

RESEARCH ARTICLE



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

2395-2636 (Print);2321-3108 (online)

Food Sovereignty, Biodiversity, and the Politics of Agriculture in Vandana Shiva's *Who Really Feeds the World?*

Kavita Priyadrshni

¹ Assistant Professor, Shri Ratanlal Kanwarlal Patni Girls College,
Kishangarh, Ajmer - 305801, Rajasthan, India
Email: priyadrshnirtahore4545@gmail.com

DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.14.3.391](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.14.3.391)



Article info

Article Received: 16/08/2026
Article Accepted: 19/09/2026
Published online: 21/09/2026

Abstract

Vandana Shiva's *Who Really Feeds the World?* The Failures of Agribusiness and the Promise of Agroecology offers a sustained critique of industrial agriculture and proposes agroecology, biodiversity, small-scale farming, seed sovereignty, localization, and women's agricultural knowledge as foundations for a more sustainable food system. This paper examines Shiva's central argument that the dominant agribusiness model has constructed a misleading definition of food production by equating agricultural productivity with industrial inputs, monocultures, chemical fertilizers, proprietary seeds, and global commodity markets. Through an analysis of Shiva's ecological, economic, feminist, and political arguments, the paper situates the book within broader debates about food security, food sovereignty, agricultural biodiversity, and sustainable development. The study also compares Shiva's arguments with research by the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development, the United Nations Environment Programme, and scholars of agroecology. The paper argues that Shiva's greatest contribution is not simply her rejection of industrial agriculture but her attempt to redefine what it means to "feed the world." Her approach shifts the question from the quantity of commodities produced toward ecological sustainability, nutrition, farmer livelihoods, democratic control of seeds, and social justice. At the same time, the paper recognizes criticisms concerning Shiva's tendency to present industrial agriculture and agroecology as overly binary alternatives and her insufficient attention to differences among agricultural contexts. Ultimately, *Who Really Feeds the World?* Remains an important intervention in contemporary debates because it connects ecological degradation with questions of power, knowledge, gender, and economic control.

Keywords: Vandana Shiva, agroecology, food sovereignty, biodiversity,

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of how humanity will feed a growing population has become one of the most important political, ecological, and economic questions of the twenty-first century. Modern agricultural systems have dramatically increased the volume of food entering global markets, yet hunger, malnutrition, ecological degradation, rural poverty, and unequal access to food continue to exist simultaneously. The contradiction is particularly significant because the global food system is capable of producing enormous quantities of food while remaining environmentally and socially unequal. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) increasingly approaches agriculture as a system involving ecological, social, economic, and cultural relationships rather than merely the production of commodities (FAO, *The 10 Elements*). Vandana Shiva's *Who Really Feeds the World? The Failures of Agribusiness and the Promise of Agroecology* enters this debate by challenging the assumption that industrial agriculture is necessarily the most effective way to feed the global population. Published in 2016, the book argues that the dominant industrial model has misunderstood both agriculture and food. Rather than treating farms as factories that convert chemical and technological inputs into commodities, Shiva advocates a model based on ecological relationships, biodiversity, local knowledge, farmer autonomy, and social justice. The book's central chapters are organized around provocative contrasts: "Agroecology Feeds the World," "Living Soil Feeds the World," "Biodiversity Feeds the World," "Small-Scale Farmers Feed the World," "Seed Freedom Feeds the World," "Localization Feeds the World," and "Women Feed the World" (Shiva).

The central argument of this paper is that *Who Really Feeds the World?* should be

understood not merely as a critique of industrial farming but as a political redefinition of the concept of food security. Shiva asks readers to move beyond the measurement of agricultural success through yields and commodity output and instead consider ecological health, nutrition, farmer livelihoods, biodiversity, cultural knowledge, and democratic control of food systems. Her argument has considerable support from contemporary research on agroecology and biodiversity. FAO, for example, describes agroecology through interconnected principles including diversity, resilience, recycling, efficiency, knowledge-sharing, human and social values, responsible governance, culture, and solidarity economies (FAO, *"The 10 Elements"*). However, Shiva's argument is also controversial. Critics have argued that her presentation sometimes creates a sharp opposition between industrial agriculture and agroecology while giving insufficient attention to the diversity of agricultural systems and the possible advantages of technological innovation. Nathan Collins, reviewing the book, argues that Shiva provides a powerful critique but sometimes lacks nuance in comparing the two agricultural paradigms (Collins 215–16).

This paper therefore examines both the significance and limitations of Shiva's argument. It investigates five major themes: industrial agriculture and agribusiness; agroecology and the living soil; biodiversity and seed sovereignty; small farmers and localization; and women's agricultural knowledge. It concludes that Shiva's work is most persuasive when understood as a challenge to the political and economic assumptions behind food production rather than as a universal rejection of all forms of agricultural technology.

This research paper has five major objectives:

1. To examine Vandana Shiva's critique of industrial agriculture in *Who Really Feeds the World?*
2. To analyze Shiva's understanding of agroecology as an alternative agricultural paradigm.
3. To investigate the relationship between biodiversity, seed sovereignty, and food security in Shiva's argument.
4. To examine her treatment of small-scale farmers and women as central actors in global food systems.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper uses a qualitative and interdisciplinary methodology. Its primary text is Vandana Shiva's *Who Really Feeds the World?* Secondary sources include scholarly books and journal articles on agroecology, food sovereignty, biodiversity, sustainable agriculture, and agricultural development, together with reports from international institutions including FAO, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD). The research employs textual analysis to identify Shiva's central concepts and argumentative strategies. These concepts are then compared with findings from agricultural science and international policy literature. This approach is particularly appropriate because Shiva's book operates simultaneously as an environmental critique, a political argument, a feminist intervention, and a proposal for agricultural transformation. The study does not assume that Shiva's claims are automatically correct. Instead, her arguments are examined alongside supportive and critical scholarship. Such comparison is necessary because agroecology itself has developed into a broad field encompassing ecological science, farmer knowledge, social movements, and public policy.

3. FINDINGS

Vandana Shiva and the Politics of Food

Vandana Shiva is an Indian scholar, environmental activist, and writer whose work has focused extensively on biodiversity, agriculture, globalization, seeds, intellectual property, and ecological justice. Her earlier books, including *Staying Alive*, *Monocultures of the Mind*, *Bio piracy*, and *Stolen Harvest*, established themes that become central to *Who Really Feeds the World?*

A recurring feature of Shiva's work is her criticism of what she considers reductionist approaches to nature. In *Monocultures of the Mind*, she argues that modern scientific and economic systems can marginalize local ecological knowledge by defining agricultural success through narrow technical criteria (Shiva). Her critique of agricultural monoculture therefore involves more than the biological reduction of crop diversity. It also involves what she describes as a "monoculture" of knowledge.

This argument is important for understanding *Who Really Feeds the World?* Shiva's question is deliberately provocative: if industrial agribusiness claims to feed humanity, who actually performs the work of producing, conserving, processing, and distributing food? Her answer emphasizes small farmers, women, seeds, soils, pollinators, biodiversity, and local communities. The book consequently challenges the tendency to attribute food production primarily to corporations, technologies, and large-scale agricultural systems.

The significance of this argument becomes clearer when food is understood as a system rather than as a commodity. UNEP's work on food systems similarly emphasizes the connections among agriculture, natural resources, ecosystems, health, livelihoods, and human well-being (UNEP, *Food Systems and Natural Resources*).

Shiva therefore asks readers to reconsider the meaning of productivity. A farm may produce a large quantity of a single commodity while simultaneously degrading soil, reducing biodiversity, contaminating water, increasing dependence on purchased inputs, and weakening rural livelihoods. From Shiva's perspective, such a system cannot be considered genuinely productive if its environmental and social costs are excluded from the calculation.

Industrial Agriculture and the Agribusiness Paradigm

One of the strongest arguments in *Who Really Feeds the World?* is Shiva's criticism of industrial agriculture. She associates industrial farming with monocultures, chemical fertilizers, pesticides, genetically modified crops, corporate control, and global commodity chains. She argues that these practices create dependence on external inputs and transform food from a basic human necessity into a commercial commodity (Shiva).

The industrial model developed historically through the Green Revolution and subsequent processes of agricultural modernization. High-yielding varieties, irrigation, synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, mechanization, and improved infrastructure contributed to substantial increases in agricultural production in many parts of the world. The historical achievements of agricultural modernization should therefore not be dismissed. Pingali notes that the Green Revolution substantially increased cereal production and contributed to reductions in hunger in several regions (Pingali). Nevertheless, the IAASTD emphasizes that agricultural development cannot be evaluated solely through aggregate production. Its assessment stresses the importance of sustainability, rural livelihoods, environmental consequences, and the distribution of benefits and costs (IAASTD).

This distinction is central to Shiva's critique. She does not simply argue that modern

agriculture produces less food. Rather, she challenges the assumption that high yields automatically represent a successful food system. If agricultural production causes soil degradation, biodiversity loss, water depletion, chemical pollution, rural displacement, and economic dependency, then its apparent productivity may conceal substantial costs. UNEP has similarly identified food production as a major driver of biodiversity loss. The organization reports that the ways in which food has been produced over recent decades have contributed substantially to the decline of biodiversity (UNEP, "Food System Impacts"). Shiva's critique is therefore best understood as a challenge to the accounting system of industrial agriculture. She asks: What is counted as productivity, and what is excluded from the calculation?

Agroecology as an Alternative

The alternative proposed by Shiva is agroecology. Agroecology applies ecological principles to agricultural systems and emphasizes relationships among crops, animals, soil organisms, water, farmers, and ecosystems. Shiva presents it not simply as a technical farming method but as a different way of understanding agriculture. The importance of agroecology has increasingly been recognized beyond activist circles. FAO defines agroecology as an integrated approach that applies ecological and social principles to the design and management of sustainable food systems (FAO, "The 10 Elements"). Its framework includes ten interconnected elements: diversity, synergies, efficiency, resilience, recycling, co-creation and sharing of knowledge, human and social values, culture and food traditions, responsible governance, and circular and solidarity economy.

These principles strongly overlap with Shiva's argument. Diversity, for example, is not simply a conservation objective. In an agricultural ecosystem, crop diversity can reduce vulnerability to pests, disease, climate

variability, and market fluctuations. FAO identifies diversification as an important component of agro ecological transitions because it can contribute to food security, nutrition, and conservation of natural resources (FAO, "Diversity"). Miguel Altieri has similarly emphasized that agro ecological systems can draw upon ecological interactions to reduce dependence on external inputs and improve resilience. Altieri and Nicholls argue that agroecology provides principles for designing farming systems that use biodiversity and ecological processes to improve sustainability. Shiva's contribution lies in connecting these ecological principles with questions of political power. For her, agroecology is not simply a set of farming techniques. It is connected to the question of who controls land, seeds, knowledge, markets, and food policy.

The Living Soil

Soil is one of the most important elements in Shiva's argument. In the chapter "Living Soil Feeds the World," she challenges the assumption that soil can be treated primarily as a physical medium to which chemical nutrients are added. Instead, she emphasizes soil as a living ecosystem. This perspective is consistent with contemporary soil science, which recognizes the importance of microorganisms, organic matter, nutrient cycling, and biological interactions in maintaining soil fertility. Industrial farming practices that depend heavily on synthetic inputs can produce short-term increases in crop productivity but may create long-term ecological problems if soil organic matter and biological diversity are neglected. Gliessman's work on agroecology similarly treats agricultural systems as ecosystems whose long-term sustainability depends on ecological processes rather than on maximizing a single output. Sustainable agriculture therefore requires attention to soil, water, biodiversity, and interactions among organisms. Shiva's argument also challenges the conceptual division between "natural" and "productive" processes. In industrial agriculture,

microorganisms, insects, decomposing organic matter, and ecological relationships can appear invisible because they are not purchased inputs. Shiva reverses this perspective: these supposedly invisible processes are precisely what make agricultural production possible.

Her argument can therefore be interpreted as a critique of the commodification of agricultural inputs. If soil fertility is replaced by purchased fertilizer, pest regulation by purchased pesticides, and seed reproduction by purchased proprietary seed, the farmer becomes increasingly dependent on commercial inputs. Shiva sees agroecology as an attempt to restore ecological processes to the centre of farming.

Biodiversity versus Monoculture

Biodiversity is perhaps the most important ecological concept in Shiva's work. In *Who Really Feeds the World?*, she presents biodiversity as a source of food security rather than an obstacle to agricultural efficiency. Monoculture simplifies ecosystems by concentrating production on a small number of crops or varieties. Such simplification can make production more efficient under particular conditions, but it can also increase vulnerability. A disease, pest, drought, or climatic event affecting one crop can have extensive consequences when genetic and ecological diversity is low. The FAO's *State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture* emphasizes that biodiversity at the genetic, species, and ecosystem levels is fundamental to food production, livelihoods, food security, and ecosystem services (FAO, *State of the World's Biodiversity*).

Shiva's emphasis on biodiversity is therefore supported by a substantial body of contemporary scientific and institutional research. Biodiversity provides genetic resources for crop improvement, ecological services for pollination and pest management, and dietary diversity for human nutrition. At the same time, Shiva's argument contains an important philosophical dimension.

Biodiversity is not merely a collection of genetic resources waiting to be exploited by scientists. It represents relationships between communities and their environments. Farmers select, conserve, exchange, and adapt seeds according to local conditions. Consequently, biodiversity is also connected to cultural memory and local knowledge.

Seed Sovereignty and Corporate Control

Seed sovereignty is another major theme in *Who Really Feeds the World?* Shiva argues that control over seeds is central to control over agriculture. Traditionally, farmers have saved, selected, exchanged, and adapted seeds. Industrial agriculture increasingly involves commercial seed systems in which farmers purchase seed from companies and, in some cases, face legal restrictions concerning reproduction and exchange.

Shiva interprets this transformation as a political struggle over knowledge and biological resources. Her concept of “seed freedom” therefore extends beyond agriculture into questions of intellectual property and economic sovereignty. Her earlier book *Biopiracy* develops a related argument, criticizing the appropriation and commercialization of biological resources and indigenous knowledge through intellectual-property regimes (Shiva, *Biopiracy*).

The issue remains relevant because agricultural biodiversity depends partly on farmers’ continued ability to conserve and use diverse genetic materials. FAO documentation on women and agrobiodiversity has emphasized the historical importance of rural women in seed selection, crop adaptation, and the management of biological resources (FAO, *Building on Gender, Agrobiodiversity and Local Knowledge*). However, the seed debate should not be reduced to a simple opposition between “corporate seeds” and “traditional seeds.” Scientific breeding has produced varieties with valuable traits, including disease resistance, improved yields, drought tolerance,

and nutritional characteristics. The more useful question is therefore how seed systems can combine scientific innovation with farmer autonomy, biodiversity conservation, and equitable access.

Small Farmers and the Meaning of Productivity

Shiva strongly rejects the assumption that large-scale farms are necessarily more productive than small farms. She emphasizes that small farmers frequently cultivate multiple crops and perform numerous functions simultaneously: food production, seed conservation, soil management, livestock raising, biodiversity conservation, and local economic activity. This argument is supported in part by research showing the importance of smallholders to global food systems. A report associated with the Forest and Farm Facility notes that farms under two hectares produce a significant share of global food while occupying a smaller proportion of agricultural land, although estimates vary depending on definitions and datasets.

Small-scale farming can therefore provide benefits that are not captured by conventional measures of yield per crop. A diversified farm may produce cereals, vegetables, fruits, pulses, livestock products, fodder, and fuel while also maintaining ecological functions. Nevertheless, it would be problematic to romanticize small farming. Smallholders often face land insecurity, limited access to credit, poor infrastructure, volatile markets, inadequate irrigation, and insufficient access to agricultural extension services. Small-scale agriculture is not automatically sustainable; its sustainability depends upon institutions, resources, knowledge, markets, and ecological conditions.

Shiva’s contribution is consequently strongest when her argument is interpreted as a call to recognize small farmers as knowledge holders and political actors rather than simply as beneficiaries of agricultural development.

Localization and Food Sovereignty

Another major theme in Shiva's book is localization. She argues that globalized food systems can separate producers from consumers and encourage agricultural production according to international commodity prices rather than local nutritional needs. Localization seeks to reconnect food production and consumption. Local food systems can potentially strengthen farmer livelihoods, reduce dependence on distant markets, preserve cultural food traditions, and encourage diversified production.

This argument connects Shiva with the broader concept of food sovereignty. La Via Campesina defines food sovereignty in terms of peoples' rights to determine their own food and agricultural systems. The concept differs from food security because food security focuses primarily on access to sufficient food, whereas food sovereignty also asks who controls the means and institutions of food production. Patel argues that food sovereignty emerged partly as a response to the limitations of conventional food-security frameworks, particularly where food can be available in markets without being accessible to poor communities or produced under socially just conditions. Shiva's localization argument therefore transforms the question from "How can the world produce more food?" into "How can communities gain greater control over the systems that produce and distribute food?" However, localization has limitations. Not every region can produce every crop efficiently, and trade can provide important access to food, income, technology, and agricultural inputs. The strongest interpretation of localization is therefore not complete economic isolation but the strengthening of local and regional food systems within a broader network of exchange.

Women and the Gendered Politics of Food

One of the most significant features of *Who Really Feeds the World?* is its explicit attention to women. Shiva argues that women

have historically performed essential agricultural tasks, including seed selection, food processing, household nutrition, livestock management, and biodiversity conservation. This is consistent with FAO research emphasizing women's major role across agrifood systems. FAO's contemporary work on women in agrifood systems demonstrates that gender equality and women's empowerment are central to sustainable, productive, and resilient food systems (FAO, *The Status of Women in Agrifood Systems*).

Shiva's feminist analysis is influenced by her earlier collaboration with Maria Mies in Ecofeminism. Ecofeminist theory links the exploitation of nature with structures that marginalize women and other vulnerable communities. In Shiva's agricultural analysis, the commodification of nature and the marginalization of women are therefore interconnected processes. Her argument is particularly important because conventional measures of agricultural productivity can make women's labor invisible. Household food production, seed conservation, gathering, unpaid farm labor, and nutritional management may not appear in formal economic statistics even though they contribute substantially to food security. However, Shiva's argument must also be approached critically. Rural women do not form a single homogeneous category. Gender intersects with class, caste, land ownership, ethnicity, age, and geographic location. A sophisticated feminist analysis therefore needs to recognize differences among women and avoid portraying "women" as naturally ecological actors. Even with this limitation, Shiva's emphasis on women broadens the definition of agricultural knowledge and draws attention to forms of labor that conventional agricultural economics often undervalues.

Food Security versus Food Sovereignty

A central theoretical contribution of Shiva's book is its distinction between food

security and food sovereignty. Food security generally refers to people's ability to obtain sufficient, safe, nutritious food. Food sovereignty adds questions of democratic control, ecological sustainability, cultural appropriateness, and producer rights. This distinction is crucial because food availability alone does not guarantee justice. A society may have abundant food commodities while farmers remain economically insecure, ecosystems deteriorate, and poor communities lack access to nutritious diets.

FAO's agroecology framework increasingly incorporates social and political dimensions into discussions of food-system transformation. Its ten elements include not only ecological diversity and efficiency but also responsible governance, human and social values, culture, knowledge-sharing, and solidarity economies (FAO, "The 10 Elements"). Shiva's book can consequently be seen as part of a broader transformation in food-system scholarship. Food is no longer viewed solely as an agricultural output. It is understood as the product of relationships involving ecosystems, farmers, markets, governments, corporations, consumers, and communities.

Shiva's Argument and Climate Change

Climate change provides another context in which Shiva's arguments become significant. Agriculture is both vulnerable to climate change and implicated in greenhouse-gas emissions, land-use change, and biodiversity loss. Diversified agroecological systems can potentially increase resilience by reducing dependence on a single crop and strengthening ecological processes. Crop diversity, soil organic matter, agroforestry, water conservation, and local adaptation can all contribute to resilience.

The IPCC has emphasized that climate-resilient food systems require changes across production, consumption, land management, and institutions (IPCC). Agroecology is consequently relevant not merely as an alternative to chemical-intensive farming but as

part of broader climate adaptation and mitigation strategies. UNEP similarly emphasizes the connection between food systems, biodiversity, natural resources, and environmental sustainability (UNEP, Food Systems and Natural Resources). The ecological concerns raised by Shiva therefore correspond with major contemporary scientific assessments.

A Critical Evaluation of Shiva's Argument

Despite the importance of Shiva's analysis, *Who Really Feeds the World?* has limitations. The first is its tendency toward binary oppositions. Shiva frequently contrasts agroecology with agribusiness, biodiversity with monoculture, small farmers with industrial farms, and seed freedom with seed dictatorship. Such contrasts are rhetorically effective, but agricultural systems are more complex. Modern agriculture includes many intermediate forms, and technologies associated with industrial agriculture can sometimes be incorporated into sustainable systems. Likewise, small-scale farming can be environmentally destructive under particular circumstances.

Nathan Collins identifies this issue in his review, arguing that Shiva's discussion can lack nuance and sometimes presents insufficiently developed comparisons between industrial agriculture and agroecology (Collins 215-16). A second limitation concerns evidence. Shiva's book is intentionally argumentative and activist in tone. Its purpose is not to provide a neutral statistical review of all agricultural systems. As a result, some claims require comparison with independent empirical research. Third, the concept of agroecology itself contains challenges concerning scale. Practices that work extremely well in particular local contexts may not automatically be transferable to all regions. Agricultural conditions vary according to climate, soils, infrastructure, labor availability, population density, market access, and cultural practices.

Nevertheless, these limitations do not invalidate Shiva's central contribution. Her

strongest insight is that agricultural evaluation must include environmental and social costs rather than focusing narrowly on commodity yields.

Agroecology and the Contemporary Food-System Debate

Recent international approaches to agroecology suggest that some of Shiva's central ideas have moved from the margins toward mainstream policy discussions. FAO's ten-element framework recognizes diversity, resilience, recycling, efficiency, knowledge co-creation, social values, governance, cultural traditions, and solidarity economies as interconnected components of agro ecological transformation (FAO, "The 10 Elements"). This development is significant because it indicates that agroecology is not simply an ideological position. It has become an internationally recognized framework for thinking about agricultural sustainability. At the same time, contemporary approaches generally avoid rejecting science and technology altogether. Instead, they emphasize the integration of scientific research with farmer knowledge and local experience. FAO describes agroecology as combining ecological principles with social considerations and recognizes the importance of knowledge co-creation (FAO, "The 10 Elements"). This provides a useful way to reinterpret Shiva. Her argument does not have to be understood as "traditional knowledge versus modern science." It can instead be understood as a demand for a different relationship between scientific knowledge, farmer knowledge, ecological systems, and economic institutions.

DISCUSSION

The analysis demonstrates that *Who Really Feeds the World?* operates on three interconnected levels.

First, it is an ecological critique. Shiva argues that industrial agriculture undermines the biological foundations of food production through monoculture, chemical dependency,

soil degradation, and biodiversity loss. Second, it is an economic critique. She argues that agribusiness can transform farmers from autonomous producers into consumers of purchased seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, machinery, and other inputs. Agricultural production consequently becomes increasingly dependent upon corporate markets. Third, it is a political and feminist critique. Shiva asks who has authority to define agricultural knowledge, control seeds, determine agricultural policy, and decide what counts as productive labor. Her focus on women and small farmers challenges the concentration of agricultural authority in corporations, governments, and technical institutions.

These three dimensions make the book particularly influential. Shiva does not treat environmental problems as isolated technical problems. She connects ecological degradation with political and economic structures. The strongest contemporary support for Shiva comes from the growing recognition that food systems must be evaluated holistically. FAO's agroecology framework, UNEP's work on biodiversity and food systems, and international assessments of sustainable agriculture all emphasize interconnected ecological and social factors. Nevertheless, the most productive reading of Shiva is neither unconditional acceptance nor complete rejection. Her book is best understood as a critical framework that asks conventional agricultural policy to reconsider what it measures, whom it benefits, and what costs it ignores.

CONCLUSION

Vandana Shiva's *Who Really Feeds the World?* Presents a powerful challenge to dominant assumptions about agriculture, food security, and economic development. Its central question—who really feeds the world?—forces readers to reconsider the actors and ecological processes hidden behind the global food economy.

Shiva argues that the world is not fed simply by corporations, machines, chemical fertilizers, patented seeds, or large monocultures. Food production depends upon living soils, biodiversity, pollinators, farmers, seeds, local knowledge, women's labor, and ecological relationships. Her argument is therefore fundamentally about redefining productivity.

The analysis in this paper demonstrates that several of Shiva's central claims are consistent with broader research. International organizations increasingly recognize biodiversity, agroecology, resilience, farmer knowledge, gender equality, and sustainable resource management as essential components of future food systems. FAO's ten elements of agroecology, for example, provide an institutional framework that closely corresponds with many of the ecological and social principles emphasized by Shiva.

At the same time, Shiva's approach has limitations. Her tendency to frame industrial agriculture and agroecology as opposing paradigms sometimes simplifies complex agricultural realities. Sustainable agriculture cannot be achieved through a single model applicable everywhere. Different regions require combinations of scientific research, local knowledge, appropriate technology, ecological management, infrastructure, public policy, and farmer participation.

The enduring importance of *Who Really Feeds the World?* Therefore, lies not in providing a single technological solution to global hunger but in changing the questions that are asked about food. Shiva challenges readers to consider whether a food system is successful if it produces commodities while degrading soil, biodiversity, rural livelihoods, and ecological resilience.

Ultimately, the book argues that feeding the world is not simply a question of producing more. It is a question of producing sustainably, equitably, democratically, and ecologically. In

this sense, Shiva's work remains an important contribution to debates about agroecology, food sovereignty, biodiversity, and the future of global agriculture.

REFERENCES

- Altieri, M. A. (1995). *Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.
- Altieri, M. A., & Nicholls, C. I. (2017). The adaptation and mitigation potential of traditional agriculture in a changing climate. *Climatic Change*, 140, 33–45.
- Altieri, M. A., et al. (2015). Agroecology and the design of climate change-resilient farming systems. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 35, 869–890.
- Carolan, M. (2018). *Society and the environment: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Collins, N. (2017). How should we feed the world? *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 7(3), 215–216.
- ETC Group. (2017). *Who will feed us? The industrial food chain or the peasant food web?*
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2004). *Building on gender, agrobiodiversity and local knowledge: A training manual*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2018). *The 10 elements of agroecology: Guiding the transition to sustainable food and agricultural systems*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2019a). *The 10 elements of agroecology*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2019b). *The state of the world's biodiversity for food and agriculture*. FAO.

- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2023). *The status of women in agrifood systems*. FAO.
- Gliessman, S. R. (2015). *Agroecology: The ecology of sustainable food systems* (3rd ed.). CRC Press.
- Holt-Giménez, E., & Patel, R. (2009). *Food rebellions! Crisis and the hunger for justice*. Pambazuka Press.
- International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development. (2009). *Agriculture at a crossroads: Global report*. Island Press.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019). *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. IPBES.
- La Via Campesina. (2007). *Declaration of Nyéléni*. International Forum for Food Sovereignty.
- McMichael, P. (2009). A food regime genealogy. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), 139–169.
- Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (2014). *Ecofeminism* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.
- Patel, R. (2007). *Stuffed and starved: The hidden battle for the world food system*. Melville House.
- Pingali, P. L. (2012). Green Revolution: Impacts, limits, and the path ahead. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(31), 12302–12308.
- Pretty, J. (2008). *Sustainable agriculture and food*. Earthscan.
- Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation*. Clarendon Press.
- Shiva, V. (1993). *Monocultures of the mind: Perspectives on biodiversity and biotechnology*. Zed Books.
- Shiva, V. (1997). *Biopiracy: The plunder of nature and knowledge*. South End Press.
- Shiva, V. (2000). *Stolen harvest: The hijacking of the global food supply*. South End Press.
- Shiva, V. (2008). *Soil not oil: Environmental justice in an age of climate crisis*. South End Press.
- Shiva, V. (2010). *Staying alive: Women, ecology and development* (2nd ed.). South End Press.
- Shiva, V. (2016). *Who really feeds the world? The failures of agribusiness and the promise of agroecology*. North Atlantic Books.
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2016). *Food systems and natural resources*. International Resource Panel, UNEP.
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). *Food system impacts on biodiversity loss*. UNEP.
- Wezel, A., et al. (2009). Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 29, 503–515.