

---

ANNALS  
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA  
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. XX, 1

SECTIO K

2013

---

Faculty of Political Science, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin – Poland

KATARZYNA MARZĘDA-MŁYNARSKA

*Food security: from national to global governance*<sup>1</sup>

---

ABSTRACT

Food constitutes the basic human need. Without food it is impossible to meet other needs. Changes in the modern world indicate that the problem of food security will steadily grow in importance in the future. The key question is therefore how to provide it, how to govern it. Despite its importance food security constitutes one of the less researched areas within international governance debate. It has never been ensured on the global level despite amazing progress of science and technology. What is more, the changing nature of threats to food security makes this goal even more distant. There are two contrasting views on that issue. In the first, the states are responsible for food security governance. This view is supported by the uniqueness of the agriculture, as a sector responsible for ensuring food. However, the growing limitations of states' ability to decide on its own agriculture and food policy due to globalization processes make this vision disputable. According to the second view, in the face of globalization processes the best way to ensure it is to enhance the global food security governance. This vision also is confronted with criticisms, however, there are strong arguments which support it. The paper deals with the problem of food security governance. Its main assumption is that national governance becomes ineffective to address all food security dimensions under the globalization processes. That is why new modes are needed. The main argument of the paper is that the global governance model can fill the governance gap in food security area at the national level.

**Key words:** food security, global governance, globalization

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper financed from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education Grant no N N116461140.

## INTRODUCTION

Since Thomas Malthus' times there is a constant debate how to achieve food security worldwide. Despite the immense technology progress eradication of hunger is still a distant goal. The statistics are alarming. According to the FAO estimates, almost one-sixth of humanity suffers hunger [FAO 2009]. What is interesting, the problem of food insecurity is not in amount of food or food production. It remains unsolved even though food production started exceeding needs of growing world population. It became clear that food insecurity is caused not by the lack of food *per se*, but it has deeper roots.

This paper is a part of research project conducted at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland under grant entitled "Global Governance of Food Security". Its main argument is that food insecurity problem is due to the lack of effective governance mechanisms at the local, national and global levels, and we are witnessing the dynamic changes in the form of food security governance under globalization processes. It is based on several assumptions: firstly, globalization processes create new quality of social life and change the way the international environment operates. Secondly, in the face of globalization food security concept is becoming multidimensional, which increases the demand for new forms of governance. Thirdly, in these new conditions the responsibility for ensuring food security is moved up to the global level and requires action of a wider group of stakeholders. And lastly, within the system of food governance there can be identified subsystems: economic, political, ecological and social. The main constraint and challenge to food security governance is the lack of coordination between its various subsystems.

These assumptions construct the background for analysis of changing models of food security governance. The shift from national to global governance, what is argued is not however at the cost of nation states. It only illustrates the changing logic of problem-solving in the new conditions. Multidimensional character of food security problem requires multi-actor approach. It means that nation states can not assure food security on their own, yet without nation states effective global governance of food security is impossible as well.

The structure of the paper consists of four parts. The first explains the concept of food security and how it is interpreted in the context of food governance subsystems and the governance concept. Special attention is put on new threats to food security, which make it necessary to look for new mechanisms and models to control growing food insecurity. The second part concentrates on national governance and its limits. The third explains the concept of global governance, and the fourth its applicability to food security. Since it is primarily a conceptual paper I neither present original data nor examine specific cases. Rather, my purpose is to identify and provide a global governance decision-making model as a conceptual framework for future research.

## FOOD SECURITY AND GOVERNANCE CONCEPTS

Food security concept has been developed since the inception of Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, but the need for some form of multilateral food security arrangement had already been recognized by the League of Nations before the Second World War [Shaw 2007: 5]. Despite the fact that its content was changing over the six decades of FAO existence, the idea which laid behind its development was still the same. The food security concept was not about the food *per se*, but it expressed the concern for the fulfilment of one of the basic human needs, which was food.

There are about two hundred definitions of food security nowadays [FAO 2003: 25]. At first food security concept was related only to the food supply, production and trade. The international community main concern was the stabilization of agricultural commodity prices at the national and the international level. Since the 1980s the concept has been modified. Its definition was extended to the ‘individual dimension’ of food security. It was noticed that focusing of international concerns only on food supply was distorting the reality. The physical food availability did not mean automatically that the poorest had access to it. That situation was confirmed by FAO and the World Bank reports on hunger and poverty, in which the need for the redefinition of food security concept has been suggested.

The expression of the new attitude to the food security problem was the new definition adopted at FAO World Food Summit in 1996 [Shaw 2007: 350]. According to which “food security, at the individual, household, national, regional and global levels is achieved when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” [FAO 2003: 28].

Food security concept was redefined once again in 2001. Apart from the physical and economic access to food the emphasis was put on the social dimension of food security. The new definition stated that “food security is a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” [FAO 2003: 28].

This new definition divides the food security problem into the four dimensions: the physical availability of food, where the production and distribution of food are involved; the economic and social access to food, where the issues of poverty reduction and food prices play the most important role; the stability of access; and the fourth dimension which covers the issues of the proper quality of food and food safety.

Similarly to the evolution of food security concept there has been evolution of its threats. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century Thomas Malthus drew attention to the direct connection between demographic factor and the hunger. He argued that population when unchecked increases in a geometrical ratio but the production of food increases only in an arithmetical ratio. It inevitably leads to the situation of world starvation.

Malthus however drew his conclusions in a specific historical context and he could not anticipate the future technological and science progress in food production, which has softened the pessimistic character of his prognosis.

Within the most important threats to the world food security there can be identified four groups [von Braun 2007: 1]. The first one covers threats caused by population and income growth. High population growth translates into the increases in food demand. High incomes are responsible for the growing demand for high-value products which is satisfied at the cost of the poorest whose access to this kind of food is limited.

The climate change challenges construct the second group of food security threats. There is no doubt that climate change mostly affects agriculture and food production. As Josef Schmidhuber and Francesco N. Tubiello argue, it affects food production directly through changes in agro-ecological conditions and indirectly by affecting growth and distribution of incomes and thus the demand for agriculture produce [2007]. Projections show that due to the climate change the land suitable for wheat production may almost disappear in Africa [von Braun 2007: 3]. As a result agricultural prices will also be affected by climate change. Temperature increases of more than 3 degrees Celsius may cause prices to increase by up to 40 percent [Easterling et al. 2007: 275–276].

The third group includes threats driven by high energy prices and especially production of biofuels. Due to the rising prices of fossil fuels (oil, gas), being accompanied by the shift towards more ecological energy sources the use of agricultural products for industrial purposes increased dramatically. According to the FAO estimation, the use of cereals for biofuel production increased by more than 25 percent [von Braun 2007: 3].

The fourth group are threats posed by globalization processes which dramatically change not only the way of production and distribution of food worldwide but also the structure of global food markets. The industrialization of agriculture, the growing role and importance of food and agriculture transnational corporations, changes in the corporate food system, the monopolization of biotechnological improvements in agriculture due to the application of property rights, the hypocrisy of liberalization of international trade in agriculture, all of this can be identified as its main manifestations.

The food security concept brought a new perspective on the issue of world starvation. The identification of the five levels where food security must be assured and the four dimensions in which it must be achieved make the problem of food security governance extremely difficult. What is more the current international practice shows that because of the broad character of the food security concept the actions to achieve it are taken in different policy areas, e.g. agriculture policy, trade policy, development policy and food safety policy.

The analysis of food security governance requires not only the explanation of food security concept but also the idea of governance. There are lots of different definitions depending on where they have been applied, on the author and on the context. In the broader sense the term ‘governance’ is used to designate all regula-

tions intended to organize human societies. When the idea of governance is moved to the international level it is also defined as regulation but ‘made in the absence of an overarching political authority’ [Rosenau 1999: 295]. However, can governance be treated the same way as the regulation? When it is understood as a process of taking under control specific issues by setting rules and restrictions on it, it seems better to define it as a decision-making.

There is no doubt that governance concept is strictly connected with the distribution of authority. The definition developed by Elke Krahnmann, in which governance means the fragmentation of political authority in different dimensions, e.g. geography, function, resources, interests, norms, decision-making and policy implementation [2003: 323–346], highlights this aspect.

In the first dimension authority is distributed across different levels. All of these levels can be identified within the food security concept. In the second dimension authority is distributed across different issue areas, which require different governance strategy. In the food security case, the most relevant strategies are: regulations, dissemination of knowledge, standard setting, and aid. In the third dimension authority is distributed across the resource holders.

According to Thomas Risse, governance refers to various institutionalized modes of social coordination to produce and implement collectively binding rules or to provide collective goods [2012: 700]. There is no doubt that in the case of food security we can identify both dimensions. The international rules on food trade, agriculture policies, quality of food, market access are examples of binding rules. On the other hand, food production, distribution, food aid can be considered as forms of food providing.

When we look deeper at the governance definition it can be understood as the decision-making process. We can identify the problem requiring solution which is food insecurity, we can identify: 1) actors involved in the decision making-process, 2) effects of the decision-making process, which can be both rules and goods, 3) implementation of the decisions, and finally 4) monitoring of implementation. On each stage of the decision-making process, there are different actors involved. As Risse points out, due to the fact that governance includes both hierarchical steering through authoritative rule-making and nonhierarchical modes of social coordination (e. g. bargaining, persuasion, deliberation, social learning) [2012: 700] there are both ‘hard players’ – nation states, and ‘soft players’ – NGOs and CSOs, international organizations.

The modes of food security governance change under the globalization processes. The logic of these changes undermines the usefulness of hierarchically organized structures of power. In this situation the effectiveness of international steering structures is conditioned by the integration of the traditional hierarchical decision-making models and horizontal ones. In his working paper *Discourse and Order – On the Conditions of Governance in Non-hierarchical Multi-Level Systems*, Jürgen Neyer uses the notion of ‘heterarchy’ to describe this new form of governance where political authority is neither centralized (hierarchy) nor decentralized (anarchy) but shared, and where the

vertical and the horizontal models of the decision-making are combined together into an integrated mode of interaction [2002: 4]. From this perspective we can say that the hybridization of the decision-making process should be the main characteristic of new food security governance model. In this model the nation states are important but one of the many elements of the decision-making process. There is no hierarchy or decision-making centre, each element of the structure is important because of the resources it possesses, which are needed in the process of solving the particular problem. The equal importance of each element is also based on the assumption that all of them fulfil certain functions within the scope of their competencies. However, as J. Neyer points out, it does not mean that all levels of this structure always have an equal influence on policy outcomes. It depends on the issue area, institutional provision and public awareness [Neyer 2002: 5]. It will be later explained in the part devoted to the global governance concept.

#### NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY GOVERNANCE AND ITS LIMITS

The early twenty-first century began with the discussion on new ways of food security governance. It was stimulated by two important events. First, the 1996 World Food Summit, and its consequences. And second, the sharp increase in food prices, which caused huge anxiety all over the world including developed countries, not seen since the 1970s food crisis.

Two competitive trends can be identified in that debate. First, postulated back to the food security governance at the national level. This kind of argumentation can be found in R. Paarlberg discussion paper entitled *Governance and Food Security in an Age of Globalization* [2002]. He believes that food insecurity, which is manifested in the extreme forms of hunger and malnutrition in developing countries is due to the lack of proper governance at the national level. According to him, states are the primary actors responsible for providing food security to its citizens. At the national level there are all instruments needed to achieve this goal: food and agriculture policies, subsidies and support to local producers, trade instruments, etc. He argues that national governments still play the dominant role in food production yet hunger persists in some regions largely because of governance deficits and failures at the national level rather than global. A little bit simplistic view on the causes of food insecurity in developing countries, which denied the influence of external factors like globalization, international trade agreements or international organizations policies, is supported by the argument that not only the lack of proper food and agriculture policies underlies the food insecurity. In the author's opinion the biggest problem in developing countries is the failure to provide the essential domestic public goods, such as peace, rule of law, public research, infrastructure which are needed for growth of farm productivity and rural incomes [Paarlberg 2002: 1]. This view can be associated with the treatment of the concept of food security in terms of the internal security

complex. States are responsible for ensuring security of its citizens, not only in the military sphere but also in other areas including food.

We can agree with Paarlberg to some point. Indeed, in most of developed countries, including the EU and its Common Agriculture Policy, national governments transfer lots of money to local food producers in a form of direct and indirect support, but it is not the case in most of countries affected by chronic food insecurity. There can be identified important external factors which make national governance extremely hard. The first is international trade. Since international food trade is very integrated, violations, distortions and speculations in global food market can easily deteriorate food security in many countries, especially in those depending on food import. According to the statistics, in the group of world's ten biggest food importers seven are developing countries [Rediff Business 2012]. The 2011 'Arab Spring' was motivated by dramatic increase in prices of food staples in North African countries. It exposed the weakness of national level governance in preventing the deterioration in food security and the lack of instruments and mechanisms which can protect, especially the poorest, from sharp increase in prices.

Trade agreements constitute the next external factor which limited effective food security governance at the national level. The Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture, brought agricultural trade more fully under the GATT. It not only provided for converting quantitative restrictions to tariffs and for a phased reduction of tariffs, but also imposed rules and disciplines on agricultural export subsidies, domestic subsidies, and sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures. In developed countries these regulations not necessarily meant barriers to national food governance but for most developing countries they sharply limited room for maneuver.

National food governance is also strongly limited in least developed countries by International Financial Institutions policies and programs (conditioning). In contrast to R. Paarlberg's arguments, countries where food insecurity is the most severe, deregulated its food sector under the IFI pressure. Since introduction of Structural Adjustment Programs many of them removed public support to local farmers, fixed food prices, subsidies for food and opened their markets to food import. This kind of policy only deepened the dependence of poorest countries on global markets and prices violations, and made the local production uncompetitive and unprofitable, and thus deprived of the impact of national governance on food security.

In food security governance strong limitation of states' operational power is also due to the threats and risks located outside its territory. Climate change and its negative impact on food security can not be effectively controlled by single states. That is why other forms of governance are gaining in importance.

Why are the nation states losing their ability to effectively govern food security issues? We have to bear in mind that this problem mainly concerns developing countries, but to the same degree it can be treated as an objective trend, observable also in developed ones. There are two theories which can be used as an explanation for this phenomenon. First one is Wolfgang Reinicke's theory of two forms of sov-

ereignty [1998: 55–58]. In his analysis on economic globalization impact on states' policy he distinguished between two forms of sovereignty: external, which constitutes the central rule of international system and refers to mutual exclusiveness of states operating in anarchic world system, pursuing its own interests, and internal, which can be understood as an ability to formulate, implement and manage internal public policy [Reinicke 1998: 55–58]. According to Reinicke, globalization processes pose a fundamental challenge to internal sovereignty. The limitation of nation states ability to govern its internal affairs is due to the changes in “political geography” and “economic geography” [Coleman 2012: 677]. States' internal sovereignty is limited by its territory, but at the same time internal affairs, like economic wellbeing, are increasingly affected by external forces (global markets, transnational trade relations, TNCs), which can not be effectively controlled by states' governments and their instruments. Food security which strongly depends on factors localized outside the states is an example of problems which should be addressed on different levels. It does not mean that nation states are becoming or should be excluded from, new forms of governance. The national level still plays an important role in food security governance, and still is at a core of global governance of food security.

The second theory which can be used to explain the limitation to national food security governance is Thomas Risse's theory of limited statehood. In his analysis he argues that the idea of modern and consolidated nation-state with a full monopoly over the means of violence and the capacity to effectively enforce central decisions is valid only to a very narrow group of highly developed countries [2012: 699]. “Outside the OECD world, we find areas of “limited statehood”, from developing and transition countries to failing and failed states” [Risse 2012: 699]. These kinds of areas lack the capacity to implement and enforce central decisions and monopoly on the use of force. The national governance is then supplemented by other forms. As Risse optimistically points out, there can be observed governance and the provision of collective goods even under the conditions of limited statehood [2012: 700]. It means that other forms and levels of governance are in play. If we understood governance as a decision-making it can be explained in terms of delegations (not necessarily understood as a formal process) of decision-making to other levels: vertically to intergovernmental organizations or horizontally to non-state actors: NGOs, CSOs, and private actors.

The second trend in the discussion on new ways of food security governance concentrates on delegation of decision-making to the higher level of governance. In general it postulates that the remedy to the food insecurity should be the strengthening of international institutions. This kind of thinking was already present after World War II. The establishment of FAO was seen as a solution to the food insecurity faced by the states. It was recognized that coordination and cooperation at the international level can have a positive impact on resolving the problem of hunger and malnutrition. An important role in this area was attributed to the World Bank Group, which through its policies and aid programs was treated as complementary to national

governance. The same way of thinking was based on CAP in EU. The integration of agricultural production sphere was perceived not only as a way to achieve the social goal, like equality of income in agriculture and industry, but also to prevent EU countries from starvation. In fact, however, efforts to strengthen cooperation at the international level were controlled by the state and can be regarded as an instrument of national governance.

The postulates for strengthening the international institutions and moving the food security governance to the supranational level can in turn be associated with the recognition of food security in terms of human security. The human security concept emerged in the early 1990s within the UNDP. The main idea behind it was to separate human security from its national interpretation. It was argued that objectively every human being has its rights which are universal, and if they are at risk, irrespective of the context, international community has the right to intervene, regardless of such principles as national sovereignty. Food security through its human dimension is therefore an element of human security.

#### THE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE CONCEPT

Research on governance in international relations has been intensified after the end of the Cold War. Attempts to find an alternative model of steering the international environment which would replace the old one, based on a domination of two superpowers, resulted in the idea of global governance, understood as a 'governing without government'. The creation of the Commission on Global Governance in 1992 and the publication of its report *Our Global Neighbourhood* in 1995 have sealed this new vision of governance of international relations.

The global governance paradigm, based on the assumptions arising from the changeability of international environment does not intend to establish the global government, but rather the additional decision-making levels between nation states, international organizations and civil society actors. It therefore undermined the priority of state-centered, hegemonic steering structures of international relations by stressing the importance of multilateralism as a fundamental rule of Post-cold War international governance.

The idea of global governance found its applicability especially to global problems solving. Problems which exceeded the abilities of particular states and existing intergovernmental mechanisms to control them. It was due to the fact that global governance in the conditions of globalization is not about adjusting different decision-making models to the hierarchical structures of nation-states but rather about the creation of systems of functional control around the specific issues – problems, based on the ability of different actors to mobilize its competencies and resources to deal effectively with these issues. In this model the nation-states are important but only one of the many elements of the decision-making process.

For the purpose of this study, global governance will be treated as a decision-making process. To analyze how it operates three categories need to be explained: its driving forces and subject, its structure, and finally its mechanism and instruments. It is important to point that there is no single model or form of global governance, nor is the single structure or set of structures. As Arie M. Kacowicz argues, “in fact global governance is a broad, dynamic, and complex process of interactive decision-making that is constantly in flux (...) it encompasses a rich mixture of actors, institutions and processes that take place at at least three levels: supranational (TNCs, IGOs, INGOs), national (firms, governments, CSOs) and subnational (local firms, local governments and local civil society) [2012: 690]. Any attempt to construct the theoretical model of global governance is a hard task and is strongly determined by the issue context.

When we think about global governance as a decision-making process, several questions need to be addressed. First one concerns driving forces and character of issues which are the subjects of global governance decision-making. Can each or selected problems be a subject of global governance? This dilemma has to be resolved at this stage of analysis. In analyses devoted to global governance origins there is a strong argument that it was stimulated by the emergence of new problems or governance tasks, and increasing pressure from the existing ones [Brühl, Rittberger 2001: 3]. The problems which became subjects of global governance are: firstly, transboundary, or suprateritorial on a global scale, they extend across state borders in almost uncontrollable way (environmental threats, refugee flows, international criminal activities), secondly, they relate to common global property, no one can be denied the right to it, and thirdly, they arise independently in a number of different places in the world and single nation-states are unable to effectively deal with them, thus actions on a global scale are needed [Coleman 2012: 681–682].

The next question concerns the structure of global governance process. In all decision-making processes there can be identified decision-making centers, which have its own structure. Within this structure we can identify different circles of decision-making actors: 1) the first one consists of a group of key decision-makers – “hard players”. Those who have the formal status for making a final decision. 2) The second is constructed by “intermediate” decision-makers who do not have a formal status to make the final decision, but they play a key role in facilitating the whole process. They are responsible for agenda, procedures, etc. and by that can influence the final outcome. 3) The third consists of the “soft players”. In this group there are lobbyists, stakeholders and others who have interests to involve in decision-making process. This kind of decision-makers do not seek for a formal decision-making status, rather to influence the final outcome. They use soft instruments, both formal and informal (lobby, information campaigns, boycotts, knowledge diffusion, expertise etc.) to influence “hard players” and to shape the decision-making outcome. 4) And the last group is civil society. The broadest group of ‘silent’ participants in decision-making, who do not seek for formal status and do not want to influence the final outcome, but in certain circumstances can mobilize themselves and express their opinion and

take actions separately from formal decision-making process. This kind of decision-making power lies in values (morality, ethics, tolerance, humanism) represented by people involved in these kinds of activities. Identification of actors from all circles, helps determine if all actors have the same decision-making power and influence over the final outcome, and if not, what is the particular actors' role in the process and formal status.

The next question is how actors interact with each other. There are four 'ideal' forms of interactions: negotiations, co-operation, partnership and co-optation. At this point we have to remember that interactions are determined by the decision-making phase. Different relations between actors can be identified in the agenda setting phase, in the decision-making phase, and in the implementation phase. While in the agenda-setting and implementation phases (operational level) the role of soft-players can increase (co-optation, co-operation, partnership), depending on the resources they possess. The decision-making phase (normative level) is still dominated by hard-players (negotiations). In his article *Global Governance, International Order and World Order*, Arie M. Kacowicz presented very interesting typology of global governance forms according to type of interactions between different groups of actors. Interactions are defined by the level of formality and direction of authority delegation. He distinguished six forms of global governance: top-down, bottom-up, market-type governance, network governance, side-by-side governance, web/network governance [2012: 691]. In the top-down global governance interactions between different actors are based on contracting out and outsourcing. In the bottom-up interactions are based on positive incentives and bargaining. In market-type governance interactions are based on public-private networks and partnerships. In network governance we have again contracting out and outsourcing. In side-by-side governance, besides the positive incentives and bargaining, there are international regimes, private-private partnerships, private regimes. And in the last form, the web/network governance, there are networks of advocacy [Kacowicz 2012: 691].

The next question we have to address concerns the decision-making levels and interlinks between them. This problem can be conceptualized twofold. Firstly, there can be distinguished spatial levels of governance: subnational (local), national (nation-state), supranational (regional, global); secondly, the systemic levels which include: civil society level, level of organized groups (governments, NGOs, CSOs.), level of international institutions (IGOs), and level of policy outcomes. According to Michael Zürn, there should be met two conditions to consider global governance as a multilevel governance. First, the global level must possess some authority, independently of nation-states. Secondly, the global level must be part of the system that is characterized by the interplay of different levels [Zürn 2012: 731].

Following Zürn argumentation this kind of "exclusive" authority of the global level can be observed in particular phases of decision-making process, especially in agenda setting and implementation. The involvement of actors operating on the global level is the highest in implementation phase. Rule interpretation, monitoring, enforcement,

evaluation and new agenda setting which are parts of implementation are increasingly carried out by actors who are not directly under the control of states. To satisfy the second condition we should interpret actions taken at the global level by non-state actors in a systemic relations with actions taken on other levels by other actors. This kind of conceptualizations needs a methodology. Very helpful in this context can be the EU open method of coordination based on soft mechanisms of problem solving. Rather than hard legislations it proposes coordination and participations, knowledge and learning diffusion as a ways of dealing with problems. This method includes several components: 1) guidelines, 2) benchmarking and sharing of best practices; 3) multilateral surveillance; 4) indicators; 5) interactive process; 6) implementation through domestic policies and legislation [Radaelli 2003: 15]. When treated as a new mode of governance it is characterized by six features: First one is new and more limited role of law. Second, new approach to problem-solving. This method works by interactions, standard settings and mutual cooperation across levels of government and between public and private actors. Third, participation is a key feature of the process. Fourth, it is built on diversity and subsidiary. Fifth, it includes new ways to produce usable knowledge. This method is supposed to work like a network looking for usable knowledge at all levels. Sixth, its final point is policy learning [Radaelli 2003: 26]. Of course not all of these features can be identified in global governance, however, this kind of interplay between different levels of governance to achieve a common goal can be found in Millennium Development Goals Project, which is based on cooperation and participation, where are globally agreed indicators and benchmarks, where is a multilateral surveillance, interactions between different actors operating on different levels and finally the outcome in a form of new legislations and policies at the national level.

The last question which needs to be addressed concerns mechanisms, procedures and instruments necessary to make the final outcome. As in a classic decision-making there are formal and informal decision-making procedures, mechanisms and instruments. We can distinguish formal procedures sanctioned by law in international bodies and institutions and a range of soft mechanisms and instruments including: co-regulation, self-regulation, lobbying, pressure, boycott, standard-setting, knowledge diffusion and aid. It is important to emphasize, however, that all of these mechanisms and instruments can be simultaneously used by different actors on different levels.

#### GLOBAL GOVERNANCE APPLICABILITY TO FOOD SECURITY PROBLEM

Basing on the theoretical assumptions developed above in this part of paper, we test the global governance decision-making model applicability to food security problem.

First analytical category is a problem. According to the theoretical assumptions, it should be suprateritorial and transboundary, it should relate to common global property, it should arise independently in a number of different places in the world

and single nation-states should be unable to effectively deal with it. Is food security satisfying those conditions? The first condition of supraterritoriality is hard to meet. Food insecurity is strictly connected to certain regions and countries. It does not move freely uncontrolled from country to country as environmental threats. However, when we look at its possible consequences as migration we can consider it as a transboundary problem. Other conditions are easy to meet. So it can be said that food security is a global problem which needs a global response.

Second analytical category is decision-making process. It includes decision-making centers, interactions between them and levels. There are four decision-making centers identified: 'hard-players'; 'intermediate'; 'soft-players' and 'silent-participants'. This distinction is made accordingly to the decision-making potential. When we look at the food security area it is important to emphasize, that nation-states have still the strongest decision-making potential in all food governance subsystems. Riva Krut in her study on NGOs influence in international decision-making confirms that despite the growing number of NGOs and TNCs its direct involvement in making final outcome is still limited and still final decisions are made by states and depend on national-governments political will [1997]. The lack of formal access to key global decision-making bodies, however, does not create impediments for 'soft-players' and 'silent-participants' and it does not mean that the decisions made by 'hard-players' are against the interests of other decision-making centers. There are instruments and mechanisms, by which other actors can shape the final outcome. As Krut points out: "In response, the conventional tools of education and persuasion are still dominant. Print and electronic media, conferences and networking are now actively being used to further their agenda. If these are not effective in changing the minds of the decision-makers, more creative and/or confrontational campaigning may ensure" [Krut 1997: 36]. In other words, they do not made the decision but they can influence its content, or influence the national-governments.

The decision-making potential of 'intermediary' and 'soft-players' is smaller but through instruments they possess they can change the states' official position towards a particular issue. In Nora McKeon's book on food security global governance, special attention is given to those actors: international organizations' (UNO, FAO) secretariats and staff (intermediary), and NGOs, CSOs, working on food security area (soft-players). Secretariats and staff play a very important role in preparation of the decision-making process. They draw the problems like food security to official agenda, they discuss the agenda with representatives of states, they decide about a list of speakers to official conferences, policy forums, intergovernmental meetings, they decide about timetable, who will speak when, and whether it is the main debate or less important meeting. Through the accreditation procedure they can decide which NGOs, CSOs, or TNCs organizations will participate in intergovernmental meetings, policy forums, and normative and operational activities [McKeon 2009: 125].

The level of influence of 'soft-players' and 'intermediary' players in food security area differs according to the food governance subsystem. In economic subsystem re-

sponsible for food production, distribution and consumption, 'soft players' like TNCs and its associations are sometimes considered as a service-deliveries and granted high status in official decision-making meetings. It is best illustrated by the Codex Alimentarius. As McKeon points out, in 2008 of the 23 members of the US delegation to the meeting of the Commission 10 represented food corporation [2009: 172].

NGOs and CSOs can influence decision-making process and its final outcomes in food security in many different ways. Good practices, side-events, mobilization resources or preparations position papers are few of many instruments analyzed by Nora McKeon in her book. 'Silent participants' have least decision-making potential, it however does not mean that they cannot influence the decision-making process. Boycotts, street protests, Internet campaigns, information campaigns, stigmatization and finally elections can change or shape the governments' official position in food security area.

In global governance understood as a decision-making process there can be identified four types of interactions. Are they typical of food security governance? 1) Negotiations are characteristic of interactions between nations-states. In food governance it is a primary form of interactions in economic and political subsystems. 2) Co-operation characterizes the relations between a broader scope of actors. We can talk about the co-operation between nations-states, nation-states and IGOs, nation-states and NGO, CSOs, and TNCs, and between IGOs and NGOs. Forms of co-operation differ according to the food governance subsystem. Cooperation can take a form of official consultations, service-delivery, resource mobilization, expertise or involvement in operational activities. 3) Partnership is characteristic of the interaction between public and private actors. In food security area this kind of relations is critical to operational activities in the social subsystem, where programs and projects on food aid, fighting poverty and hunger are conducted. And the last form of interactions, 4) co-optation can be found in all subsystems and relates to inclusion of non-state actors in formal intergovernmental meetings. Co-optation is characteristic especially of the economic subsystem, where expertise and knowledge is needed.

In the current food security governance system there can be identified three levels: the global level represented by the United Nations System, the regional level represented by the regional organizations (European Union) and the nation-states level. The subnational level is missing from this system, however, there can be observed new processes in this area. The most important is the emancipation of regions functioning within the states at the international level. Decentralization processes which took and take place in a different part of the world (not only in Europe) make the voice of these sub-state actors better heard. Regions are perceived not only as a level of governance more responsive to the people's needs compared with the state level but also more effective in dealing with global problems touching local communities, whether it is climate change or food security. The institutional manifestation of the regions' involvement in global issues is Forum of Global Associations of Regions created in 2007. The main objectives of the Forum, besides the promotion of initiatives

for mutual knowledge and cooperation between regions around the world are ensuring the regions voice in globalization and organizing new strategic governance rules.

The growing importance of sub-state actors at the international level can be illustrated by some practical initiatives. One of them is the Art Gold initiative set up by the UNDP as a 'platform for innovative partnerships' which brought together local authorities, states and UN agencies in collaboration for achieving Millennium Development Goals. The other initiative worth to mention is the first Summit of the World's Regions on Food Security which took place in January 2010 in Dakar, Senegal, arose from a belief that the regions have the political and technical capacity to lead concrete actions that respond to the actual needs expressed by their fellow citizens.

There is no doubt that the world food security system is dominated by the UN System. As a universal organization the UNO is responsible not only for addressing the problem of food security but also for seeking the solutions. It would not be exaggeration to say that the UN System and especially FAO are playing a pivotal role in the food security governance, by harnessing the private sector and civil society and by building a collective action through global partnership or alliance in the broadly defined development policy. What is more, the global level of food security governance embraces also the World Trade Organization, the IMF and the World Bank. That is why the priority areas which were identified for the global level include also the establishment of an open international trading system to achieve food security and strengthening of the international finance and technical cooperation.

In the discussion on food security governance the strong accent is put on the responsibilities of nation-states in this area. Robert Paarlberg argues that the greatest governance deficits in the food security area are still at the national level and not at the global level [2002]. He stresses that the 'global level' efforts to fill these gaps in the national governance have ended in frustration since the traditional norm of state sovereignty continues to stand in the way. What is more, his research shows that to mitigate food insecurity, especially in the poorest and the least developed countries the practice of taking over states responsibilities by other actors should be replaced by strengthening states governance capacities. Because the national governments are still playing the dominant role in food production, distribution and consumption, the problem of food security should be dealt on this level.

The European Union represents the regional level of food security governance. However, despite the money spent and the high involvement, its role in food security governance is very ambiguous. When we look at the actions taken by the EU in the following policy areas: agriculture policy, trade policy, and development policy, we can see that it is characterized by a huge incoherence. The strong involvement in international development policy is not followed by its involvement in the establishing an open international trading system in agriculture to achieve food security.

The levels of governance include also the new players: civil society and private actors. Their involvement depends however on the food security subsystem. For example, in the food safety policy, apart from the national level where responsibility lies first,

there is strong involvement of private sector – food producers and food processors and its associations, not only as recipients or observers but also as standard setters. In the development policy the private actors and civil society organizations and networks play even a greater role. In these contexts the global multilevel governance idea of ‘functional control’ over the specific issues seems to materialize.

The next element of decision-making process are interactions between different levels. Food security area is a good example how different levels (spatial and systemic) can interplay. As Riva Krut argues, “food security became a legitimate focus for international (global) attention in large part because of efforts by civil society to frame the issues in the way that require government attention” [Krut 1997: 28]. The mechanism of interactions between different levels in food security issue is maybe not quite the same as open coordination method in EU, yet it is based on the same logic. How does the global governance decision-making model work in practice in food security area? The answer to this question requires a deeper study, and I hope the research project I conduct will shed some light on this problem.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The limitation to national governance in food security area indicates that new mechanisms are needed. The main argument of this paper is that the global governance model can fill the governance gap in food security area at the national level. However, the question which needs to be addressed as an introduction to the further analysis is why global governance should be transferred to the food security area. The most obvious answer is because the existing decision-making model is ineffective and there is still huge food insecurity worldwide. However, when we look deeper at the problem of food security, we can easily observe that there are immense qualitative changes in the food security problem itself, as well as in the processes aiming to solve it, which are missing in the existing decision-making system.

Three processes identified in world politics as a background of global governance development have crucial meaning to its applicability to food security area. Due to the globalization processes the changes occurred in political mobilization, in policy-making, and in the states’ structures, which are transforming the architecture of food security governance. In the first instance, we can observe the new ways of political mobilization around the problem of food security. The traditional forms like political parties, trade unions or elections are supplemented by new ones like grass-root movements, food security coalitions, food security networks, peasant’s movements, social campaigns and others.

In the second instance there could be easily observed qualitative and quantitative changes in actors involved in food security issue. Beside the states and intergovernmental organization, there is growing involvement of private actors, especially

transnational corporations from agribusiness, as well as civil society organizations, farmers organizations, and researchers.

In the third instance, the changes are marked by the emancipation of local and regional representation at a global level. Despite the very first stage of this evolution it becomes obvious that in the food security case distance between the decision-makers and decision-receivers should be as short as possible. Patterns of food insecurity vary within the states, that is why the solutions made at this level are often insufficient. It leads to the conclusion that the better responses to food security problem can be drawn at the lower level and depend on the local level involvement in food governance. This philosophy laid down as a background of the Worldwide Action for Food Security, which stressed that local governments and their partners have a vital role to play in assessing food insecurity and in planning concerted responses.

Application of global governance to food security is also conditioned by growing demand for governance in international relations. As James N. Rosenau points out, “people throughout the world are restless and unhappy over the quality of their governments, cynical about, and often alienated from the effectiveness and integrity of the procedures whereby government frame and implement their policies” [Rosenau 2004: 31–48]. In the food security field this growing demand for governance is conditioned not only by the changing capacities of the states but also by changing character of food security problem itself. New threats to food security, new actors involved, contradictory interest over food, increase the pursuit of new modes of governance.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Braun, von J. 2007. *The World Food Situation. New Driving Forces and Required Actions*, International Food Policy Research Institute: Washington.
- Brühl, T., Rittberger, V. 2001. *From international to global governance: Actors, collective decision-making, and the United Nations in the world of the twenty-first century*, [in:] *Global Governance and the United Nations System*, V. Rittberger (ed.), United Nations University Press: Tokyo, New York, Paris.
- Coleman, W. D. 2012. *Governance an Global Public Policy*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, D. Levi-Faur (ed.), Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Easterling, W. E. et al. 2007. *Food, fibre and forest products*, [in:] *Climate change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of working group II to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M. L. Parry, O. F. Canine, J. P. Palutikof, P. J. van der Linden and C. E. Hanson (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- FAO, 2003. *Trade Reforms and Food Security. Conceptualizing the Linkages*, Rome.
- FAO, 2009. Press Release, *More People Than Ever Are Victims of Hunger*, <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/20568/icode/> (access 12.05.2012).
- Kacowicz, A. M. 2012. *Global Governance, International Order and World Order*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, D. Levi-Faur (ed.), Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Krahmann, E. 2003. *National, Regional, and Global Governance: One Phenomenon of Many*, “Global Governance”, 9 (3).

- Krut, R. 1997. *Globalization and Civil Society: NGO Influence in International Decision-Making*, UNRISD Discussion Paper no 83.
- McKeon, N. 2009. *The United Nations and Civil Society. Legitimizing Global Governance – Whose Voice*, Zed Books, London–New York.
- Neyer, J. 2002. *Discourse and Order – On the Conditions of Governance in Non-hierarchical Multi-Level Systems*, ARENA Working Paper no 9.
- Paarlberg, R. L. 2002. *Governance and Food Security in an Age of Globalization*, IFPRI Discussion Paper 36: Washington.
- Radaelli, C. M. 2003. *The Open Method of Coordination: A New Governance Architecture for the European Union*, SIEPS, Rapport no 1: Stockholm.
- Rediff Business 2012. *World's top 10 exporters and importers of food*, <http://www.rediff.com/business/slide-show/slide-show-1-worlds-top-10-exporters-and-importers-of-food/20110315.htm> (access 11.06.2012).
- Reinicke, W. 1998. *Global Public Policy: Governing without Government?*, Brookings Institution Press: Washington DC.
- Risse, T. 2012. *Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, D. Levi-Faur (ed.), Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Rosenau, J. N. 1999. *Toward Ontology for Global Governance*, [in:] *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*, M. Hewson, T. J. Sinclair (ed.), State University of New York Press: Albany.
- Rosenau, J. N. 2004. *Strong Demand, Huge Supply: Governance in an Emerging Epoch*, [in:] *Multi-level Governance*, I. Bache, M. Flinders (ed.), Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Schmidhuber, J., Dubiello, F. N. 2007. *Global Food Security under Climate Change*, 2007, [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0701976104](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0701976104) (access 15.06.2012).
- Shaw, D. J. 2007. *World Food Security. A History Since 1945*, Palgrave: Macmillan, London–New York.
- Zürn, M. 2012. *Global Governance as a Multi-level Governance*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, D. Levi-Faur (ed.), Oxford University Press: Oxford.

#### BIOGRAPHY

**Katarzyna MARZĘDA-MLYNARSKA** graduated from the Faculty of Political Science of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin and Foreign Policy Studies at the Diplomatic Academy in Warsaw. PhD in political science at UMCS in 2005. Lecturer at the Faculty of Political Science at UMCS. Member of the national and international scientific societies. Author of numerous publications on global issues, food security, globalization and foreign policy of the Republic of Poland.