterioration of healthy diets” that registered “more than 3.1 billion people in the world – or 42 percent – were unable to afford a healthy diet in 2021”? The fairy tale triggered by the United Nations Sustainable Goals 2023 also seems a farce as Goal 2 (Zero Hunger), which envisages eradicating hunger from the world, achieving food security, and

improving nutrition and sustainable agriculture continues to be problematized. If one buys the utopian argument that the world has enough food for anyone then why do these data represent squeamish reality?

Growth, development, and sustainability cannot be just keywords that end up only in policies, they need to be translated into action for which, a democratic movement for food justice is needed. I conceptualize this movement of global justice for food as “foododcracy. Foodocracy is a clarion call for equitable access to food, not just as basic human rights, but also as the very constituent of life. Of course, life also needs other important elements such as care, love, empathy, and resilience, and the movement for foodocracy can only be achieved by converging all of them into the ultimate goal of equal access to growth and development. As Allen advocates, “no other public issue is as accessible to people in their daily lives as that of food justice. Everyone – regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, or social class – eats. We are all involved and we are all implicated.” (2008, 159) Afterall, is no hidden secret that “when people lack the opportunity to earn enough income, to be educated and gain skills, to meet basic health needs and have a voice in the decisions that affect their community,” according to the Hunger Project, a global nonprofit organisation working towards the goal of sustainable development and eradication of hunger. (Los Angeles Times online)

Situating this crisis within *The Black Soil (TBS)*, one finds the underlying tension of food scarcity that damages the quotidian life of Perumalpuram inhabitants. While the Master enjoys his privileges and unchecked corruption, he converts all the villagers into labours, and the entire village land into resources for himself, thus keeping them in a perpetual state of hunger. The Master is an authoritarian figure, almost the epitome of Dracula, who sucks the blood of the entire village, ensuring his control over their daily life and deciding the right of life and death for them. Of course, the village master’s brutalism is derived from the

exceptional sovereignty that he enjoys over the whole village. No wonder, he ensures that matters pertaining to socio-political and economic conditions in the village are decided by him. This is precisely what Achille Mbembe conceptualizes as “necropolitics” (2019) which assigns sovereignty “to dictate who is able to live and who must die.” (66) Mbembe argues that in the necropolitical structure, “to kill or to let live thus constitutes sovereignty’s limits, its principal attributes. To be sovereign is to exert one’s control over mortality and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power.” (66) The fanatical disavowal of life conditions in this novel is an extreme case of feudal certitude, that subscribes to violent methods of controlling and diminishing conditions and resources needed to sustain and promote life. In the absence of any democratic ethos in the village, life becomes a death zone, as we can witness in the case of Kannappan, who has just landed in the village to teach as the new schoolmaster, “He felt he was living in an alien land with which he was in no way connected. Not knowing how to live in this land with its people, he stood in front of the school, perplexed.” (12)

The village master’s exceptional sovereignty leads to the creation of horrific conditions, denying education, work, and even food for them. The master has become a supreme authority, and the villagers seem to have no point of departure from this web of brutality, endlessly reproducing the same brutal conditions as predefined and foreclosed destiny. How else can one justify the denial of food even after a full day of hard work by the villagers on the land that was once owned by them, and has been confiscated by the master by tricks and violent methods? The breaths of these workers continue to gasp in the search and desperate hope for food. In other words, one can argue that even their breaths have been monetized for the landlord, making the entire region unsecular and undemocratic. The following passage exposes the dilapidated conditions of the villagers:

Except Sarkaraisamy, all others worked for daily wages. A few of them owned small pieces of land, which ultimately failed to feed them even for four days. Just like a bald dotard grooming his scant locks of hair, they cultivated their lands. It was the landlord's fields that actually fed them. Even an ex-serviceman, who had fought in the Second World War and had lost a leg and received ten acres of land as compensation, had pledged a major part of his land to the landlord in order to educate his son. (10)

Evidently, the hunger and poverty highlighted in the novel are not tenured, but a transgenerational one, passing on from one generation to the next, in the absence of any reformative measures. The landlord, who also happens to be the village council head ensures the council is devoid of any law or planning. "No opposition; no elections. Whosoever the landlord chose became a Panchayat [Council] member, and the landlord himself was the eternal President." (11)

Frustrated by the "unbearable hunger pangs" (44), the villagers gather in the Master's house to raise their daily allowance citing the fact that "we coolies might get work ten to fifteen days per month; but for thirty days of the month, we have to feed ourselves with what we earn... We can't afford it." (45) But the master is untenable, "This is the way, I want to pay. Work if you can, or else work elsewhere. ... Leave now... Stop thinking with your stomach." (45) Since the Master had occupied the entire village, it is obvious that these villagers do not have any alternative to eradicate their pervasive hunger and poverty. It is this unsecular character of the Master that has eschewed democratic reforms in the village, throwing the villagers into a perpetual state of crisis.

That is why, the foodocracy movement that I advocate for the global redistribution of food, resonates with the democratic norms of the worldmaking exercises, in the sense that food access and distribution should not be demarcated upon the faulty lines of race, class, nation,

and gender, rather it should contribute to collective capacity for health. In other words, foodocracy is ‘of the people, for the people, and by the people.’ Foodocracy, therefore, also demands a mediated space for dissolving the rapacious boundaries that guard and divert the supply to a particular class and geographical spaces while ensuring that the rest continues to gasp in its shortage as one also witnesses in *TBS*.

This democratic reform in the novel is put into action by Kannappan, a newly appointed schoolteacher in the only school that the village had. On joining the school, Kannappan, is surprised to witness the absence of students. Food is the only thing that draws them to the school. The availability of food thus becomes the driving source for its existence. In one such passage in the *TBS*, the students talk of the importance of sharing the food. Overhearing this, Veerayyan, another rebellious character that we come across in the novel, expresses his curiosity to inquire about what’s happening in the school, to which Kannappan responds:

‘We’ve to share the food we get.’

One witnesses this moving conversation between the two:

‘So who is sharing?’

‘No one does really.’

‘So what is all this reciting aloud about?’

‘In the hope of achieving it in future.’

Is it? All right. You feed the children daily for free. How can a country develop when its children are trained to beg early in childhood? (29)

The ruptured relationship between education and the future also happens to be the defined limits of the villagers. In that region deprived of any social measures, what one witnesses is a

brutal exercise of worldmaking. As also shown in *TBS*, it is vital to keep an eye on the culpability of extractive ideologies and feudal mindsets that neither know nor follow any social order. For example, Kannappan is appalled to experience the inhuman conditions in the village. “The thought of falling into the cruel quicksand of poverty – which killed the heart, burnt feelings, forcibly pushed one into an unwanted life, made one the enemy of one’s own self, caused one to hurt and become imprisoned in oneself that made filling the stomach the sole reason for survival.” (12) The fact that the Master has managed to evade the scrutiny of law and order only substantiates the collusion of feudal and state in this case.

Hence, this paper argues that achieving the aim of foodocracy also requires continuous negotiations and resilience since it is not a one-time goal, rather it is a processual moment, concerning both the present and the future alike. It comes out forcefully when Veerayyan discloses to Kannappan that the Master is abhorrent to the idea of reading. “I asked Master. He is saying that reading newspapers would spoil the village.” (51) The process of reading is tantamount to the process of digging out the hidden facts as it is about the imaginational stretch to conceptualise and experience freedom. Reading can lead to cross-fertilization of ideas, which are so central in framing and shaping the movement of foodocracy. The power of words is also the culmination of our actions and emotions, shaping the power of our will to change the world. It needs to be emphasized that words shape and define the way we breathe. If we see breathing as an act of *living*, it is vital to widen the imaginative purchase of words to make us feel and to make us live. What cannot be imagined, can never be created. That is why Kannappan was adamant in his efforts to build a reading library for the villagers in order to chart out their freedom movement. Elsewhere I have argued, that “Freedom, therefore, preconditions an institutional form. While our democratic rights warrant us access to justice, to equality, and to other social welfare measures, it is problematized in the absence of a shared concern for each other’s suffering.” (2022 170) The framing of such a society is central to

Kannappan's mission, "If only I could channelize all this enthusiasm and speed to help these youngsters build a new society, how great that society would be." (150) As Ernest Renan also prefigured, the realisation to have a collective present is vital. Equally crucial is "to have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present; [...] these are the essential conditions for being a people." (1990 19)

Also, reading and resilience are closely tied to each other. For, both reading and resilience require constant engagement in search of meanings. This is symbolically represented in *TBS*, when Pattalathar, one of the seniors in the village, recounts the woeful tale of his son for whose education he had sold off whatever he possessed. But the rebellious nature rendered by education imperils his future. "I believe he led a strike in the college and that is why he got rusticated. We are not fortunate. Looks like he is destined to plough the land for wages for this master." (79) As already argued, resilience requires constant efforts because it is only through repeated efforts that one may achieve the goal.

It is no wonder that the idea of resilience undergirding foodocracy is reinforced forcefully by Herman and Goodman in their editorial. In a disparaging mood about the inequities of our global conditions that control and distort the food supply and its equitable access, they argue for a more nuanced understanding of our socio-economic conditions. Summing this phenomenon "as a contested and complex *practice*", they suggest, "it is not enough to merely talk about food justice, but rather it needs to be explicitly enacted through everyday and ongoing action that is increasingly international." (2018 1042)

Kannappan and Veerayyan are both aware of the transformative power of education as a mode of resilience that can restore our denied rights and dignity. Throughout *TBS*, one can easily notice the solidarity for the community expressed firmly by both these characters. While Kannappan was a schoolteacher, working to create a new society, Veerayana was a farmer,

working for the Master but equally concerned for the welfare of the villagers. So, while Kannappan “yearned for a revolution to happen that very moment; for a new society where the survival of every newborn was promised. In his heart, turbulent with passion, a few lines of poetry took shape and began to prick at it” (91), Veerayan decides to rebel against the Master citing the fact, “No one treats even cattle the despicable way he treats those who work for him.” Disturbed by “his work and curses. ...I’ll work and survive or starve to death. I will not accept giving up my self-respect and surviving my fate.” (191)

If one situates these incidents to widen the conceptual framework of foodocracy, it becomes evident that this movement demands frameworks for persistence and the creation of a fulcrum of social steadiness. In this context, I define foodocracy as the world-making exercise, that promotes and legitimises not just the individual world, but a collective world, driven by the guiding objective of food justice and food sovereignty. The merit of viewing this as a world-making process is also to disavow the palpable existence of unequal integration of the global north and global south, thereby demanding equal access to resources and growth opportunities. Foodocracy, therefore, advances the urgency to reconfigure phenomenology of world-making and global redistribution of food, that has been marred with hierarchies and racial prejudices. Of course, it needs to be underlined that that in the drive for global equality, the focus on local regions should not be sacrificed. For, there cannot be an equal global order in the wake of existing local inequities and material injustices.

For foodocracy to be achieved, dialogical spaces alone will not suffice, one also needs performative zones, assigning these zones as potential structures of positive transformation. As Bruin, et. al. aver “[T]he risk is that not all principles are adopted and existing injustices are reproduced or new injustices are created.” (2023 346). That is why, the rallying cry for foodocracy is tied inextricably to the power of acting, which is the tipping point for charting

out equitable access to food and sustainable growth. To derive power for one's own existence, or to wage the battle for the welfare of underprivileged people requires exposing and mitigating the unchecked villainy of the state-capital nexus and subsequently creating and promoting a general imperative of care. Like our body requires food, in the same way, our existence requires a regular supply of care, hence, in our framework of foodocracy, care needs to drive the movement for equitable access to food for all.

Both food and care are focused not just on healing and repairing this present moment but also on nourishing the future. The rootedness in this *now* of care navigates the future of the body. There can be no future if there is no now after all. It is therefore vital to develop this caricatured understanding of foodocracy, which is twofold – nourishing the present while creating a sustainable model of the future. Derrida captures the interrelatedness of the future with the present in a telling way: “The future can be anticipated only in the form of an absolute danger. It is that which breaks absolutely with constituted normality and can therefore only announce itself, *present* itself, in the species of monstrosity.” (2016 5) The radicality of the present moment is also enough to expose the lies that underpin stories of future growth and development. As individuals, our existence and identity are not only relational but also constitutional, that is to say, we are dependent and constituted by/with external sources for our survival and well-being, and in this way, one is invariably and relationally constituted with the other. It is in this moment, therefore, that one has to live because it is in this very moment that one breathes. The question of growth is equally a question of how one breathes, which in turn is linked to the amount of food or what kind of food one gets access to. Like growth without any pattern or rhythm is detrimental, in the same way, breathing also requires a balanced supply of food.

How can one exist or breathe in the absence of food or its limited supply? For that breathing or existence will be a perennially traumatic and endless journey of burnout syndrome. Hence, foodocracy opens up an aperture for deconstructing the radical forces that limit food supply and promote iniquitous life conditions in the global south. That is why Derrida was quick to understand this future not just as an absence in this present moment but as the very possibility of the same present as a perennial condition of humans. In his skeptical tone, Derrida offers a caveat to be aware of the luring of the future, “[W]henever something other can arrive, there is a “to come,” there is something of a “future-to-come.” With the determinism you spoke of, there is no future.” (2004 53) This pervasive conflict between the present and future also defines the waxing-waning moment of our existence. Foodocracy, therefore, insists on the performative spaces in this very present moment. Building a future inevitably requires a strong base in this very presence but the brutal conditions that divert food supply to more privileged spaces continue to erode and question our collective presence. After all, “food is more than just another commodity and people are more than just consumers.” (Levkoe 2006, 90).

In the wake of such uncertain conditions, the underlying assumption of foodocracy is to approach our life as a probationary one, always open for rigorous scrutiny and subsequent updates. Through its probationary approach, foodocracy aims to strike a balance between enriched and impoverished conditions, thus legitimizing and celebrating spaces of mutual recognition. The driving force of foodocracy is the realization that for many of us, there may not be enough future, but certainly, there is this present moment that can be invested with love and care to make our lives more secular. The purpose of our life can hardly be found in that celebrated future because there is no future; it keeps evading and shifting like a mirage, or, like that momentary ripple in water when one throws a stone at it. There is only this *now*, this present moment, which we can *live* and *feel*. Seen this way, foodocracy is not a project of waiting, but a project in-making, demanding situatedness *right here, right now*, while

debunking the exceptional sovereignty of the state-capital nexus that often promotes a euphoric proposition of the future. Future-oriented as it is, foodocracy identifies this present moment as fertile, holding possibilities to map our territories of self-creation while also underlining the explicit point, “that the benefits and risks of where, what and how food is grown and produced, transported and distributed, and accessed and eaten are shared fairly” (Gottlieb and Joshi 2013, 6).

The demand for equitable access to food is an alien idea to the extractive forces of the state-capital duo. This deeply privileged system of production monetizes everything by evading the scrutiny of laws, immunized as it is, and stoking mostly the rhetorics of development, growth, and inclusiveness. But to see and evaluate everything in terms of economy is a naïve idea because connects only with the availability and the subsequent disposability of resources. Precisely, why Bruno Latour advocates the need to restructure:

the system of production but to get out of it altogether. We should remember that this idea of framing everything in terms of the economy is a new thing in human history.

The pandemic has shown us the economy is a very narrow and limited way of organising life and deciding who is important and who is not important. (Latour online)

In conceptualizing foodocracy, it is important to be cognizant of the fact that if access to food gets determined by the capacity of one’s pocket, then life is already foreclosed to sustainable growth; in fact, it is doomed, and that is why the critical purchase of foodocracy lies in its combative power to promote living zones with unfailing regularity. The power to bring the non-liveable zone into conversation with the liveable ones can only be triggered when one recognizes that all life matters. That is the radical call of foodocracy. Hence, this paper suggests a shift from governmentality to carementality that has more potential to churn out a socialist structure. Likewise, Susan Philip puts it, “food can function as a love language, its familiar

aromas, colours, and textures speaking of care, concern, and comfort.” (2022 i) Seen this way, this paper argues that foodocracy is not just a social movement, but it needs to be an imperative condition from which life takes its flight.

Networks of Care

What unites the entire Perumalpuram village are issues of hunger and poverty and, therefore, Kannappan is cognizant of the fact that to alleviate their conditions it is vital to create structures of empowerment. For Kannappan, this empowerment drive is to be rooted in networks of care. Faced with his suspension by the Education Commissioner for his empowerment drive and also for not paying bribes to the administration, Kannappan does not lose any hope. His enemies are far too many, including the prominent Master, but he realizes that his cause is a bigger one, for which he is willing to sacrifice his job:

I’ve developed a deep bond with this karisal soil. Successful life or utter failure, let it happen here on this black soil. I’ll do farming with Veerayyan. Whatever they eat will be there for me too! Let’s see how far these plotting games go!

In a highly evocative conversation with his lover, Ponni, Kannappan sheds light on his commitment to bring about epochal changes in the village:

‘Why’ Aren’t you happy now?, he asked.

‘I’m happy.’

‘Then why would we go to any lone island?’

‘Humans are not letting us be happy.’

‘Then we should fight against them.’

‘What if we are defeated?’

‘How can we live if you surrender even before starting?’ (305)

This conversation is important at many levels. First, it recognizes that a spirit of resilience is vital to living this life. Second, Kannappan prioritizes the community before his lover or himself, which underlines the implicit suggestion of the transition from a feudal state to a communist state, which promotes equality, care, and justice. When the Master devises a plan to let some hooligans from the neighbouring region work on his land, it was Kannappan's and Veerayyan's unfailing meetings that encouraged the villagers to not yield and resist such a move. Listen to what Kondappan says:

‘We'll definitely get into the field, Ayya! You just see! Listen! We are born to work on this land. We will not go anywhere and no one else is coming here! Either we farm here or we die here!’

He continues:

‘If we are not able to stop them tomorrow, then we have nowhere to go – no home, no wife, no children... nothing!... So tomorrow everybody come prepared...’United we can change the world!’ (227 – 228)

What started as a one-man protest, has now become contagious, which convincingly demonstrates the reformative power of Kannappan's teachings, aided and abetted by Veerayan. Apparently, these two periodize the transitory movement from governmentality to carementality, driven as it is by a general imperative of the importance of care in our daily life.

In redescribing the stark divide between villages and the Master, which could also be seen as an issue of epistemic marginalization since the Master continues to strive to impose legal and economic forms of domination on them, he stops giving them wages in the hope they would end their rebellion against him and work on his farmland again. That does not happen as Kannappan and Veerayan formulate a plan, urging all the villagers to contribute to their

mission in whatever capacity they can. They were able to collect sufficient money to buy resources and start work on their farms. Their rebellion sets up an example for the nearby villages as well, who were also subjected to humiliating life conditions by their Masters. For example, Andiyyappan makes a revelation:

Master, do you think your issue is restricted to your village? Everyone is talking about it. In many villages, the workers are threatening their masters, asking for better wages by using this example. ... Times have changed, Master. Better you change to suit the times.” (314)

The agency to redeem the entire village is set in motion. Consequently, one witnesses the unity among them, which is rooted not in monetary goals but in promoting and maintaining networks of care, in the ultimate realization that life demands a constant supply of resilience. Precisely, why “renewing and strengthening the decimated social contract requires investment in our resilience. The struggle in the present will determine the quality of the future for these precarious lives.” (Dwivedi 2023, 41)

The intimate connection between foodocracy and networks of care can be gauged from the realization that together they are potentially viable for charting out a map of our collective world, undeterred by the dominating global hierarchies and neocolonial tendencies and practices, giving new directions to issues about the promotion of our socialist world, collective health, and survival. The fusion of these two movements is needed to maintain “an hostility towards ‘holistic forms of social explanation.” (Lazarus 2002, 21) Or, as also advanced by Angela Davis, who weds the idea of social justice to care, “I think our notion of what counts as radical have changed over times. Self-care and healing attention to the body and spiritual dimension - all of these are now a part of radical social justice struggles.” (2016 online). In the same vein, Hobart and Kneese in their excellent editorial emphasise the need for radical care

in uncertain times arguing that, “radical care is inseparable from systemic inequality and power structures, it can be used to coerce subjects into new forms of surveillance and unpaid labor, to make up for institutional neglect, and even to position some groups against others, determining who is worthy of care and who is not.” (2020 2) The movement to trigger this shift from radical structures of injustices to social welfare requires an unflinching commitment as Kannappan points out in *TBS*, “We are human beings. Get more involved in your duties. Your sorrows will disappear...” (390)

Conclusion

Human life is a process and it would be a severe injustice to impair life by prejudiced and unfavorable regulations that favour one group or region over the other. The paper aimed to advocate the need for a radical movement to give a new direction to our distorted world, driven and governed as it is by the keywords of profit and loss. That is why, foodocracy aims to inflate the world-making processes with possibilities of sovereignty and sustainability, assigning more recognition to shared responsibility and collective actions. The fact is that the resources are always already locked within the power networks, as also convincingly demonstrated in *The Black Soil*, and for us to reclaim the lost world, it is important to think of radical strategies. There can be no discount to the crude reality that controlling food distribution is also tantamount to controlling life and death. Social needs and social security need to be in constant conversation with structures of power and injustices that tend to control this thing we call life.

Notes

1- The idea of ‘foodocracy’ was conceived in a conversation with my friend, Johan Höglund, Linnaeus University, Sweden. I am grateful to him for being so encouraging and supportive of my work.

Works Cited

- Allen, Patricia. "Mining for Justice in the Food System: Perceptions, Practices, and Possibilities." *Agriculture and Human Values* 25: 157–161, 2008.
- Bruin, Annemarieke de, et.al. "Easier said than defined? Conceptualising Justice in Food System Transitions." *Agriculture and Human Values*. 41: 345 – 362, 2023.
- Davis, Angela. "The Radical Work of Healing: Fania and Angela Davis on a New Kind of Civil Rights Activism," *Yes Magazine*. 19 Feb. 2016.
<https://www.yesmagazine.org/issue/life-after-oil/2016/02/19/the-radical-work-of-healing-fania-and-angela-davis-on-a-new-kind-of-civil-rights-activism>. Accessed on May 15, 2024.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016.
- Derrida Jacques and Elisabeth Roudineco. *For What Tomorrow: A Dialogue*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 2004.
- Dwivedi, Om Prakash. "Marginality and Traumatic Realism: Mapping the Human Rights Discourse in *Jai Bhim*." *Journal of Asia-Pacific Pop Culture*. Vol. 7.2: 167 – 182.
- _____. "Precarity and Resilience in Kavery Nambisan's *The Story That Must Not be Told*," *ASIATIC* Vol. 17.2 : 31 – 42, 2023.
- Fraser, Nancy. *Cannibal Capitalism: How Our System is Devouring Democracy, Care, and the Planet – And What We Can Do About It*. London: Verso. 2022.
- Gottlieb, Robert., and Anupama Joshi. *Food justice*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 2013.
- Herman, Agatha and Mike Goodman. "Editorial: New Spaces for Food Justice." *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability* 23(11): 1042 – 1046, 2018
- Hobart, Hi 'ilei Julia Kawehipuaakahaopulani and Tamara Kneese. "Radical Care: Survival Strategies for Uncertain Times," *Social Text*. Vol. 38.1: 1 – 16, 2020.
- Latour, Bruno. "This is a Global Catastrophe." *The Guardian*. 6 January 2020.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jun/06/bruno-latour-coronavirus-gaia-hypothesis-climate-crisis>. Accessed on May 14, 2024.
- Lazarus, Neil. *The Postcolonial Unconscious*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Levkoe, Charles Z. "Learning Democracy through Food Justice Movements." *Agriculture and Human Values*. 23: 89–98, 2006.

Mbembe, Achille. *Necropolitics*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. 2019.

Philip, Susan. “Editorial: Food for the Body, Food for the Soul,” *SARE: Southeast Asian Review of English*. Vol. 59, Issue 2 | 2022 I – iv.

Ponneelan. *The Black Soil*. Translated by J. Priyadarshini. New Delhi: Penguin. 2023.

Renan, Ernest. “What is a Nation?,” in Homi Bhabha ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990, 8 – 22.

Simons, Ann M. “On World Hunger Day, a look at why so many people don’t get enough Food,” *Los Angeles Times*. 28 May, 2017. <https://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-world-hunger-day-20170528-story.html>. Accessed on 12 May, 2024.

UN Report “122 million more people pushed into hunger since 2019 due to multiple crises, reveals UN report.” 12 July 2019. <https://www.who.int/news/item/12-07-2023-122-million-more-people-pushed-into-hunger-since-2019-due-to-multiple-crises--reveals-un-report>. Accessed 12 May, 2024.