This is a pre-print version. Please cite the published version of the paper available at:

Anderson, C. R., Ferrando, T., Blay-Palmer, A., Espinosa-García, F. J., Cabral, L., Termine, P., … Zurek, M. (2025). **Time for a vision exam: diagnosing problems in the pursuit of equitably transformative resilience in food systems**. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 1–20.

Time for a vision exam: Diagnosing problems in the pursuit of equitably transformative resilience in food systems

Colin Anderson, Tomaso Ferrando, Alison Blay-Palmer, Francisco J. Espinosa-García,, Lídia Cabral,, Paola Termine, Johanna Wilkes, Tammara Soma, Garima Bhalla, Isabel Madzorera, Philip Antwi-Agyei,

Abstract

Amid intensifying climate change, biodiversity collapse, political instability, and widening inequality, the urgency to reimagine food systems is greater than ever. This commentary builds on the concept of Equitably Transformative Resilience (ETR), first proposed in the 2025 *High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE-FSN)* report *Building Resilient Food Systems* (HLPE, 2025). As elaborated in the report, conventional approaches to resilience emphasize "bouncing back," through privileging risk management and return to its prior state, reinforcing the very structures that generated vulnerability. These framings obscure ecological fragility and entrenched inequities, leaving communities and ecosystems unable to achieve genuine resilience. Drawing on the HLPE report and the wider literature, we use an eye exam metaphor to identify six "vision problems" that distort dominant resilience framings in relation to food systems: (1) tunnel vision (siloed thinking), (2) bifocalism (separating ecological and social dimensions), (3 and 4) temporal myopias (ignoring historical injustices and short-termism), (5) spatial myopia (overlooking cross-scale dynamics), and (6) overlooking intersectionality. Correcting these distortions illuminates pathways toward ETR.

Introduction

As overlapping crises intensify, the resilience of food systems has emerged as a central concern in both policy and research (FAO et al., 2024; OECD, 2025). Disruptive and existential threats, such as climate change, biodiversity collapse, pandemics, corporate consolidation, conflict, and economic instability have made communities around the world less resilient. These overlapping crises have also raised the stakes and oriented more of our attention toward the capacity of food systems to cope while providing food security and nutrition (FSN) and maintaining ecological integrity (Webb et al., 2020; Ruben et al., 2020; Juri et al., 2024). Yet, dominant resilience thinking intersects with mainstream understanding of food systems to narrowly focus on the capacity to "bounce back" to precrisis conditions when there is a disruption (HLPE, 2025). For example, recent analyses of national food system transformation plans reveal that they often offer constrained diagnoses and limited solutions (Candell et al., 2025). This echoes broader analyses that institutions tend to default to incremental adjustments designed to preserve existing structures (Leeuwis, 2021).

As outlined in the HLPE 2025 report 'Building resilient food systems' this framing of resilience as 'bouncing back' rests on the assumption that the current food system merits preservation as it is. However, there is growing consensus that food systems, failing to ensure food security and nutrition (FSN) for all (FAO et al., 2025), are both unjust and ecologically unsustainable. This failure has led to growing calls for a new paradigm in support of transforming food systems (HLPE 2020; Ingram and Thornton, 2022; Zurek et al., 2022; Anderson et al. 2019; HLPE 2020). To this end, the 2025 HLPE-FSN report, *Building Resilient Food Systems*, consolidates a body of critical scholarship that argues it is important to reframe resilience debates away from consolidation and restoration of the status quo to instead emphasize resilience as a capacity to transform to a better state. The report builds on the idea proposed by Scoones et al. (2020) that there are multiple and mutually reinforcing pathways to transformation that involve changing structures, harnessing systemic interdependencies and enabling the agency of people and communities. It applies this perspective to the transformation of food systems and work towards FSN while addressing drivers of differential vulnerabilities, safeguarding planetary health, and upholding community sovereignty and agency into the future.

In the 2020 report *Food security and nutrition: building a global narrative towards 2030*, the HLPE re-imagined food security to go beyond the commonly accepted four dimensions (availability, access, utilization, and stability) to incorporate the role of agency and sustainability (HLPE, 2020; Clapp et al., 2022). The important addition of these two new dimensions internalized these all-too-often excluded dimensions. As widely discussed within academic literature and by the voices on the ground, the fulfillment of the six comprehensive dimensions of food security is hindered by structural obstacles such as corporate consolidation and concentration, financialization, and marginalization, which have been central to constructing the global food regime (Clapp, 2016; IPES-Food, 2016). Thus, approaches to transformation should focus not on maintaining existing systems that would reproduce these deeply inequitable outcomes, but on transforming food systems and society, to strengthen all six dimensions equitably and sustainably (HLPE, 2025). Yet, the deeply rooted structural and cultural systems that prevent transformation are often difficult to see and are further obscured by this narrow framing of resilience. In this paper, we build on the concept of ETR, developed in HLPE 2025, and offer an approach to sharpening the analysis of ETR and thus better envision the transformations required to address the current poly-crisis and the ongoing damages inflicted by a deeply unequal political economy. Using the metaphor of a vision exam, we construct a

diagnostic framework designed to clarify and overcome the conceptual blind spots in resilience thinking that hinder transformational change.

Equitably Transformative Resilience

The request for the HLPE-FSN report, *Building Resilient Food Systems* (HLPE, 2025), was elaborated by the CFS as a result of negotiations on its multi-year program of work, which importantly developed a scope that encompassed food systems as a whole. This shift in language from agriculture to food systems helped to create space for the development of the ETR concept, starting with an integrated food systems perspective, marking a much wider field of view than value chain thinking, which are often the focus of resilience studies (Tendall et al., 2015; Ericksen et al., 2012).

Even within a broader remit of 'food systems' the prevailing interpretations constrain the view of transformation and support reproduction of the status quo. The current food system has proven to be highly robust and resilient in its ability to maintain and restore a corporate-driven modernization paradigm (IPES-Food, 2016; Oliver et al., 2018) that has resulted in market dominance and returns for investors, thus limiting the political and economic incentive to change. While the prevalence of hunger in 2024 was slightly lower than the previous year, the number of people experiencing hunger has increased by approximately100 million in less than a decade, meaning that more people experience hunger now than when the Sustainable Development Goals were established (FAO et al., 2025). In 2024, an estimated 2.3 billion individuals were affected by moderate or severe food insecurity (ibid). Industrial and monocultural food systems are one of the most significant contributors to many pressing socio-ecological global problems. Food systems account for roughly one-third of global greenhouse gas emissions, drive widespread diet-related disease (Willett et al., 2019), are a major contributor to biodiversity loss (Benton et al., 2021) and to global inequity (Goyal et al., 2025). Resilience thinking locked into maintaining this status quo is thus highly problematic and has also been critiqued to have been captured by corporate interests (Clapp et al., 2025). There have also been concerns that dominant understandings of resilience prioritize individual actions (e.g. changes in behavior, consumption, etc.) over collective and state responsibility (Joseph, 2013; Anderson, 2025).

The focus of resilience in relation to food systems is thus all-too-often about maintaining a food system that has proven incapable of achieving FSN. Equitably Transformative Resilience (ETR), responds to this impasse by prioritizing the well-being of people, communities, and ecosystems and the ability of food systems to realize all six dimensions of food security (HLPE 2025). ETR directly confronts the systemic and structural drivers of differential vulnerabilities (Thomas et al. 2019). As discussed below, differential vulnerabilities result from inequities embedded in trade regimes, colonial legacies, racialized and patriarchal governance systems, and other entrenched power asymmetries. ETR is thus aligned with the principles of food sovereignty (Wittman, 2011; Nyeleni, 2007), recognizing the necessity of community control over food systems and a shift towards the systemic transformations that are needed now (Nyeleni, 2025). Yet, too often, resilience debates neglect these historical and structural forces, narrowing analysis and obscuring root causes of food insecurity, poverty, and inequality (HLPE, 2025).

In the sections that follow, we use the metaphor of an eye exam to identify six common "vision problems" that distort dominant framings and hinder efforts toward ETR: (1) tunnel vision; (2) bifocalism; (3) temporal myopia – ahistoricism; (4) temporal myopia – short-termism; (5) spatial myopia; and (6) overlooking intersectionality. We chose this metaphor because the structural issues at the heart of ETR are often difficult to perceive, shaped by how we frame and

interpret problems. Addressing these distortions can open pathways toward actions that tackle the root causes of ETR. In each section, we first describe the vision problem with reference to the relevant literature, and then highlight areas of creative practice, activism, policy-making, and scholarship that offer ways to confront these obscured perspectives.

Diagnosing Vision Problems that Prevent Equitably Transformative Resilience

1. Tunnel Vision

Mainstream resilience thinking tends to treat food systems as an island and fails to confront the extent to which food systems are deeply enmeshed in broader, multi-scalar social, cultural, economic, and political systems that fundamentally shape their dynamics (HLPE, 2025; Ericksen, 2008; Clapp, 2020; IPES-Food, 2017). This narrow framing obscures deeply rooted structures, such as global financial speculation, racial capitalism, or state-corporate power relations, that shape food systems yet are often dismissed as beyond the scope of practical intervention. Food systems are often implicitly or explicitly treated as bounded systems, where problems are conceptualized as internal matters of production, distribution, or consumption and solutions are sought primarily within the sector itself. The tunnel vision problem is particularly pronounced in value-chain approaches that emphasize linear and globalized flows of commodities, overlooking the complex interdependencies with wider societal systems (Mausch et al., 2020), which strongly influence the ability to achieve FSN.

Such framings obscure how many of the structural drivers that undermine equitable resilience lie outside the areas of consideration that arise from food system interventions, which often focus on supply chains, agricultural systems, consumption patterns, or dietary behavior. Key determinants of vulnerability and resilience, such as armed conflict, sovereign and private debt crises, displacement, inadequate housing and energy access, household impoverishment, inflation, poverty, intersectional exclusion, weakening governance structures, and speculative capital flows, are rarely addressed in mainstream food systems discourse or policy. In other cases, they are considered but not centered. For example, the notion of "food poverty" brings a focus back to food systems when the structural issues at play are related to social and economic inequity and poverty, rather than in food itself. On the other hand, tunnel vision is further problematic when scientific analysis and development dismiss the knowledge and the centrality of people, communities, and territories' agency in achieving FSN (Pimbert, 2016). The combination between structural and agency issues creates layered and intersectional vulnerabilities that directly impact food access, availability, and agency yet remain largely invisible within dominant intervention frameworks.

As highlighted in the HLPE 2025 report, building transformative food systems resilience requires a more holistic, and systems perspective. This involves addressing the political economy of food, recognizing the embeddedness of food systems within broader structures of inequality and precarity, understanding their interconnections with other systems (such as energy, housing, and health), and pursuing structural transformations that tackle root causes rather than symptoms (HLPE, 2025; Scoones et al., 2020; Anderson et al., 2019). The notion of just transitions is useful in this regard, as it intentionally makes links between different sectors as part of a wider commitment to moving from extractive to regenerative economies (EESC, 2025; Cabral et al. 2025). Scholars who are linking food systems resilience with broader traditions and movements for economic justice (Pimbert, 2025), degrowth (Gibson, 2025), postgrowth (McGreevy et al., 2022), bioregionalism (McGinnis et al., 1999.) and transformational city-region approach (Blay-Palmer et al., 2019) and other approaches can help consolidate ETR's capacity to go beyond the tunnel vision that characterizes mainstream approaches to resilience.

2. Bifocalism

Research on food systems resilience has often followed a bifurcated trajectory, drawing predominantly from either social or natural science paradigms (Tendall et al., 2015). This bifocalism fails to account for the deep interdependencies between human and non-human systems, and the co-constitution of social and ecological processes. This reifies a nature-society divide that underpins a paradigm where people hold dominion over nature and non-human beings. There is a growing recognition that resilience thinking must move beyond these disciplinary silos toward an integrated, relational approach that foregrounds the interconnectedness of all living and non-living beings, but also addresses issues of structural inequality, political power, and agency (Scoones et al., 2020; Anderson et al., 2019).

As elaborated in HLPE 2025, a socio-ecological and holistic approach is thus essential to understand and leverage these interdependencies, and promote equitable distributions of benefits, responsibilities, and risks within food systems while ensuring FSN and fostering regenerative ecological processes within planetary boundaries. Such an approach can mitigate the frequency and severity of shocks and stresses, such as climate-related events, pandemics, and market disruptions by strengthening ecological integrity and social solidarity as two key pillars of long-term capacity to adapt, transform, and reimagine. In contrast with the modernist vision inherent in the industrialization of the agri-food system, this socio-ecological relational ontology reconceptualizes nature not as an external backdrop to human activity, but as a co-constitutive and dynamic participant in human and food system wellbeing (Escobar, 2018; Haraway, 2016; Kimmerer, 2024).

Indigenous cosmovisions have long emphasized the inseparability of humans and nature, recognizing that humans are not apart from but embedded within the natural world (Doran, 2024; ICCA Consortium, 2021; Smith and Hutchings 2024). This worldview underpins Indigenous food systems, which have demonstrated remarkable resilience through their capacity to sustain livelihoods, maintain biodiversity, and adapt to social and ecological change (Lugo-Morin, 2020). It is important to learn from Indigenous food sovereignty movements, which protect Indigenous food systems in the face of ongoing colonial erasure and structural racism, and seek to revitalize Indigenous food systems and claim space for self-determination (Coté, 2016; Setee and Shukla 2020; Native American Food Sovereignty Alliance, 2025). As expressed by Dawn Morrison (2011, P. 100), “Indigenous food sovereignty is ultimately achieved by upholding our long-standing sacred responsibility, to nurture healthy, interdependent relationships with the land, plants and animals that provide us with our food.” The ethic of interdependence, kindship, and responsibility expressed through Indigenous Food Sovereignty are critical to building toward ETR.

Agroecology, which is in part based on principles developed by Indigenous Peoples and peasants (González-Jácome, 2002; Rosado-May, 2006), and then formalized through science and by institutions such as the FAO (2018) and the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE, 2019), offers a paradigmatic example of a socio-ecological approach. It not only emphasizes sustainable agricultural practices but also integrates ecological, cultural, and political dimensions to transform food systems toward justice and resilience. Agroecology addresses power imbalances, revalues traditional and Indigenous knowledge, and promotes the agency and rights of those most exposed to systemic vulnerabilities including smallholders, women, and marginalized communities (Bezner Kerr et al., 2023; Méndez, 2013; Gliessman, 2016; HLPE, 2022). Political ecology (Moragues-Faus and Marsden, 2017) and emerging ideas

such as interspecies justice (Johnson et al., 2024) and the rights of nature (CDER, 2022) invite ways of thinking that bring human and non-human resilience into the same frame, grounded in an understanding of our shared and interdependent wholeness.

At the policy level, this vision of socio-ecological equity aligns with growing calls for the adoption of integrative frameworks like Planetary Health and One Health (Baquero et al. 2021). approaches, which aim to sustainably balance and optimize the health of people, animals, and ecosystems. One Health moves away from the notion of trade-offs between healthy humans, animals, and environments, and instead advocates for systemic governance and cooperation across community, national, and global levels. One Health calls for multi-sectoral governance, co-creation, and participatory knowledge integration (Destoumieux-Garzón et al., 2018). ETR extends this thinking by more explicitly centering questions of power, justice, historical legacies, and human rights, thereby moving beyond techno-managerial framings to address root causes of socio-ecological vulnerability and exclusion. By addressing the problem of bifocalism by bringing nature and society into the same frame, pathways towards ETR can become illuminated.

3. Temporal Myopia: Ahistoricism

A significant shortcoming in much of the literature and policy discourse on food systems resilience is its ahistoricism, or the tendency to neglect or minimize the role of deep historical processes, trauma and harm in shaping contemporary vulnerabilities and structural inequities (Hinton & Carodenuto, 2025; HLPE, 2023). Mainstream resilience thinking often adopts a narrow temporal scope, focusing on immediate disruptions (e.g., climate shocks, pandemics, supply chain interruptions), while failing to engage with the historical legacies of colonialism, capitalism, and racialized dispossession that underpin vulnerability in today's food systems (Hinton & Carodenuto, 2025). This omission contributes to a form of epistemic erasure, where the roots of inequity and ecological abuse and destruction are obscured, and the political and economic systems that have long extracted value from marginalized communities and ecosystems are left unchallenged (Nixon, 2011).

Ahistoricism in resilience thinking not only fails to recognize how the past continues to shape present-day inequities but also obscures the unequal distribution of responsibility for those inequalities. The modern food system did not emerge in a vacuum but was built through centuries of colonial plantation economies, land expropriation, forced displacement, coerced labor, and unequal trade regimes that consolidated wealth and power in the Global North (McMichael, 2013; Beckford, 1972; Mintz, 1985). As such, strategies that aim to promote equitable resilience must be grounded in historical accountability and meaningful reparation (Taiwo, 2022), and must resist ahistorical framings that treat all actors and regions as equally responsible for or affected by global food system dynamics. The work of Indigenous food sovereignty and resurgence can heal and resist the ongoing impact of colonial legacies (Howard & Liu, 2025; Figueroa-Helland, 2018; Grey and Patel, 2015), starting from the need to redistribute land and decommodify natural resources (Alfred, 2023).

Recent calls for decolonization and reparative justice in food systems scholarship emphasize the importance of remembering and redressing these histories (Hinton & Carodenuto, 2025; Grey & Patel, 2015). Mainstream approaches to resilience may overlook the fact that the intensity and extent of individual and collective experiences of food insecurity and exposure to risks and uncertainty are intrinsically linked with the past (Lindroth and Sinevaara-Niskanen, 2019). ETR is premised on the recognition of decolonization as an unfinished project and ongoing process, where colonial power relations are not only in history, but are omnipresent in

the present day (Bhambra, 2022; Maldonado-Torres, 2007). This is the same for the ecological damage that has been imposed over several generations and that should be central when thinking about the present and future capacity of people and food systems to be resilient. Therefore, ETR requires implementing a process of meaningful reparations for people, the planet, and all that binds both together (Táíwò, 2022).

Decolonizing resilience requires not only including marginalized voices but reconfiguring whose knowledge counts, what histories are told, and how responsibility and agency are distributed (Whyte, 2018;HLPE 2025). This involves questioning the meaning attributed to resilience, which is often rooted in a western episteme and can only partially reflect the complexity of human and ecological experiences vis-à-vis shocks and stresses (Lindrotz & Sinevaara-Niskanen, 2019; Moulton & Machado, 2019). Furthermore, it requires creating space for collective memory, truth-telling, and justice-driven frameworks that address both historical and ongoing forms of structural violence. Without this, resilience discourse risks becoming an apolitical exercise in adaptation, rather than a tool for reparation and transformation.
In this sense, any historically grounded approach to ETR must also confront the contemporary mechanisms through which global inequalities are reproduced, particularly the international debt system. Rising debt and interest payments in the Global South not only curtail investments in food systems and climate adaptation, but also represent a continuation of colonial patterns of extraction, where wealth is siphoned from vulnerable communities to financial centers in the Global North (Hickel et al., 2022; Pimbert, 2025). Debt servicing to public and private creditors, coupled with policies of structural adjustment and multiple waves of austerity, deepens political and financial dependence and erodes sovereignty (Vasic-Lalovic et al., 2023), including the capacity of countries and their communities to build ETR (HLPE, 2025). Unsustainable debt and the erosion of state welfare through structural adjustment, "leaves countries critically exposed to shocks and undermines their ability to make urgently needed investments in climate-resilient food production and food security." (IPES, 2023, p. 4). Without "Breaking the Cycle of Unsustainable Food Systems, Hunger, and Debt" (IPES-Food, 2023), resilience risks being reduced to an ahistorical technocratic project of adaptation rather than a transformative pathway toward justice and reparation.

4. Temporal Myopia: Short-termism

A major limitation in the literature and practice of food systems resilience is the dominance of short-termism (Marsden et al. 2016), or the tendency to frame diagnoses, policies, and interventions within truncated time horizons that rarely extend beyond immediate recovery, electoral cycles, funding windows, or annual economic reporting periods. This narrow temporal scope fundamentally undermines the pursuit of intergenerationally just and equitable resilience as it prioritizes immediate returns and crisis mitigation over structural transformation and long-term sustainability. While including sustainability as a sixth dimension of food security (HLPE, 2020) has begun to shift attention toward the needs of future generations, much of the policy discourse remains focused on short-term technical fixes, often underpinned by a focus on quick, scalable solutions based on narrow views of innovation (Anderson and Maughan, 2021).

As elaborated in HLPE (2025), ETR requires a long-term, intergenerational perspective, for example expanding the time horizon towards, "*Safeguarding Seven Generations in times of Food, Social, and Ecological Crisis*", as expressed in the statement from the second United Nations Global Indigenous Youth Forum in 2023. This draws on a temporally relational worldview, a view towards intergenerational justice (Barry, 2017; Soma et al., 2025) stands in

deep contrast to the neoliberal notion of society being composed of self-interested actors. Tackling short-termism will require challenging fundamental systems, programs, and self- and collective- worldviews. It requires consideration of the question, "how can we be good ancestors" (Krznaric, 2020), and committing to make changes today that may only have dividends for those that inherit the earth beyond the time of those making decisions today.

Vignola and Oosterveer (2025) highlight the governance challenge posed by temporal misalignment in food systems, in which short-term financial and political gains are favored over long-term ecological and social health. Powerful actors often prioritize rapid returns, framing agricultural outputs as electoral tools or financial assets. This disconnect between incentives and socio-ecological needs accelerates ecosystem degradation, undermines sustainability, and reduces the capacity to adapt to future shocks. Addressing these issues requires alternative economic and political models that move beyond short-term horizons. These could draw on the rich work the social and solidarity economy (Hickel, 2020) and post-growth economics (McGreevy et al., 2022), doughnut economics (Raworth, 2018), and commons-based visions (Pettenati et al., 2018) that challenge the enclosure of food systems and centre the socio-ecological interdependencies that sustain territories and communities.

Centering ancestral wisdom, traditional technologies, and cultural practices counters short-term thinking, as these have long supported resilience (Carrasco-Torrontegui et al. 2021). The prevailing focus on innovation as a quick fix has obscured their importance (Anderson and Maughan, 2021). Too often, this knowledge is appropriated, discarded, or reshaped to generate new knowledge that serves corporate interests. Corporate oligopolies now dominate knowledge systems, technological innovations, production inputs, processing, and distribution (Clapp, 2025). As a result, communities lose their connection to nature and their autonomy in food production, preparation, and consumption. Industrial agriculture prevails not because it is ecologically or socially sound, but because it benefits oligopolies and the governments and narratives that support them (Anderson, 2024;Clapp, 2025). By contrast, ancestral food knowledge, preserved through biocultural food memory and transmitted by elders, remains vital for food sovereignty, particularly in times of crisis such as COVID-19 (Lugo-Morin, 2022). Preventing the erosion of this knowledge requires stronger regulation of corporate power and market dominance, including restrictions on patents for crops and breeds developed over generations, and measures to eliminate biopiracy (HLPE, 2025).

To move beyond short-term thinking requires centering the importance of intergenerational transfer (Babcock et al., 2019) and intergenerational resilience (Budowle et al., 2019; Shukla, 2024). This resonates with growing calls for youth inclusion, intergenerational justice, and social innovation in food systems, approaches that emphasize just transitions, co-created solutions, and the cultivation of resilience capacities that are meaningful and durable over time. Ultimately, building food systems that are resilient not only in the present but also for generations to come requires a deliberate slowing down toward deep transformation, while confronting deep social and economic inequities rather than a short-term sprint for superficial gains.

5. Spatial Myopia in Food Systems Resilience Thinking

A critical shortcoming in much of the food systems resilience literature is spatial myopia, or a failure to see the interconnected nature of global food systems, where actions in one territory often have profound and sometimes contradictory impacts on resilience elsewhere (Eakin et al., 2017; Newell et al., 2023). Efforts to promote ETR should be fully aware of these transboundary

effects and of the histories of intertwined relationships. For instance, promoting sustainability and resilience "here" (e.g., in the Global North) may rely on, or even exacerbate, inequity, environmental degradation, or socio-economic precarity "there" (often in the Global South), due to offshoring of production to regions with lower labor standards, the establishment of 'green sacrifice zones' (Zografos & Robbins, 2020; Vela Almeida et al., 2024), or exploitative practices such as forced labor (The IGLP Law and Global Production Working Group, 2016). Conservation efforts in the Global North often replace land depletion in one area by sourcing from distant landscapes, typically exacerbating global inequities (Margulis et al., 2013). Such displacement of harm contradicts the goals of equitable resilience, reinforcing structural dependencies and unjust power asymmetries within the global food system.

This spatial disconnect is particularly evident in global sustainability initiatives such as the EU's deforestation-free commodity regulation (Reis and Ferrando, forthcoming; Kumeh and Ramcilovic-Suminen, 2023). While these policies aim to reduce the environmental footprint of consumption in the Global North, they rarely acknowledge or address the distributive implications for producer countries, many of which have been shaped by centuries of extractive trade relationships and colonial legacies (Newell et al., 2023; Muradian et al., 2024). As Stevis and Felli (2020) argue, a planetary just transition requires not only a decarbonized economy but also justice in how transitions unfold across space and scale. Without attention to global justice and historical responsibility, place-based strategies may inadvertently contribute to the destabilization of local livelihoods and food systems elsewhere.

For example, policies or reforms implemented in isolation, such as tax or labor protections in one country, can trigger corporate relocations to regions with more favorable regulatory environments, thus requiring international cooperation and multilateral governance to prevent resilience gains in one place from producing vulnerability in another (Eakin et al., 2017; Newell et al., 2023). By not seeing the political and socio-ecological complexity of space and territories, these interventions fail to engage with context and instead implement measures that reinforce inequalities and reduce the capacity of the most marginalized to achieve FSN and fulfil their rights. An ETR approach to resilience requires a view that engages with spatial complexities to support planetary just transitions (Stevis and Felli, 2020).

Ultimately, addressing spatial myopia in food systems resilience requires a shift toward telecoupled and world systems-based approaches, grounded in an understanding of planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009) and global interdependence. This involves acknowledging that local and territorial food systems cannot be decoupled from broader global dynamics, and that just, equitable, and sustainable food system transformations demand cross-scalar coordination, common but differentiated responsibilities , and redistributive justice on a planetary scale informed by the recognition that certain economies, industries and food systems need to degrow, and to do so at a faster speed, than others (Hickel, 2020).

6. Overlooking Intersectionality

One of the major omissions in mainstream food systems resilience literature is its limited attention to how multiple forms of oppression intersect, a dynamic that Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) originally termed intersectionality. From this perspective, vulnerability and resilience are shaped by "the interaction between gender, race, and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies, and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power" (Davis, 2008, p. 68). An intersectional ETR approach situates people, communities, and societies within overlapping systems of power rather than

analyzing them through single-axis or single-issue approaches. It is therefore vital to account for how intersecting systems of oppression, such as racism, patriarchy, colonialism, ableism, and heteronormativity, shape people's differentiated vulnerabilities to food system shocks and stressors (Denton, 2022; Vinyeta, 2016; Thomas et al., 2019; HLPE, 2023).

Approaches that support moving towards ETR can draw on the notion of intersectionality to move beyond simplistic and universalizing perspectives that obscure the complex and shifting nature of power, vulnerability, and resilience. Power and resilience are not static traits but dynamic relations that vary across contexts and positionality. Approaches that rely on a single axis of analysis, such as gender alone, overl the lived realities and diverse sources of resilience among Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC); women; LGBTQ2SIA+ individuals; people with disabilities; and others who experience intersecting marginalizations. As a result, resilience strategies may appear to be technically sound yet be indifferent to intersectional oppression, reinforcing rather than redressing inequities in food systems.

In food systems, bodies of thinking such as food sovereignty (Nyéléni, 2007), food justice (Alkon and Agyeman, 2011) and feminist agroecology (Morales, 2022) have laid bare power relations and structural exclusions embedded within food systems, in particular at the crossroads of race, gender, sexuality and class. For instance, Trevilla Espinal et al. (2021) argue that feminist agroecology provides essential tools to analyze how patriarchal and colonial power dynamics manifest in land access, labor relations, and knowledge systems. Similarly, Ramdas (2021) critiques the capitalist-Brahminic-patriarchal regime in Indian agriculture, illustrating how caste, gender, and class intersect to produce unequal exposure to food and ecological precarity. These perspectives expose the limitations of dominant resilience discourses, which too often focus on short-term risk reduction or technocratic adaptation while neglecting intersectional understandings of how historical injustices, structural inequalities, and ongoing dispossession differentially produce present vulnerabilities.

Building towards ETR requires centering the leadership, knowledge, and agency of those most impacted by systemic injustices in food systems. It also requires an emphasis on the perspectives of those who are in positions of marginalization and allowing the 'standpoint of the subordinate' to come to the fore (Harding, 1991) and 'subaltern agency' to come into being (Conway, 2018). Analytical and mobilizing concepts, such as food sovereignty (Patel, 2009), food justice (Alkon and Agyeman, 2011), black agrarianism (White, 2018), feminist agroecology (Morales, 2022), and decolonial food politics (Hinton & Carodenuto, 2025) provide critical alternatives to dominant paradigms by emphasizing autonomy, justice, and community-based governance. These frameworks call for redistributive and reparative measures, such as land return, support for BIPOC farmers, and inclusive policy-making processes, as prerequisites for true resilience. Moreover, as Reese (2019) argues in her study of food justice in Washington D.C., ignoring race and power in food system interventions often results in well-intentioned programs that fail to serve, or even alienate, the very communities they are meant to support. Without explicitly addressing structural inequality, resilience efforts risk becoming another layer of exclusion in an already deeply unequal system.

Conclusion

The HLPE (2025) report, by introducing the concept of ETR, makes an important contribution through foregrounding structural and systemic transformation that centers equity and agency. Today's intersecting crises, including climate change and extreme climatic events, severe biodiversity loss, pandemics, famine and starvation, armed conflict, economic shocks, are

not random events that are external to the socio-economic structures of capitalism, nor are they experienced evenly across society. They originate from within these structures and unevenly affect the most disadvantaged people and communities.

Talking about food systems resilience while ignoring capitalism, racism, hetero-patriarchy, war, violence, authoritarianism, and corporate power is like rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. These issues are not tangential; they are existential and both lay the foundation of differential vulnerability to crises and are the reason why they appear to be unsolvable problems. We must address them head-on if we are serious about resilience, through a commitment to "everyday struggle requiring unwavering scrutiny with a commitment to care for the marginal concerns" (Pandey and Cabral, 2025, p. 259). Without this structural and systemic analysis, and without questioning the reasons and implications of differential vulnerabilities, any proposed solutions will be partial at best, and counterproductive at worst.

This signals the need to align efforts to build resilience in food systems with broader movements for climate justice, racial justice, peace, gender equity, economic sovereignty, and reparations. These efforts should employ both bottom-up and top-down approaches to harmonize multiple ecological and social solutions encompassing individuals, communities, countries, and their institutions. HLPE's (2025) embrace of equitably transformative resilience is a needed step forward with material and epistemic implications. Governments and food system actors, including food and resilience scholars, must treat it not as an aspiration, but as an urgent imperative for today's policy, advocacy, research, and action.

References:

Alfred, G. T. (2023). It's all about the land. University of Toronto Press. Toronto.

Alkon, A. H., & Agyeman, J. (Eds.). (2011). Cultivating food justice: Race, class, and sustainability. MIT Press. Cambridge.

Altieri, M. A., Funes-Monzote, F. R., & Petersen, P. (2015). Agroecologically efficient agricultural systems for smallholder farmers: Contributions to food sovereignty. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 32(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0065-6

Anderson, C. R., & Maughan, C. (2021). "The innovation imperative": The struggle over agroecology in the international food policy arena. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 5, 619185. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.619185

Anderson, C. R., Bruil, J., Chappell, M. J., Kiss, C., & Pimbert, M. P. (2019). From transition to domains of transformation: Getting to sustainable and just food systems through agroecology. Sustainability, 11(19), 5272. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195272

Anderson, M. D. (2024). Transforming food systems: narratives of power. Routledge. London.

Babcock, A., & Budowle, R. (2022). An appreciative inquiry and inventory of Indigenous food sovereignty initiatives within the western U.S. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 11(2), 135–160. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2022.112.016

Barry, B. (2017). Sustainability and intergenerational justice. In L. Meyer (Ed.), Intergenerational justice (pp. 183–208). Routledge. New York.

Beckford, G. L. (1999). Persistent poverty: Underdevelopment in plantation economies of the third world. University of the West Indies Press. Kingston.

Benton, T. G., Bieg, C., Harwatt, H., Pudasaini, R., & Wellesley, L. (2021). Food system impacts on biodiversity loss: Three levers for food system transformation in support of

nature. Chatham House. https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/09/food-system-impacts-biodiversity-loss
Bhambra, G. K. (2022). A decolonial project for Europe. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 60(S1), 229–244. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13311
Blay-Palmer, A., Cabral L., Espinosa-Garcia, Zurek, M., Ferrando, T., Anderson, C.R. Antwi-Agyei, P., Madzorera, I., Soma, T. & G. Bhalla. (Forthcoming). Introducing Building resilient food systems, High Level Panel of Experts, FAO report.
Blay-Palmer, A., Santini, G., Dubbeling, M., Renting, H., Taguchi, M., & Giordano, T. (2018). Validating the City Region Food System Approach: Enacting Inclusive, Transformational City Region Food Systems. Sustainability, 10(5), 1680. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/5/1680
Brouwer, S. F. (2023). Kumusha and masalads: (Inter)generational foodways and urban food security in Zimbabwe. Agriculture and Human Values, 40, 761–775. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-022-10393-4
Budowle, R., Arthur, M. L., & Porter, C. M. (2019). Growing intergenerational resilience for Indigenous food sovereignty through home gardening. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 9(B), 145.
Budowle, R., Arthur, M., & Porter, C. (2019). Growing intergenerational resilience for Indigenous food sovereignty through home gardening. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 9(B), 145–165. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.09B.018
Cabral, L., Volonterio, M., Peša, I., Millar, G., & Levick-Parkin, M. (2025). Just food transitions: a plurality of framings and repertoires from below. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2025.2488812
Candel, J., Sietsma, A. J., & Biesbroek, R. (2025). National pathways for food systems transformation are limited in scope and degree of ambition. Nature Food, 6(8), 809–816. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-025-01206-y
Carrasco-Torrontegui, A., Gallegos-Riofrío, C. A., Delgado-Espinoza, F., & Swanson, M. (2021). Climate Change, Food Sovereignty, and Ancestral Farming Technologies in the Andes. *Current Developments in Nutrition*, *5*, 54-60. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzaa073
Clapp, J. (2025). Titans of industrial agriculture: How a few giant corporations came to dominate the farm sector and why it matters. MIT Press. Cambridge.
Clapp, J., & Isakson, S. R. (2018). Risky returns: The implications of financialization in the food system. Development and Change, 49(2), 437–460. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12388
Clapp, J., Moseley, W. G., Burlingame, B., & Termine, P. (2022). Viewpoint: The case for a six-dimensional food security framework. Food Policy, 106, 102164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2021.102164
Clapp, J., Vriezen, R., Laila, A., Conti, C., Gordon, L., Hicks, C., & Rao, N. (2025). Corporate concentration and power matter for agency in food systems. Food Policy, 134, 102897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2025.102897
Conway, Janet M. 2018. “When Food Becomes a Feminist Issue: Popular Feminism and Subaltern Agency in the World March of Women.” International Feminist Journal of Politics 20 (2): 188–203. doi:10.1080/14616742.2017.1419822.

Coté, C. (2016). “Indigenizing” Food Sovereignty. Revitalizing Indigenous Food Practices and Ecological Knowledges in Canada and the United States. Humanities, 5(3), 57. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0787/5/3/57

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989(1), 139–167.

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. Feminist theory, 9(1), 67-85.

Denton, F. (2002). Climate change vulnerability, impacts, and adaptation: Why does gender matter? Gender & Development, 10(2), 10-20.

Destoumieux-Garzón, D., Mavingui, P., Boetsch, G., Boissier, J., Darriet, F., Duboz, P., ... & Voituron, Y. (2018). The one health concept: 10 years old and a long road ahead. Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 5, 14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2018.00014

Doran, N. (2024). Defining cultural-ecological resilience through community and sovereign food systems. Ecology and Society, 29(4). https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-14894-290409

Eakin, H., Rueda, X., & Mahanti, A. (2017). Transforming governance in telecoupled food systems. Ecology and Society, 22(4). https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09831-220432

Ericksen, P. J. (2008). Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change research. Global Environmental Change, 18(1), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.09.002

Ericksen, P., Bohle, H. G., & Stewart, B. (2012). Vulnerability and resilience of food systems. In J. Ingram, P. Ericksen, & D. Liverman (Eds.), Food security and global environmental change (pp. 67–77). Routledge. London.

Ericksen, P., Stewart, B., Dixon, J., Barling, D., Loring, P., Anderson, M., & Ingram, J. (2012). The value of a food system approach. In J. Ingram, P. Ericksen, & D. Liverman (Eds.), Food security and global environmental change (pp. 25–45). Routledge. London.

Escobar, A. (2008). Territories of difference: Place, movements, life, redes. Duke University Press. Durham.

Escobar, A. (2018). Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds. Duke University Press. Durham.

European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). (2024). A just transition to ensure a sustainable future for EU agri-food systems. https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/just-transition-ensure-sustainable-future-eu-agri-food-systems

FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, & WHO. (2025). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2025: Addressing high food price inflation for food security and nutrition. FAO.

FAO. (2018). The 10 elements of agroecology: Guiding the transition to sustainable food and agricultural systems. FAO. Rome.

Figueroa-Helland, L., Thomas, C., & Aguilera, A. P. (2018). Decolonizing food systems: Food sovereignty, Indigenous revitalization, and agroecology as counter-hegemonic movements. Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 17(1–2), 173–201. https://doi.org/10.1163/15691497-12341544

Gibson, M., Mason-D’Croz, D., Norberg, A., Conti, C., Boa Alvarado, M., & Herrero, M. (2025). Degrowth as a plausible pathway for food systems transformation. Nature Food, 6(1), 19–24. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-024-00906-9

Gliessman, S. (2016). Agroecology: The ecology of sustainable food systems. CRC Press.

González-Jácome, A. (2022). Traditional Mexican agriculture: A basis for sustainable agroecological systems. CRC Press. Boca Raton.
Goyal, M., Hickel, J., & Jha, P. (2025). Increasing inequality in agri-food value chains: Global trends from 1995–2020. Global Food Security, 46, 100883. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2025.100883
Grey, S., & Patel, R. (2015). Food sovereignty as decolonization: Some contributions from Indigenous movements to food system and development politics. Agriculture and Human Values, 32(3), 431–444. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9548-9
Haraway, D. J. (2016). Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene. Duke University Press. Durham.
Harding, Sandra. 1991. Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Harris, J. (2025). What is gained (and what is lost) between evidence and policy in the HLPE-FSN and CFS convergence process? FAO. https://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe/insights/news-insights/news-detail/what-is-gained-(and-what-is-lost)-between-evidence-and-policy-in-the-hlpe-fsn-and-cfs-convergence-process/en
Hickel, J. (2020). What does degrowth mean? A few points of clarification. Globalizations, 18(7), 1105–1111. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1812229
Hickel, J., Dorninger, C., Wieland, H., & Suwandi, I. (2022). Imperialist appropriation in the world economy: Drain from the global South through unequal exchange, 1990–2015. Global Environmental Change, 73, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102466
Hinton, L., & Carodenuto, S. (2025). Exploring recipes of (de)colonization: A scoping review of decolonization and food systems scholarship. Agriculture and Human Values, 42(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-024-01001-7
HLPE. (2019). Agroecological and other innovative approaches for sustainable agriculture and food systems that enhance food security and nutrition (HLPE Report 14). Committee on World Food Security. Rome.
HLPE. (2020). Food security and nutrition: Building a global narrative towards 2030. http://www.fao.org/3/ca9731en/ca9731en.pdf
HLPE. (2023). Reducing inequalities for food security and nutrition. CFS HLPE-FSN.
HLPE. (2025). Building resilient food systems. FAO. Rome.
Howard, O. M., & Liu, C. (2025). Indigenous food systems heal the socio-ecological wounds of colonialism: A discussion using two case studies. Bristol Institute for Learning and Teaching (BILT) Student Research Journal, 6, 1102.
ICCA Consortium. (2021). Territories of life: 2021 report. ICCA Consortium. https://report.territoriesoflife.org
Ingram, J. (2011). A food systems approach to researching food security and its interactions with global environmental change. Food Security, 3(4), 417–431. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-011-0149-9
Ingram, J., & Thornton, P. (2022). What does transforming food systems actually mean? Nature Food, 3(11), 881–882. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-022-00585-7
IPES-Food. (2016). From uniformity to diversity: A paradigm shift from industrial agriculture to diversified agroecological systems.
IPES-Food. (2017). Unravelling the food–health nexus: Addressing practices, political economy, and power relations to build healthier food systems.

IPES-Food. (2023). Breaking the cycle of unsustainable food systems, hunger, and debt.
Joseph, J. (2013). Resilience as embedded neoliberalism: A governmentality approach. Resilience, 1(1), 38–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.765741
Juri, S., Terry, N., & Pereira, L. M. (2024). Demystifying food systems transformation: A review of the state of the field. Ecology and Society, 29(2), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-14525-290205
Kerr, R. B., Postigo, J. C., Smith, P., Cowie, A., Singh, P. K., Rivera-Ferre, M., ... & Neufeldt, H. (2023). Agroecology as a transformative approach to tackle climatic, food, and ecosystemic crises. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 62, 101275.
Kimmerer, R.W. (2024). The serviceberry: Abundance and reciprocity in the natural world. Simon and Schuster.
Krznaric, R. (2020). The good ancestor: How to think long term in a short-term world. Random House. New York.
Kumeh, E. M., & Ramcilovic-Suominen, S. (2023). Is the EU shirking responsibility for its deforestation footprint in tropical countries? Power, material, and epistemic inequalities in the EU's global environmental governance. Sustainability Science, 18, 599–616. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01302-7
Leeuwis, C., Boogaard, B. K., & Atta-Krah, K. (2021). How food systems change (or not): Governance implications for system transformation processes. Food Security, 13(4), 761–780. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-021-01180-0
Lindroth, M., & Sinevaara-Niskanen, H. (2019). Colonialism invigorated? The manufacture of resilient indigeneity. Resilience, 7(3), 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2019.1605662
Loew, P. (2014). Seventh generation earth ethics: Native voices of Wisconsin. Wisconsin Historical Society.
Lugo-Morin, D. R. (2020). Indigenous communities and their food systems: A contribution to the current debate. Journal of Ethnic Foods, 7(1), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42779-019-0043-1
Lugo-Morin, D. R. (2022). Looking into the past to build the future: Food, memory, and identity in the Indigenous societies of Puebla, Mexico. Journal of Ethnic Foods, 9(1) . https://doi.org/10.1186/s42779-022-00131-5
Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. Cultural studies, 21(2-3), 240-270.
Margulis, M. E., McKeon, N., & Borras, S. M. (2013). Land grabbing and global governance: Critical perspectives. Globalizations, 10(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2013.764151
Marsden, T., Sjöblom, S., Andersson, K., & Skerratt, S. (2016). Introduction: exploring short-termism and sustainability: temporal mechanisms in spatial policies. In *Sustainability and Short-term Policies* (pp. 1-14). Routledge.
Martens, T., Cidro, J., Hart, M. A., & McLachlan, S. (2016). Understanding Indigenous food sovereignty through an Indigenous research paradigm. Journal of Indigenous Social Development, 5(1).
Mausch, K., Hall, A., & Hambloch, C. (2020). Colliding paradigms and trade-offs: Agri-food systems and value chain interventions. Global Food Security, 26, 100439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100439
McGinnis, Michael Vincent, ed. (1999). *Bioregionalism*. Routledge. London.

McGreevy, S. R., Rupprecht, C. D. D., Niles, D., Wiek, A., Carolan, M., Kallis, G., ... & Tachikawa, M. (2022). Sustainable agrifood systems for a post-growth world. Nature Sustainability, 5(12), 1011–1017. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00933-5
McMichael, P. (2009). A food regime genealogy. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36(1), 139–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150902820232
McMichael, P. (2013). Food regimes and agrarian questions. Fernwood Publishing.
Méndez, V. E., Bacon, C. M., & Cohen, R. (2013). Agroecology as a transdisciplinary, participatory, and action-oriented approach. *Agroecology and sustainable food systems*, *37*(1), 3-18.
Mintz, S. (1985). Sweetness and power: The place of sugar in modern history. Penguin.
Moragues-Faus, A., & Marsden, T. (2017). The political ecology of food: Carving 'spaces of possibility' in a new research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *55*, 275-288. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.08.016
Morales, H. (2021). Agroecological feminism. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 45(7), 955-956.
Morrison, D. (2011). Indigenous food sovereignty: A model for social learning. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), Food sovereignty in Canada: Creating just and sustainable food systems (pp. 97-113). Fernwood. Winnipeg, MB.
Moulton, A., & Machado, M. R. (2019). Bouncing forward after Irma and Maria: Acknowledging colonialism, problematizing resilience and thinking climate justice. Journal of Extreme Events, 6(1), 1940006. https://doi.org/10.1142/S2345737619400060
Native American Food Sovereignty Alliance (2025). Six Pillars of Indigenous Food Sovereignty. https://www.nativefoodalliance.org/blog/6-pillars. Accessed October 6, 2025.
Newell, P., Daley, F., Mikheeva, O., & Peša, I. (2023). Mind the gap: The global governance of just transitions. Global Policy, 14(3), 425–437. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13205
Nixon, R. (2011). Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor. Harvard University Press.
Nyéléni. (2007). Declaration of Nyéléni: Forum for food sovereignty. Selengue. Mali.
Nyéléni. (2015). Declaration Of the International Forum for Agroecology. Selengue. Mali.
OECD. (2025). Practical Approaches to Develop Resilience Strategies for Food Systems. OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Paper No 217. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2025/02/practical-approaches-to-develop-resilience-strategies-for-food-systems_97f31bb2/caa2b274-en.pdf
Patel, R. (2009). Food sovereignty. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36(3), 663–706. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150903143079
Pimbert, M. (2016). Food sovereignty, agroecology and biocultural diversity. Routledge.
Pimbert, M. P. (2018). Food sovereignty, agroecology and biocultural diversity: Constructing and contesting knowledge. Routledge.
Pimbert, M. P. (2025). Financing agroecological transformations for territorial agri-food systems: Beyond the myth of financial scarcity. Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene, 13(1), 00026. https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2025.00026
Ramdas, S. R. (2021). Towards food sovereignty: Dismantling the capitalist Brahminic-patriarchal food farming regime. Development, 64(3), 276–281. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00308-3
Raworth, K. (2018). Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Reese, A. M. (2019). Black food geographies: Race, self-reliance, and food access in Washington, D.C. University of North Carolina Press.
Reis, T., & Ferrando, T. (forthcoming). Unravelling the EU Deforestation-Free Products Regulation: A transnational governance mechanism that misses the forest for the trees.
Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S. III, Lambin, E. F., ... & Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. Nature, 461(7263), 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a
Rosado-May, F.J. 2015. The Intercultural Origin of Agroecology: Contributions from Mexico. In V.E. Méndez, C.M. Bacon, R. Cohen and S.R. Gliessman (Eds.), Agroecology: a Transdisciplinary, Participatory and Action-Oriented Approach. (pp: 123-138). CRC Press. Boca Raton.
Ruben, R., Cavatassi, R., Lipper, L., Smaling, E., & Winters, P. (2021). Towards food systems transformation—Five paradigm shifts
Scoones, I., Stirling, A., Abrol, D., Atela, J., Charli-Joseph, L., Eakin, H., Ely, A., Olsson, P., Pereira, L., Priya, R., van Zwanenberg, P., & Yang, L. (2020). Transformations to sustainability: combining structural, systemic and enabling approaches. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *42*, 65-75. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.12.004
Settee, P., & Shukla, S. (Eds.). (2020). Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations. Canadian Scholars. Toronto.
Shukla, A. (2024). Examining the role of intergenerational relations in food systems: Evidence from Western India. Progress in Development Studies, 24(3), 234–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/14649934231215116
Shukla, A. (2024). Examining the role of intergenerational relations in food systems: evidence from western India. Progress in Development Studies, 24(3), 234-251.
Smith (Waitaha, Kāti Māmoe, Kāi Tahu), J., & Hutchings (Ngāti Huirapa and Gujarat, India), J. (2024). Feeding Indigenous Aotearoa better. Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 55(6), 2286–2304. https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2024.2327420
Soma, T., Armstrong, C. G., Welsh, C., Jung, S., Atleo, C. G., Li, B., & Shulman, T. (2024). Indigenizing Food System Planning for Food System Resiliency. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *90*(3), 510-524. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2023.2269147.
Stevis, D., & Felli, R. (2020). Planetary just transition? How inclusive and how just. Earth System Governance, 6, 100065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100065
Taiwo, O. (2022). Reconsidering reparations. Oxford University Press.
Tanner, T., Lewis, D., Wrathall, D., Bronen, R., Cradock-Henry, N., Huq, S., ... & Thomalla, F. (2015). Livelihood resilience in the face of climate change. Nature Climate Change, 5(1), 23–26. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2448
Tendall, D. M., et al. (2015). Food system resilience: Defining the concept. Global Food Security, 6, 17–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2015.08.001
The IGLP Law and Global Production Working Group. (2016). The role of law in global value chains: A research manifesto. London Review of International Law, 4(1), 57–79. https://doi.org/10.1093/lril/lrw003
Thomas, K., Hardy, R. D., Lazrus, H., Mendez, M., Orlove, B., Rivera-Collazo, I., ... & Winthrop, R. (2019). Explaining differential vulnerability to climate change: A social science review. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 10(2), e565. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.565

Trevilla Espinal, D. L., Soto Pinto, M. L., Morales, H., & Estrada-Lugo, E. I. J. (2021). Feminist agroecology: Analyzing power relationships in food systems. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 45(7), 1029–1049. https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2021.1882362

Vela Almeida, D., Kolinjivadi, V., Ferrando, T., Roy, B., Herrera, H., Vecchione Gonçalves, M., & Van Hecken, G. (n.d.). The "greening" of empire: The European Green Deal as the EU first agenda. Political Geography, 105, 102635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.102635

Vignola, R., & Oosterveer, P. (2025). Conceptualizing the governance challenges for food system transformation. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 9, 1397574. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1397574

Vinyeta, K., Whyte, K., & Lynn, K. (2016). Climate change through an intersectional lens: Gendered vulnerability and resilience in indigenous communities in the United States.

Vivero-Pol, J. L., Ferrando, T., De Schutter, O., & Mattei, U. (Eds.). (2018). Routledge handbook of food as a commons. Routledge.

Webb, P., Benton, T. G., Beddington, J., Flynn, D., Kelly, N. M., & Thomas, S. M. (2020). The urgency of food system transformation is now irrefutable. Nature Food, 1(10), 584–585. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-00173-9

White, M. M. (2018). Freedom farmers: Agricultural resistance and the Black freedom movement. University of North Carolina Press.

Whyte, K. P. (2018). Indigenous science (fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral dystopias and fantasies of climate change crises. Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space, 1(1–2), 224–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848618797476

Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., ... & Murray, C. J. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. The Lancet, 393(10170), 447–492. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4

Wittman, H. (2011). Food sovereignty: A new rights framework for food and nature? Environment and Society, 2(1), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2011.020106

Zografos, C., & Robbins, P. (2020). Green sacrifice zones, or why a green new deal cannot ignore the cost shifts of just transitions. One Earth, 3(5), 543–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.10.014

Zurek, M., Hebinck, A., & Selomane, O. (2022). Climate change and the urgency to transform food systems. Science, 376(6600), 1416–1421. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abq0765