Visiting Food Sovereignty

Exploring the Interaction of Food Sovereignty and Tourism

Mislav Petrušić

Independent project • 30 credits
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Rural Development and Natural Resource Management - Master's Programme
Uppsala 2022

Visiting Food Sovereignty. Exploring the Relations of Food Sovereignty and Tourism

Mislav Petrušić

Supervisor: Linus Rosén, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development

Examiner: Harry Fischer, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development

Credits: 30 credits

Level: Second cycle, A2E

Course title: Master thesis in Rural Development

Course code: EX0889

Programme/education: Rural Development and Natural Resource Management - Master's Programme

Course coordinating dept: Department of Urban and Rural Development

Place of publication: Uppsala

Year of publication: 2022

Online publication: https://stud.epsilon.slu.se

Keywords: Food Sovereignty, Alternative Tourism, Alternative Agriculture, Ireland, Eco Village, Rural Development

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Division of Rural Development

Abstract

Both the agriculture and tourism sectors have been heavily criticized for the social and environmental imprints they leave on the world, especially in rural areas. This thesis explores the intersection between alternative approaches to both agriculture and tourism which seek to bring positive social and ecological effects to rural areas. I ask how and to what extent practices of food sovereignty and tourism can intertwine to promote rural development, one that addresses the social and ecological issues tied to the practices of predominantly economic-oriented agriculture and tourism. Through an explorative case study conducted at the Cloughjordan Eco Village in Ireland, the analysis shows how through the interaction of food sovereignty and tourism both forces are concomitantly shaped by each other. Practices of tourism enact and encounter food sovereignty, while food sovereignty imbues the tourism experience with its ecological and social characteristics. Furthermore, the thesis analyses how such interactions contribute to the formulation of a larger system of food exchange within which the integrated elements of food sovereignty and tourism contribute to characterise the system as a social and solidarity economy. In these ways the thesis contributes to expanding an unexplored academic field as it exemplifies how a 'food sovereign tourism' might be practiced and how it might characterise rural agriculture and tourism. The thesis concludes with a reflection on the way that rural areas might achieve more socially and ecologically oriented food systems and tourism practices simultaneously. From a wider perspective, the analysis highlights that alternative approaches to agriculture and travel may be utilised to harness synergies and provide rural areas with the benefits that both approaches espouse; that of healthier, environmentally sound and more equitable food systems integrated with a tourism which is responsive to the cultural, social and financial needs of hosts.

Keywords: Food Sovereignty, Alternative Tourism, Alternative Agriculture, Ireland, Eco Village, Rural Development

Table of contents

Abbreviations **8**

1. Introduction **9**

1.1 Aim and research questions 12

2. Background **14**

3. Theoretical Framework **17**

3.1 Food Sovereignty 17

3.2 Tourism 20

3.3 FS-T Interaction 22

4. Method, Methodology **24**

4.1 Approach 24

4.2 Study Site 24

4.3 Choosing the study site and reaching participants 25

4.4 Data collection 26

4.4.1 Interviews 26

4.4.2 Observation 27

4.5 Ethical Considerations 28

4.6 The Researchers' Role 28

4.7 Data Analysis 30

5. Analysis **31**

5.1 Analytical Structure 31

5.2 Volunteer Tourism 31

5.2.1 Theme 1: Agroecology, Enacting and Encountering 32

5.2.2 Theme 2: Enacting the decommodification of food by engaging with FS 35

5.2.3 Theme 3: Encountering FS. Valuing of Volunteers as Food Producers 37

5.3 Educational Group Tourism 40

5.3.1 Theme 1: VERT for Tourism and Food Sovereignty 40

5.3.2 Theme 2: Cuan Beo, A Potential New Space for Tourism and FS. 42

5.3.3 Theme 3: Encountering Food Sovereignty Through Education and Food 44

5.4 Food Sovereignty and Tourism in a Social and Solidarity Economy 47

5.4.1 VERT, the protection and creation of decommodified economic circuits. 47

5.4.2 Tracing the embeddedness of FS-T interaction through a meal 49

6. Analytical Conclusion: Food Sovereignty, Tourism and Rural Development 53
6.1 Summary of Key Findings....53
6.2 Contributions and Outlook....55
References....59
Acknowledgements....64
Appendix 1....65
Appendix 2....67
Appendix 3....68

Abbreviations

CBT	Community Based Tourism
CCF	Cloughjordan Community Farm
CJEV	Cloughjordan Eco Village
FS	Food Sovereignty
FS-T	Food Sovereignty-Tourism
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
OFN	Open Food Network
RED	Research, Education and Development (Gardens)
SSE	Social and Solidarity Economy
VERT	Village Education and Research Team

Introduction

The industrial food system has some serious issues to overcome. The eradication of global hunger and malnutrition still looms as an attainable yet distant goal (Clapp 2016). The infringement on indigenous people's lands for the production of cash crops and livestock still occurs (White et al. 2012). Monoculture production still poses problems for biodiversity and carries a significant ecological footprint (Nicholls 2016) as well as contributing to the vulnerability of food systems to ecological and economic shocks (Anderson et al. 2021). Food is still transported around the world, exacerbating the use of fossil fuels and polluting our air (Clapp 2016). The field of tourism, likewise has raised a plethora of pressing issues. Tourism still degrades natural areas, creates economic dependency and damages cultures and societies (Ryan, 2003). This thesis will investigate the nature and result of interactions between food sovereignty (FS) and tourism in order to contribute to understanding to what extent practices of food sovereignty and tourism can intertwine to promote rural development that is more socially and ecologically responsible. I aim to achieve this goal through a qualitative critical case study on a unique rural Irish Eco Village in Cloughjordan.

There is a range of approaches within both the fields of tourism and alternative food systems which deal more or less explicitly with the issues mentioned above. However, I have found the literature on the connection between alternative food systems and tourism to be fractional, especially when considering FS in relation to tourism. This rather unexplored field provides an important starting point to discuss the potentials of an approach to rural development which unites an alternative food approach with tourism. Given the lack of studies done on this topic, I will use the remainder of the introduction to make the argument that the food sovereignty – tourism (FS-T) interaction is worth investigating within a rural development context. I will then recap the studies done and emphasise what this thesis will add.

Rural areas, far from being isolated from issues mentioned above, are very much affected by them. It is in the rural that often many farms are located and much food produced, that the many effects of industrial agriculture are felt, that farmers are dependent on supermarkets (Clapp 2016), and sometimes struggle to make a living off of farming alone (Palomo-Campesino 2021). And it is oftentimes with these ideas in mind that policy circles conjure up the word diversification. Diversification

of economic activity in rural areas is promoted and oftentimes through tourism, in order to hedge against economic vulnerability but also to try and promote economic growth (Despotovic et al. 2017, Sznajder et al. 2009, Higgins-Desbiolles et al. 2019, Failte Ireland 2018, Government of Ireland 2021a). Given the presence of food production, natural areas and unique customs and cultures it is also the rural that is the site of much food, culture and nature-based tourism (Figueiredo & Raschi 2013).

One specific alternative food movement that has been discussed as beneficial for the development of rural areas is Food Sovereignty (FS) (Pachon-Ariza 2013). Launched in 1996 by La Via Campesina, an international peasant organisation, FS in its widest articulation promotes a radically egalitarian alternative to the currently dominant neoliberal model of food governance (Patel 2009, McMicheal 2013). Under this umbrella, the goals of the FS movement touch upon aligning food systems with ecological processes, embedding control over food systems into the hands of local actors and reducing the power of distant economic actors to control the fate of rural agriculture. According to FS, all people should have the right to affordable, healthy, and culturally appropriate foods as well as having the right to participate in democratically governing their food systems. This approach emphasises a decommodified food system where food is seen as having social, cultural and ecological values, instead of simply exchange value. FS aims to include all people equally and ultimately aims to achieve food security (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018). By aligning with agroecology, FS further incorporates a focus on an alternative, holistic, low input, nature-oriented approach to farming. Thus, for rural areas, FS promotes a future where food producers are valued for their important role and food systems are re-embedded within social and ecological processes in order to sustainably prioritise the needs of people and environments over capital. In these ways, FS aims to deal with the pressing questions of social inequality, food insecurity, and environmental degradation.

Alongside Food Sovereignty, tourism has likewise been employed as a vehicle for rural development. Tourism is, at its most basic form, the movement of people (Robinson 2011). With a long history, the modern phenomenon of tourism overwhelmingly resembles a narrow conception of tourism as an activity of capital where tourism is used as a tool for economic growth (Higgins-Desbiolles et al. 2022, Higgins-Desbiolles et al. 2019). However, people have historically travelled for many different purposes and with many different goals (Ryan 2003). The proliferation of tourism types such as rural-, agri-, food-, gastro-, sustainable-, volunteer- etc. reflect this wide range of purposes and goals of different tourism structures. Each unique structure of tourism therefore deals with different questions and similarly, tends towards different outcomes. Regarding rural development, tourism has been promoted as a means of diversifying rural economies and as a means of promoting conservation of natural areas (Figueiredo & Raschi 2013,

Weaver 2007). By providing an additional income stream and by increasing demand for natural areas, tourism can both reverse economic decline and incentivise the protection of ecological services (Figueiredo & Raschi 2013, Weaver 2007). It is important to remember though that tourism can also serve to progress social goals such as through serving the interests of the hosts, for example through volunteer tourism.

Thus, both a FS agenda and a tourism agenda have been promoted to deal with the issues facing rural areas. This begs the question of how FS and tourism might work together to promote rural development. Interestingly, the literature that does deal with the crossroads of FS and tourism is scarce. A research database search gives no more than the following three articles which explicitly discuss FS and tourism.

The first of these, by Santafe-Troncoso & Loring (2021), examines the effects of a tourism route in Ecuador on the indigenous food systems of the hosts. It approaches this topic by using Food Sovereignty as a framework for analysis. Santafe-Troncoso & Loring's (2021) paper is instructive for my purposes as it makes use of "food sovereignty to draw attention to the complexities of development and ways that tourism can undermine or improve local livelihoods and ecosystems." (ibid.:392). While the methodological and theoretical approach of my thesis are inspired by this paper, I will add to the findings of Santafe-Troncosco & Loring's (2021) paper by looking at how the interactions themselves contribute to new articulations of both FS and tourism. I will further add to the discussion of the FS-T interaction by examining the unique example of Ireland which is both influenced by EU programmes and has a strongly established industrial export-oriented agriculture model. By doing so, I hope to contribute to the understanding of how FS-T agendas might be approached and utilized in order to promote rural development not just in a European context but also in the context of similar agricultural orientation.

The second of these studies deals with FS and tourism in the context of a wine-valley in Canada. Robinson (2021) explores how actors understand and utilise the *concepts* of FS in regards to rural tourism and to what ends. In contrast, this thesis will rather look at how FS-T interactions *materialise*, and how their parallel existence and their interactions contribute to the form that they take. Instead of focusing on understandings of FS and tourism, I will rather focus on portraying the enactment of FS and tourism, the points of interaction between the two and the results of interaction.

Finally, Naylor (2019) investigates how notions of place create understandings of FS for 'travellers' in Cuba and Spain. She concludes that while educational tourism may create space for dialogue about FS and act as a 'touchstone', understandings of FS are subject to confusion and "do not always travel well" (2019:705). I hope to add to this study by further investigating how tourism

experiences within a FS context may result in new understandings and perceptions of food systems.

Jointly analysing FS and tourism will provide insights into how an alternative food movement might be supported by and/or support the enactment of tourism. Furthermore, such an analysis might develop our understanding of how the two forces shape each other, how FS might shape tourism to be more just, or how tourism could undermine instances of FS.

I will approach these questions through an analysis of Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV), in central Ireland. Ireland provides an interesting context for this study due to a high economic dependence on industrial agriculture and tourism. CJEV meanwhile provides an interesting case as it is a uniquely structured community of like-minded people intent on learning how to live sustainably and motivated to serve as an educational resource and social model to promote social change. Because of this, the community has a unique governance structure where amongst other things food and tourism are collectively[1] managed for the goals of the community.

1.1 Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this case study is to investigate and discuss how Food Sovereignty and tourism interact and with what sort of influence on rural development. This thesis will follow a critical case study design to investigate FS-T interactions in Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV), a rural Irish eco-village. The research is guided by the following questions;

1. *Main*: How and to what extent can practices of food sovereignty and tourism intertwine to promote rural development that is more socially and ecologically responsible?
    a. *Sub 1*: How are food sovereignty and tourism present in CJEV?
    b. *Sub 2:* How do food sovereignty and tourism interact in CJEV, and with what results for rural development?

In this thesis, I draw on Pain and Hansen (2019:9, see Cowen & Shenton 1998:50), to understand rural development as "an imminent process of social change". Such a definition purposefully avoids both describing a process as

[1] Villagers can influence activities within CJEV in several ways; they can voice their concerns at general meetings where all residents are welcome and they may join into the management bodies governing certain processes.

developmental as well as avoiding ascribing a value to such a process. In this way, my discussion of rural development focuses on how visible social realities might relate to existing trends within rural Ireland, and how they might be indicative of possibilities or challenges. At the same time, it helps me avoid framing such processes as part of a larger developmental discourse and ascribing them normative value.

Background

I will approach investigating the Food Sovereignty-tourism (FS-T) interaction through a specific case in rural Ireland. To understand the problem that I am investigating I will first describe some key takeaways from the FS-T literature by summarising some of the findings of the literature. I will then discuss the specific context of Ireland, focusing on the state of agriculture, tourism, grassroots organisations and rural areas in order to situate the discussion within this context.

A key aspect that the FS-T literature highlights is that FS can be embodied in systems. In the study by Santafe-Troncosco & Loring (2021), although participants were not in the majority familiar with 'FS' as a term, the findings show that many of the ideas of FS were embodied in a traditional agroforestry method called the 'chakra gardens'. Santafe-Troncosco & Loring write: "Among Kichwa people, chakra gardens represent more than just a piece of land useful for growing food. Indeed, the chakra gardens emerged as a powerful symbolic embodiment of food sovereignty" (ibid.:401). These findings suggest that systems of organisation can be understood as complex locations within which the principles of FS may be present both, in a material and immaterial way. Further findings from the same study discuss the interaction of FS and tourism. While tourism provided several benefits, it likewise placed pressures on these communities. For example, the participants felt that the name of the tourist route placed pressure on the chakra gardens as it created an unbalanced demand for cacao over other products produced within the gardens. This serves as a clear example of how the demands of tourism can directly pressure and influence how a people interact with their surroundings, especially here with food and in the context of FS.

Robinson's (2021) study of FS and rural tourism intentions in a Canadian wine producing region finds that despite an overall interest in developing the characteristics of a FS transformation, and an orientation of the participants that is suggestive of a FS transformation, the study site nevertheless showed several signs of lacking FS. Amongst these is included a heavy use of imported farm inputs, an un-affordability of local produce for the local community, un-affordability of accommodation for temporary workers in the wine sector and a question of unequal distribution of wealth generated by wine-tourism within the local communities. These findings highlight the importance of investigating FS through the visible systems and activities that occur on the ground as well as through the thoughts of

participants. While participants may have varying ideas of FS, it seems to me that it is *what occurs* within their food systems and *how it occurs*, that will ultimately decide the extent to which a place aligns with FS. In other words, I am specifically interested in *outcomes* rather than *intents*.

Ireland provides an interesting starting point for investigating the FS-T interaction. It is first of all important to understand the context of rural Irish agriculture. Rural agriculture in Ireland faces a plethora of problems such as low agricultural income - something which is especially true for alternative farmers, a difficulty to access finance - especially for young farmers, ageing rural populations, a lack of farm workers and an "extremely low" proportion of female workers in the agricultural sector (Government of Ireland 2021a&d, Talamh Beo 2021). Furthermore, there is concern about biodiversity loss, soil fertility, water quality, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Government of Ireland 2021d, EU 2020, Regenerative Farming Ireland 2019). With over one third of Irish GHG emissions coming from agriculture (Environmental Pillar 2021b) - it is the largest emitting sector in the country (Government of Ireland 2021b). Moreover, it has been emphasised that market volatility, climate change and changing consumer behaviour are expected to pose risks for specialised livestock production, particularly beef and dairy, which is the backbone of Irish agriculture (Government of Ireland 2021e, Department of Agriculture Food and the Marine 2021). It is furthermore due to a colonial history of the rural in Ireland that FS becomes a relevant approach to this topic. Ireland suffered from extractive agricultural practices brought upon it by the UK in the 18th and 19th centuries (Talamh Beo 2020). Fergal Anderson has argued exactly that through the continuation of this "old extractivist model" Irish farmers have lost power to corporate actors within their agricultural system (Talamh Beo 2020). Anderson further emphasises social and cultural impacts, mentioning that farmers are "locked into a production system which serves agribusinesses rather than the community or Irish citizens" (ibid.) and that this history has left Ireland with "a very skewed understanding of our [Irish farmers] role in the landscape and in the natural world" (ibid.). Therefore, FS provides me an approach towards rural Ireland which pays attention to ideas of reasserting independence of small farmers from historically encroaching capitalist processes which have largely dismantled traditional practices and cultures.

It is further important to understand that the fields of agriculture and tourism significantly overlap in the discussions of government and grassroots organisations when dealing with rural Ireland. Government publications often commit to the importance of agri-tourism and rural-tourism as drivers of rural development (Government of Ireland 2021a&e, Teagasc 2016, Failte Ireland 2016) and consider tourism a "hugely important economic sector for Ireland" as it "supports many thousands of jobs in rural communities throughout the country" (Government of Ireland 2021a:41). There has been recognition that "opportunities exist to develop

agri-tourism by providing on-farm accommodation and allowing for educational on-farm visits to see and experience working farms" (Government of Ireland 2021d:22). Furthermore, "competitive and dynamic agri-food supply chains" and tourism have been linked as closely related factors for the successful diversification of rural areas, particularly remote and depopulated ones which are predicted to be particularly vulnerable economically and socially (Government of Ireland 2021e:40).

At the same time, a wide array of grassroots organisations with a wide range of organisational structures have popped up across Ireland and deal in creative ways with the aforementioned rural context. To my knowledge these include, but are not limited to Talamh Beo, Cultivate, Regenerative Farming Ireland, Farming For Nature, Community Supported Agriculture Ireland, Irish Seed Savers, OurGanic Gardens, The Organic Centre and Cloughjordan Eco Village. These organisations are involved in a wide array of activities including organising events, promoting alternative food systems and agriculture, educating about food, advocating for policy change, conserving biodiversity and, some practice aspects of tourism. Moreover, several of the aforementioned organisations explicitly promote FS. Given the existence of a concomitant involvement in alternative food and tourism, these organisations make up an unexplored terrain for the FS-T relationship that merits more attention.

It is clear then, that Ireland is a context in which tourism and agriculture both play an important role in rural areas and overlap significantly. But it is important to ask which type of tourism. A primarily economic conception of the role of tourism reflects a wider mainstream conceptualisation of tourism as an industry. Government publications dealing with tourism see it through this same lens. However, "this pervasive view of tourism as an industrial sector contributing to growth in economies has had significant repercussions on not only increasing the unsustainability of tourism but also diminishment of tourism's social possibilities." (Higgins-Desbiolles et al. 2022:2). It is therefore important to understand that tourism, additionally to an economic effect can also have social and ecological effects on destinations, and therefore food systems as well. This is something that the previous literature on FS and tourism has discussed. Robinson (2021) emphasises that if inclusive of the principles that FS promotes, rural food tourism is likely to have positive effects socially, economically and environmentally. Similarly, Santafe-Troncoso & Loring (2021), while commenting on an indigenous context, likewise emphasise that FS offers a framework for pursing 'just sustainability' in tourism. Thus, the injection of a FS agenda into tourism practices is theorised to provide a responsible and sustainable colour to the practice of tourism. How this might occur and what it might mean for real areas is at the core of this thesis.

Theoretical Framework

In order to theorise the interaction of Food Sovereignty (FS) and tourism it will be necessary to firstly clarify how both FS and tourism can be conceptualised and envisioned. Therefore, this section will first outline my approach to theorising FS and will follow this with an approach to understanding the presence of tourism. Finally, I will shortly discuss the use of a dialectical approach to theorising the interactions between FS and tourism.

3.1 Food Sovereignty

To see the presence of Food Sovereignty (FS), I will make use of the six principles of FS as expressed by European Coordination Via Campesina (2018) as a framework to guide my analysis. However, theorising FS is not a clear task and so this section will first focus on clarifying the difficulties that this poses. I will then account for these problems by supplementing the framework with other key concepts in order to create a clearer picture of FS.

FS is thus far largely un-theorised (Nathan Clay, personal communication)[2] and there are no prescriptions as to actions which can be taken to achieve it (Patel 2009). It has been mentioned that the term has a wide and somewhat unclear usage and meaning (Patel 2009; Chiafetz & Jagger 2014:89). This complicates the use of the concept since it leaves open the process of interpreting whether or not something resembles FS. However, this interpretive character can be seen as a "symptom of food sovereignty itself" (Patel 2009:663), as it aims to provide local autonomy in regards to which strategies are chosen and implemented to understand and achieve it (ibid.). The FS movement is, after all "a call for peoples' rights to shape and craft food policy" (ibid.) and it is this flexibility which may have led to observations that it lacks "articulation, operationalization, and measurement" (Chaifetz & Jagger 2014). In other words, precisely because FS should be understood as an open invitation to citizens to collectively organise and improve food systems (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018), "struggles over how to enact it [FS] are directly related to different understandings and strategies concerning how to

[2] Nathan Clay, researcher, Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, video call meeting 22.12.2021

achieve/deploy it and at what scale" (Naylor 2019:707). This can also be seen reflected in the principles of FS which, while giving some guidance as to their meaning, stop short of identifying practices which may be deemed 'food sovereign'. Thus, while the principles of FS guide a food sovereign approach, it seems open to interpretation whether or not FS is present, and to which extent. This poses somewhat of a difficulty in theorising FS, and it is exactly because of this that I will employ complementary concepts in order to further develop FS and strengthen my arguments.

To being with, there are six principles of FS[3]; they include; 1) focuses on food for people; 2) values food providers; 3) localises food systems; 4) puts control locally; 5) builds knowledge and skills; and 6) works with nature (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018). As each of these principles is loaded with meaning and open to interpretation there is a wide array of theoretical and conceptual additions that could be made. However, there are several characterises of the food sovereignty agenda which I find key to understanding the concept, and which will inform my choice of supportive theories. These are its foci on egalitarianism (Patel 2009), decommodification (Trauger 2017), and agroecology (Gliessman et al. 2019). To capture these key points, I contend that the use of Social and Solidarity Economy, Decommodification and Agroecology can sufficiently bolster the principles of FS to provide a rich, albeit limited theoretical analysis. I will now turn my attention to each of these concepts to clarify how they may help me to do so.

The Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) touches upon many principles of FS. The term can be understood as a concept which encompasses "forms of economic activity that prioritise social and often environmental objectives, and involve producers, workers, consumers and citizens acting collectively and in solidarity." (Utting 2015:1). A SSE is an alternative economy which asserts the primacy of social and ecological goals, emphasising ethics, democratic self-management, decommodified economic circuits and a rooted bias towards greater equality (ibid.). Crucially, SSE can be conceptualised as decommodified economic systems (or circuits) within which "the social organization and practices of the circuit constitute an alternative logic to prevalent market processes" (ibid., see Vail 2010:328). In fact, Ojong (2021) writes that FS is particularly prevalent in discussions of SSE regarding food as it has "championed solidarity approaches with respect to repossessing land, promoting fair trade networks, and creating cooperative organisations" (ibid.:25, see Loh & Agyeman, 2019). Thus, although SSE and FS overlap in their interest, the SSE can help situate aspects of FS as components of a unique form of economic system. Using the SSE to help understand FS, therefore, allows me to understand the logic which connects practices resembling FS principles within a social and solidarity-based economic system.

[3] For a list of the full principles see Appendix 1

Given the stress to remove the primacy of market rule from social structures in both FS and SSE literature, I believe that it is important next to clarify the concept of decommodification. Decommodification can be "conceived as any political, social, or cultural process that reduces the scope and influence of the market in everyday life." (Vail 2010:310). The argument for a decommodification agenda lies in the belief that "Decommodification could also generate wider social benefits by ensuring basic needs, enhancing individual capacities and capabilities, promoting social cooperation and collaboration, deepening social solidarity, and improving the social capacity for collective decision making" (ibid.:313). Especially regarding food, commodification has been a particularly present theme through which to highlight the negative processes of industrial agriculture[4].

Vail (2010) offers an expanded analytical framework for decommodification which presents five processes of which three are of relevance here: boundary protection, decommodified economic circuits and market transparency (ibid.:319). Boundary protection refers to the shielding of areas of social, cultural, and political life from "the intrusions of the market" (ibid.:320). Decommodified economic circuits refer to zones of decommodified trade within exiting market structures - cooperatives making up one example of such circuits. What defines decommodified circuits is "economic activity (broadly defined) that influences and reorients the motivations, incentives, interests, values, priorities, and behaviour of economic actors to promote social priorities and egalitarian objectives rather than market rationality." (ibid.: 329). To build such a circuit means to root a bias towards greater equality and inclusion into the arrangements that define it (ibid. see Unger 2006). Finally, market transparency refers to the problems that arise from what can be understood as 'distance' (Clapp 2016). This 'distance' is both material and immaterial and explains the disconnection that characterises relationships between people throughout the industrial food system. Because of this distance, or lack of market transparency, Vail (2010) argues, consumers are dislocated from the ethical dilemmas inherent and hidden within the capitalist economy. While the principles of FS only go so far as to "reject that food is just another commodity" (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018:14), adding this theoretical component of decommodification will allow me to clarify processes which contribute to removing food from market influence, therefore rejecting food as a commodity and signifying FS.

Finally, a consideration of agroecology should be added to this discussion. Agroecology plays a prominent role in FS and has been aligned with FS since 2015 (International Forum for Agroecology 2015). It has been called a "path to food sovereignty" (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018:19) and "a social movement within the food sovereignty movement" (Gliessman et al. 2019:92). It is through agroecology that FS articulates its vision for autonomous and sustainable

[4] For examples see Clapp 2016, Trauger 2017, McMichael 2013

food production (International Forum For Agroecology 2015). Therefore, in the context of this thesis, we can say that where agroecological farming practices or practitioners interact with tourism, so does one part of FS. Agroecology is however a large field and it is thus necessary to delimit the scope of the concept which I will use. Given that the use of agroecology in the sixth principle of FS is limited to ecological considerations, I will likewise limit my focus on the five ecological principles of agroecology provided by Nicholls et al. (2016)[5]. Nicholls et al. (2016) further provide a table which connects farming practices to the realisation of ecological principles of agroecology[6]. Using the ecological principles of agroecology and the table provided by Nicholls et al. (2016), I will be able to roughly clarify to what extent producers within the study site adhere to ecological principles of agroecology. This knowledge will then help me to understand how certain occurrences within tourism may interact with agroecology. In this way, I will be able to better understand the relationship between tourism and the sixth principle of FS.

3.2 Tourism

In this section I will first explain what tourism is and will then expand my understanding of tourism by discussing various themes within the tourism literature. Further expanding on and borrowing from these themes of tourism will allow me to better understand the characteristics of certain tourism practices as well as help me to discuss my findings in light of conceptual literature. Moreover, to understand tourism in light of FS, it is necessary to delve into the themes of tourism which overlap with FS as they discuss similar topics such as food, agriculture, and equality.

Tourism is, at its most basic form, the movement of people (Robinson 2011) and although it has historically been practiced with a wide variety of purposes, today tourism is predominantly understood through an economic lens, as an industry (Marson 2011). However, there exists a strong current against such a conception and practice of tourism. This 'alternative' side of tourism emphasises the potentiality of tourism to be more ethical, responsible and sustainable, and calls for a significant re-imagination and re-orientation of tourism as a means of supporting social and ecological goals as well as economic ones (Weaver 2006, Higgins-Desbiolles 2022). It is because of these themes that I see such an orientation to tourism as relevant in regards to a FS agenda.

[5] For a full list of the principles see Appendix 2

[6] For the full table see Appendix 3

The topic of food is discussed through many tourism themes. One such theme is gastronomy. Gastronomic tourism sees food as more than a meal but instead as "a social and cultural event in which the choice and consumption of food bring into play a whole set of ecological, historical, cultural, social and economic factors" (Gimenes-Minasse 2017:30). Gastronomic tourism therefore can be seen as communicating the conditions embedded within food.

Furthermore, volunteer tourism is recognised as an alternative tourism practice due to a rooted emphasis on altruistic motives (Callan & Thomas 2005). It is also seen as a practice which benefits the host and develops the tourist (ibid.). A significant aspect of volunteer tourism is the labour that it can provide for hosts. Seeing as labour shortages are an often mentioned problem in alternative food and farming systems (Bruce et al. 2017), volunteers tourism can prove helpful in supporting small scale ecological production (Terry 2014). While these tourism themes do offer quite a comprehensive conception of food within tourism and even touch upon ecological and social considerations, they still do not discuss a key factor of FS, that of democratic governance structures.

Thus, community-based tourism (CBT) is an important theme to consider here. As is sustainable tourism. CBT can be defined as "a type of tourism run by and for the local community." (Robinson & Wiltshier:88 see France 1997) and sustainable tourism as the 'application of sustainability ideas to the practice of tourism' (Oriade & Evans 2011). While CBT places control in the hands of the hosts, it may nevertheless contribute to both facilitating alternative or mass-tourism, since the community in questions has the freedom to choose what form of tourism to practice. This is a similar characteristic of sustainable tourism which is seen as having been adopted as an industry instead of a philosophy (Oriade & Evans 2011). What makes CBT and sustainable tourism particularly interesting in the context of FS is that they relate to calls for a re-imagination of tourism as a social force. Higgins-Desbiolles et al. (2019) write on the topic of degrowth in tourism that a just and sustainable tourism must orient itself towards the needs and interests of local communities. They further emphasise that "in this restructure of tourism, tourism operators would be allowed access to the local community's assets only under their authorisation and stewardship" (ibid.:1936). While CBT and sustainable tourism may be employed in various ways, a structure which places authority in the hands of the community could therefore signify a move towards a more just and sustainable tourism governance system. It is through these ideas that CBT and sustainable tourism overlap significantly with FS's focus on local and democratic control of food systems.

As explained by Yvette Reisinger (2013), transformational tourism, based on Mezirow's Transformational Learning Theory, discusses the ability of tourism to provide transformational education through tourism experiences; "In transformational learning, individuals "reinterpret an old experience (or a new one)

from a new set of expectations, thus giving a new meaning and perspective to an old experience" (Reisinger 2013:18, see Mezirow, 1991:11). Reisinger (2013) further explains that transformation occurs in places where people engage with the unknown, in places that "present individuals with a different experience to their habitual domestic environment" (ibid.:28). A further strength of transformational tourism is that it is seen as contributing to action; "By critically reflecting on world perspective or frame of reference and underlying assumptions and taken-for-granted beliefs, tourists can shape new attitudes and perceptions of the world and, consequently, change their actions." (ibid.:xiii). Transformational tourism is useful for investigating how tourism might help the FS movement incite change within food systems by transforming tourists attitudes towards food and food systems.

Eco-tourism is another form of alternative tourism important to consider which is defined by Weaver (2007) as having an attraction based in nature, having an educational component and being sustainable. A widely mentioned merit of eco-tourism is in its ability to help preserve natural areas and specific flora or fauna (ibid.). These characteristics make the field vital to consider in a FS perspective. This is because FS seems to support the practice of eco-tourism by promoting nature based and biodiverse farmland, seeking to build on the knowledge and skills of local food providers, and aiming at respecting social and ecological processes alongside economic ones.

Finally, authenticity is seen as the 'holy grail' of the tourism offer, and is important to investigate due to the fact that it is a key driver for tourism. Given the very context and place dependent nature of FS, it is relevant to investigate how a FS approach may come off as authentic, and therefore enticing to tourists. Staged authenticity is an idea provided by MacCannell (2010) which details seven stages of authenticity leading from a tourism experience which is completely fabricated for the tourist to one which is very much at the core of the host communities everyday life.

3.3 FS-T Interaction

To bring these ideas together, I will conceptualise the FS-T interaction in dialectical terms. I understand a dialectical interaction as one in which the collision of two separate forces reconfigures each other, and gives rise to a new type of situation, one characterised by a unique combination of attributes of the clashing forces (Inglis & Thorpe 2012).

Applied to FS and tourism, such a conceptualisation of interaction allows me to understand on-the-ground actions and processes as attributes of FS or tourism. Moreover, it allows me to discuss interaction as the clash of such attributes which eventually lead to the creation of a new situation. More explicitly, seeing the FS-T interaction as a dialectical process allows me to theorise how actions and processes

which resemble FS principles come into clashes with actions and processes of tourism practice. It allows me to see such actions and processes as concomitantly changing in order to accommodate specific characteristics of each other to finally culminate in the emergence of a new situation.

Methodology

In this section I will first explain my study design by focusing on the choice of a critical case study approach. Furthermore, I will detail the reasoning which led me to choose Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV) as a study site and will follow this with an explanation of how participants within CJEV were chosen. I will then discuss the use and purpose of semi-structured interviews and informal observation in data collection for this study. Next, I will detail both the general and specific ethical considerations relevant for my study site and will thereafter reflect on how my role might have impacted the data collection and interpretation processes. Finally, in the last section I will explain how data analysis was approached.

4.1 Approach

This study follows a critical exploratory case study approach. A case study approach was chosen in order to investigate the interaction of Food Sovereignty (FS) and tourism in a specific context. The case study is appropriate here given that the analysis deals with a phenomenon which cannot be isolated from its context (Robson & McCartan 2002), in this case the FS-T interaction. While this approach benefits the context dependent nature of my topic, it nevertheless is limited in that provides a snapshot of a narrow reality and therefore, lessons can likely not be generalised to other contexts. Moreover, rooting my findings on one single example masks characteristics which might be outliers if seen in the context of other examples. Nevertheless, such an approach provides a detailed look into the realities of the study site, to provide a clarified example of an unexplored phenomenon and to develop specific theoretical insights. Furthermore, given the unexplored nature of the topic of this thesis, Kanazawa (2018) recommends using an exploratory approach which has allowed freedom in investigating the study site, and thus allowed for improvisation as new facts emerged.

4.2 Study Site

The Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV) was chosen as the study site based on several criteria. Firstly, it was visible from online material that the village both

participated in tourism and was aware of the idea of FS. However, what makes CJEV so interesting is its purpose as a model sustainable village which seeks to learn by doing and to share their experiences and knowledge through education. CJEV is organised as a charity who's ownership is divided amongst roughly 130 residents. This means that while the public spaces of CJEV such as the land, belong to the charity, they are nevertheless governed by the residents. Therefore, an interesting situation is created in which CJEV, through relevant governance systems, has direct control over decisions regarding land use, including which projects will be allowed to operate within their property. Going further than this, CJEV also hosts several unique and significant projects within its area, of which I will now only list those of most relevance for this study. These include the Cloughjordan Community Farm (CCF), which operates on a Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) scheme, and an agricultural project named the Research, Education and Development (RED) Gardens. An additional focus will be given to the Night Orchard, a social enterprise located outside of, but near to CJEV and are very much involved in CJEV's tourism activities. The Night Orchard produces food and value added food products as well as offer catering services. On the other hand, tourism activities, while small scale, are quite diverse. CJEV organises educational group visits though the organisational body responsible for education - The Village Education and Research Team (VERT). These visits are tailor-made to the interests of the visitors and sometimes deal with food. As such, food-related enterprises within CJEV are often brought into the offer to participate by giving lectures or providing workshops for tourist groups when possible. Moreover, locally grown and cooked food is often served to the visitors as part of the experience by the Night Orchard. CJEV also benefits from an EU run scheme, the European Solidarity Corps (ESC) through which roughly ten volunteers come on a year to year basis. The volunteers are then split between two food producing organisations in Cloughjordan; the community farm (CCF), and the Night Orchard where they learn, amongst other things, about farming, cooking and nutrition.

4.3 Choosing the Study Site and reaching Participants

A purposive search was conducted of rural establishments which both produce food and practice tourism. Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV) was approached on the basis of an exploratory critical case study methodology (see above). I was put into contact with a person who guided me through the field work, who I can refer to as the 'research coordinator'. The research coordinator suggested interviewees, contacted potential interviewees, informed them of my study and asked them first if they would like to participate in the study. If the interviewees answered favourably, I would be put into contact with them to organise an interview. This relationship proved to be respectful to the organisational norms of CJEV, as the

research coordinator acted as a mediator between residents and myself to ensure that I do not disrespect norms or disturb residents. Moreover, this arrangement made it easy for me to gain access to a wide range of contacts within the village which I would not have been able to reach myself. However, it raises questions about the possibility of a sampling bias given that the research coordinator played a significant role in the choice of participants and in a sense resembled a 'gatekeeper' (Robson & McCartan 2002). Nevertheless, since participants later suggested that much the same contacts might be of interest for my study, I am sceptical that there was a strong sampling bias. Apart from relying on formally suggested interviewees, I also sampled a small amount of people according to emerging information during field work. This method of 'snowball sampling' (Robson & McCartan 2002) turned out to be very appropriate as a significant amount of details regarding the organisations operating within CJEV, and the people working within them was not available online before I began with field work. Therefore, such improvisation allowed me to adapt quickly to arising information.

4.4 Data collection

4.4.1 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were chosen for their ability to be both flexible, in allowing interviewees to speak openly, and structured, by keeping the interview focused on a certain topic or theme (Kanazawa 2018). I found that flexibility worked very well as it allowed participants to express their thoughts freely and allowed me to adapt the angle of questioning in response. In the case that chosen participants were unable to meet in person, interviews were conducted over video call. All of the interviews were voice recorded.

The research site proved to be very complex with a wide diversity of projects and people. Therefore, a separate interview guide was made for each participant, focusing either on food, tourism or a combination of both topics, depending on the role of the interviewee. Questions relating to food encouraged the participants to reflect on social and ecological dimensions relating to the growth, processing, consumption, governing and interaction with and around food. On the other hand, questions relating to tourism looked at predominantly social questions of organisation, adaptation, pressures, purpose and the role of food in tourism. Additionally, tourism-related questions also looked at impressions of tourist satisfaction and host acceptance of tourism activities.

In total seven interviews were carried out with eight participants as one interview was conducted with two participants. Six of the eight participants belong to the perspective of the host community given their residence in or near to the CJEV,

while the other two being temporary volunteers, belonged to the perspective of volunteer-tourists. This represents a limitation of the study, notably that the voices of tourists are under-represented in this thesis as the interview materials represents host more than tourists and only cover the views of volunteer tourists, leaving out educational group tourists. Furthermore, only one of the six participants representing the host perspective works outside of the CJEV. This participant was included due to their economic and social proximity to CJEV as they work with residents of CJEV, and live within the larger Cloughjordan Village.

Finally, a fellow student also conducting interviews with some members of CJEV covered topics similar to FS as they dealt with agroecology. With the explicit permission of this students' interviewee, the interview data was shared with me for the purposes of my study. The interviewee whose data I received had also been interviewed by myself and so this additional data did not add the perspectives of a new person to the study.

4.4.2 Observation

Observation was carried out as a supportive method of data collection in order to gain a better understanding of the study site. This was done through the position of an active 'participant as observer' (Robson & McCartan 2002). This role emphasises that the observer's role should be made clear to those being observed. The observations opened space for informal discussions, allowing me to discover more about how CJEV is organised, how certain processes occur, and how Eco Villagers feel about projects and people within CJEV. Specifically, I gained insights into how processes governing collective land work, what sort of social issues confront the community, what hopes and aspirations the community has, and also gained some valuable insights into how villagers feel about the local food system.

A significant benefit of this method is that the observer can ask participants for relevant clarifications throughout the observation (Robson & McCartan 2002). Through observation I came into contact with five people. Of these, two did not also participate in interviews; one guided me on a village tour, and another was tending to their garden when we met. Throughout these observations I was accompanied by mostly one or two people and was therefore able to shape the conversations in order to discuss my topic. Therefore, my presence significantly shaped the data collected. For example, on the tour of CJEV, seeing as I was the only person present, it was easy to engage in conversation regarding my topic with the guide. After I explained the topic of my study, the guide gave me a tour which focused on how food is produced and organised within CJEV as well as how tourists engage with and feel about places of food production within the village.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

There are several ethical considerations which are important to take into account for this study, and in order to do so I've followed the recommendations set out by Creswell & Creswell (2018). Firstly, at the beginning of each interview the participants were informed of the research objectives and their role in the research was clearly explained to them. Secondly, interviews were recorded only with the prior consent received from the participants. Thirdly, the participants anonymity was ensured and they were informed that they were able to withdraw from the research at any point during the research process. Fourthly, all of the participants received copies of their interview transcripts to check for accuracy and to have the chance to leave out sensitive information that might have been collected. Lastly, the data collected has been used exclusively for the purposes of this study.

Additionally, I have also adhered to the ethical research guidelines of Cloughjordan Ecovillage as published on their webpage (Cloughjordan Ecovillage 2021). A majority of the guidelines overlapped with the recommendations set out by Creswell & Creswell (2018). However, there were some additional ethical considerations to follow. Firstly, I was required to send the research proposal to the research coordinator in the eco village who reviewed the proposal in order to grant me an ethical approval for the study. Secondly, I completed and signed a research enquiry form which required information such as my personal contact details, institutional affiliation, subject of my research and proposed outcome of the research.

Since CJEV is a relatively small village and the residents know each other very well, I have been careful throughout the thesis to ensure that their anonymity is respected. This was done by omitting gendered pronouns, the formal roles of respondents and avoiding the usage of quotes which made their role obvious.

Finally, due to the unfolding circumstances of the coronavirus pandemic, I have followed the recommendations of the Irish Department of Health (Government of Ireland 2021c) while conducting research.

4.6 The Researchers' Role

Creswell & Creswell (2008) emphasise that researchers should explicitly identify personal aspects, such as past experiences, background or knowledge, that might shape their interpretations formed during a study. I have both experience working in tourism and knowledge of the negative social and ecological processes of tourism given the prevalence of tourism in my home country, Croatia. Moreover, I have a political interest regarding the need for a more sustainable living that takes into account social and natural wellbeing. Therefore, I explicitly support FS and alternative forms of tourism, forms that prioritise social and ecological goals. This

might have brought me closer to my participants as it seems that we shared a similar interest in sustainability and a similar view that social and ecological objectives should be prioritised in societies. However, being opinionated about this topic may have influenced data collection and analysis as I might implicitly have focused on the positive realities and outcomes of the alternative food and tourism agendas. To deal with this I often practiced self-reflection in order to be aware of any assumptions that I might be making. Moreover, throughout the thesis I searched for contradictory information which might force me to re-think my interpretations or conclusions.

Moreover, in 'People, power, change: three pillars of a food sovereignty research praxis', Levkoe et al. (2019) reflect on their past studies in the field of FS and make suggestions for studies dealing specifically with FS. Firstly, it is suggested that the researcher humanise research relations by incorporating trust, reciprocity and solidarity. The key here is to approach social relations through a "comprehensive and transformative approach" which involves emphasising "a common humanity, mutual agency and blurring the division between the personal and the professional" (ibid.:1396). This was attempted by sharing personal thoughts and feelings with participants after interviews and stopping by to meet them in person when I had the chance. I further tried to have informal conversations and get to know the people behind the interview. This seems to have helped me develop honest relationships with some interviewees. Finally, the researcher should attempt to support the transformative work of progressive social movements by committing their research to political and practical outcomes and taking on additional roles (ibid.). In my specific context this would mean orienting my study so as to provide insights which can be useful for supporting the development of FS at the study site. While Levkoe et al. (2019) suggest this from the perspective that the researcher and the participants explicitly agree on an aim for the study, I was unable to do so due to time constraints. Instead, I have done my best throughout this study to offer insights into how a combination of a FS and an alternative tourism agenda might work together to promote rural development. While this is not something that was asked of me by the participants, CJEV has a goal of being a model of sustainable living and an educational centre and Cultivate, an NGO based within CJEV, explicitly promotes FS. Therefore, I believe that this thesis will provide useful insights for CJEV. Finally, Levkoe et al. (2019) suggest to take on roles which assist the participants in achieving their goals. I attempted to do what little I could here by trying where possible to help participants in their everyday operations. For example, I built a relationship with one participant by helping dust, mop and prepare an area for a farmers market.

4.7 Data Analysis

Interview transcripts were firstly autogenerated by the online program Otter.ai.[7] To ensure accuracy, the transcripts were then double checked by carefully comparing interview audio recordings with the generated transcripts. After this process the checked transcripts were additionally sent to participants who were then provided with the chance to read through and clarify if any mistakes were made. Of the eight participants four participants reviewed the transcripts. In regards to observations, voice memos were recorded immediately after the observation, in which I recounted in as much detail as possible everything that I could recollect. Therefore there exists the possibility that the recounted information is somewhat biased according to the aspects that I remembered best. These recordings were likewise transcribed by using Otter.ai, and furthermore reviewed by myself to correct any mistakes made by the program.

Data analysis centred on thematic coding. Where codes were already available, such as with the six principles of food sovereignty coding was done deductively. Oppositely, where codes were a matter of interpretation, such as with processes of decommodification, characteristics of a social and solidarity economy, the presence of tourism themes, and the interaction of FS aspects with tourism, coding was done inductively. As proposed by Robson & McCartan (2002), in order to ensure familiarity with the material, transcripts were re-read several times before beginning the coding process. Codes signifying the presence of FS were then reviewed in light of codes signifying the presence of tourism and those indicating processes of thematic interaction, in order to better theorise the FS-T interaction (ibid.). After this process, the types of interactions were grouped into themes of FS-T interactions.

[7] For access to the application see webpage: https://otter.ai

Analysis

5.1 Analytical Structure

There are two main ways that tourism occurs at Cloughjordan Eco Village (CJEV); through volunteer tourism and through educational group tourism. Given that these forms of tourism are very different in the experiences they offer and in the management that they require, they will be dealt with separately. From these findings it emerges that through the FS-T interaction, FS *imbues* tourism with certain characteristics as tourism *enacts* or *encounters* FS. The principles of FS can imbue tourism with educational, ecological and social aspects. On the other hand, tourism can engage with FS either by *acting* in ways which align with FS (enacting) or by *coming into contact* with actions which align with FS (encountering). Because of this, the two sections on volunteer tourism and educational group tourism will be split into themes which focus in on the specific ways in which tourists enact and encounter FS as well as how FS characterises the practice of tourism. Finally, the analysis will end by summarising the role of FS-T interactions in creating a unique social and solidarity food system within which FS and tourism are embedded and integral parts of a larger SSE. I conclude with a reflection on FS-T interaction and rural development.

5.2 Volunteer Tourism

In CJEV, one way that volunteer tourism occurs is through the European Solidarity Corps (ESC) programme where the EU finances volunteer activities for young Europeans. The volunteers arrive annually and stay for one year to work either at the Cloughjordan Community Farm (CCF) or the Night Orchard and at the time of writing they totalled twelve volunteers all together split evenly. In regards to the CCF, the volunteers arrive into the role of farmers. Volunteers are a very heterogenous mix comprising young people of both genders arriving internationally. The volunteers who arrive most often lack in any farming experience.

According to two interviewed volunteers, a prime motivation for undertaking the volunteering role was to gain new experiences. These characterises very much suggest that the volunteers can be understood as volunteer tourist. Wearing & McGehee (2013) define international volunteer tourism as "individuals volunteering away from their home countries for periods from 3 months to 2 years" (ibid.:20). They further explain that these activities are "not undertaken for financial reward, are undertaken on behalf of an individual's own free will, and should benefit someone other than the volunteer (although they recognize the benefits to the volunteer as well)" (ibid.). In essence, this is how volunteer tourism occurs within CJEV if we are to imagine it outside of the context of FS. Once this rather plain conception of volunteer tourism is placed within the context of FS, or the context of the site where FS occurs, it begins to take on colour as the two forces interact.

At this point I may begin the discussion of how volunteer tourism and FS interact. I will do this by beginning with places or actions through which FS is present. I will then describe how the volunteer tourist experience is influenced as a result of FS and how FS is affected through the tourist's enactment and engagement with FS.

5.2.1 Theme 1: Agroecology, Enacting and Encountering

Firstly, we can begin with the farming practices employed at the CCF. The sixth principle of FS deals specifically with farming practices. Here, the principle champions "…low external input agroecological production and harvesting methods that maximise the contribution of ecosystems…" (European Coordination Via Campesina 2018). There is ample evidence to support that the farming methods at the CCF align with low external inputs, and agroecological production.

First of all, the CCF has a very low reliance on external inputs. This can be seen firstly in regards to machinery. The CCF employs one old tractor which is used to drive less than one kilometre distance twice a week. Furthermore, farmers have expressed an interest in replacing the tractor with working horses. Seed saving is also practiced on-farm, and there is no use of herbicides, pesticides, fertilisers or GMO seeds. Furthermore, one respondent explains how the farm creatively replaced refrigerated storage with shipping containers;

> "I worked on a farm in England in Kent, and they had 1000 acres. And they grew cheap crops. 400 acres of scallions or salad onions, 400 acres of iceberg and 200 acres of radish. And we used to […] harvest the radish in the trailer and tractor and we back the trailer into the fridge and then unhitch and close. That's how big it was. You know, we don't have any fridges here. We do some storage. And we tried to be smart about this. So we use bales of hay as insulation." (Interview 4)

Furthermore, the CCF shows characteristics of an agroecological approach in regards to farming practice. By practicing compost application, the use of cover crops and green manure, crop rotations, use of living fences, intercropping and animal integration, the CCF contributes to all ecological principles of agroecology as described by Nicholls et al. (2016).

The CCF further focuses on working with nature instead of against it through encouraging natural enemies by providing natural habitats for them. One farmer explains the interplay between ladybirds and aphids;

> "So we are leaving wild areas - see the wild areas around the edges and stuff? And we have nettles growing, which the nettles, they grow very early in the season. And then the lady birds have laid their eggs in there, which feed on the aphids. The aphids will come for a point, but then we find everything balances down. We get very few major pest problems." (Interview 4)

Bringing the volunteer tourists back into the discussion, we can see now that they enter right into the thick of a farm which fairly strongly embodies the sixth principle of FS. The volunteers enter such an ecologically oriented farming system in perhaps the most engaging way possible, as farmers. By doing so, two interactions occur between the volunteers and the principles of FS. Firstly, the volunteers receive an education in such agroecological farming practices and by doing so, they *encounter* FS. Specifically, it is because they are present to learn directly from the head farmer of the CCF, building on the knowledge and skills of local food providers, that the CCF is practicing the fifth principle of FS. On the other end, as they learn and practice agroecological farming practices, the volunteers begin to actively *enact* the sixth principle of FS.

Such interactions create specific new realities for both the volunteer tourism experience as well as for the practice of the sixth principle of FS. Let me start with the impacts on the volunteer tourism experience first. The mix of educational, ecological and nature-based elements present in the volunteer tourism experience through the learning of agroecological farming practices places the volunteer experience within the realm of eco-tourism. In this way, FS imbues tourism with specific characteristics. Weaver (2007) specifically lists three characteristics of the eco-tourism offer as having; a basis in nature, a learning component and a focus on sustainability. Volunteer tourism at the CCF can very much be said to fulfil the second two criteria of eco-tourism. Firstly, the volunteer experience includes an "element of education, learning or appreciation of the natural attractions" (ibid.: 11) that form the basis of the experience. And secondly, as the farming methods of agroecology conserve the natural resource base, they constitute a practice which can be interpreted as ecologically sustainable, that is, they meet the needs of the present without compromising future generations to meet their own needs (Weaver 2007:14). However, it is questionable whether the volunteer tourism experience at

the CCF can be said to meet the criteria of having an attraction which is 'based in nature'. While the farm is most certainly a natural element and has a focus on sustainable management, the attractions that conventionally attract eco-tourists are centred on specific 'charismatic' ecological elements. The findings of this study indicate instead that the attraction for the volunteer tourists was specifically the allure of a new, different experience, not a specific natural element.

However, the practice of agroecological farming can embrace and support unique local varieties of crops, ecosystems and animal species (Anderson et al. 2021). The educational potential from an overarching FS approach also seems significant. The findings therefore suggest that the agroecological element of FS might provide an alluring attraction for eco-tourists given its focus on education, nature and sustainability. Volunteers exemplified this by explaining what they have learnt about farming and about how to interact with food in a more sustainable way;

> "For me, I didn't have any knowledge about soil, growing vegetables, nothing about that. And now I can say that I know a bit more than at the beginning." … "So when I was here, also, I realised all the work that supposed to grow vegetables. So for me is to be more aware about climate change. What can I do to just to help about that? Yeah, and also be more aware about what I eat." (Interview 7)

> "…also some technical aspects like what is in season, or how to do some task, like weeding or like planting or like sowing" (Interview 6)

On the other end, such a practice of volunteer tourism has significant effects on the CCF and therefore also on the practice of FS. These effects are related to the nature of tourism as its temporary character spills over into the practices of FS. Perhaps the most significant of these is a question concerning labour. The CCF has difficulties with engaging members[8] to work on the farm. Nevertheless, despite low involvement, the membership of the CCF receives weekly produce largely thanks to the work of the volunteers. While it is not clear exactly why the member involvement is low - if this is because volunteers are filling the labour requirements, or perhaps because members simply do not have the time - it is clear that the farming education and experience invested by the CCF in volunteer tourists is lost each year as the volunteers leave and new ones arrive. Such a pattern of temporary labour seems ineffective at retaining educated labourers in order to sustain the practices of the farm. Additionally to these concerns, it has been mentioned that the CCF has struggled with finding suitable long-term employees to work on the farm (Interview 4). It seems that the CCF is struggling to pass on the very knowledge and experience that such an agroecological farming practice relies on, to future generations. One Farmer emphasises this;

[8] These members, also often referred to as 'the membership' pay a monthly fee to the CCF and as members become also part owners, and can therefore participate in decisions regarding the management of the CCF.

> "I took that break and then after I came [back] - I suppose [after] about three years - but I always seem to have a hand in because they were struggling to get someone else to replace us. And my friend continued on without me. And then he got a heart attack. So he had health issues. So you had to pull back. So all of a sudden, we didn't have [us two] on the farm, you know. And so they advertise that we got two young farmers in, but they didn't have much experience. But they held it as well as they could, but they really lacked the experience that we had. So now that time has happened, and we've had two years of this, a bit unpredictable gaps in the crops, and, you know, just not as smooth as maybe it was before…" (Interview 4)

These topics therefore raise questions regarding the viability of the CCF to function properly without volunteer tourist labour. Given that groups of volunteers come annually to support the CCF which is organisationally adapted to their labour, what might happen if the ESC programme is discontinued? In the scenario that EU funding grinds to a halt and volunteers can no longer be financially supported to undertake this venture, how would the CCF cope? While some have voiced opinions that the members could easily replace the volunteers by reorganising and dedicating more time to the farm (Interview 6) others have emphasised that membership involvement is low due to lacking time in their everyday schedules (Interview 4,7). Therefore, it seems a possibility that labour from volunteer tourism is really sustaining the CCF. Either-way, it is clear that the volunteers sustain the current form of the CCF. Thus, volunteer tourism may affect the practice of FS in two ways; firstly, by creating a pattern whereby the investment in volunteer tourists of localised farming knowledge and experience is overwhelmingly lost year on year and therefore limits the ability to educate and retain permanent farmers. Secondly, volunteer tourism affects FS by creating a dependence on temporary farm labour. Through its temporary nature, volunteer tourism may hamper the achievement of the fifth principle of FS, that of building on the skills and knowledge of local food providers, as the knowledge and skills accumulated by tourists leaves the community each year.

Therefore, the interaction between FS and tourism results in both forces changing as a result of the others characteristics; FS is enacted and supported by tourists yet becomes vulnerable to the temporary nature of tourism while on the other hand tourism becomes imbued with an ecological, educational and sustainable character through the practice of agroecological farming.

5.2.2 Theme 2: Enacting the Decommodification of Food by Engaging with Food Sovereignty

A further way in which volunteer tourism interacts with FS is by providing a means for everyday people to build a decommodified understanding of food. Specifically, in this case, decommodification is enacted by the tourists as they increase market transparency within a FS context. Increasing market transparency

deals with bridging the gap of knowledge between producers and consumers in food systems. Vail (2010), in his discussion of decommodification, lists increasing market transparency as one of the four processes of decommodification. He argues that by dislocating human relationships relating to the processes of production, a sort of structural mystification occurs in which the social relations embedded in products are not visible to consumers. While Vail (2010) gives the example of how slave labour is not visible in Chinese produced toys, these same arguments can easily be applied to food production. In fact, Clapp (2016) discusses the idea of 'distance' in a very similar way specifically in regards to food. For Clapp, distance refers to both the physical distance that food travels before it is eaten and the mental distance at which the consumer is kept from the true conditions of food systems. However, improved knowledge, or transparency, does not simply incite action and transformative practices, Vail (2010) recognises;

> "Indeed, it may be difficult for individuals to comprehend their own culpability in these arrangements: the insight that our consumption *here* is inextricably linked to someone else's misery *there*." (ibid.:335)

Instead, Vail (2010) argues that such an 'empathetic leap' between knowing and doing requires a fundamental ethical and emotional transformation. He goes on to describe that such transformation should be pursued not through education but rather through experiences where 'moral shocks' "reorient individual identity and behaviour in the direction of collective identity and struggle" (ibid:335).

This is very much something that I have observed occurring through the process of volunteer tourism at the CCF. In the first place, volunteers willingly increase market transparency by dedicating a year of their lives to experiencing the realities of food producers. In this process the volunteer as a past consumer of food becomes the provider of food, and thus reduces the mental distance between the two roles. It is significant to consider that the role of the volunteers in this example is one which interacts with many contextual FS principles situated within the study site, as they practice nature-based farming (principle 6, see section 5.2.1), build on knowledge and skills of food providers (principle 5, see section 5.2.1), contribute to localising food systems (principle 3, see section 5.2.3 & 5.4.2), and as they are valued as food producers (principle 2, see section 5.2.3 & 5.3.1). These highlight that agency in increasing market transparency is not solely on the tourists but rather also on the host destination which facilitates the experiences and in that sense also allows tourists to encounter and learn from FS practices. Such experiences have proven to be enlightening to volunteers in exactly the ways theorised by both Clapp (2016) and Vail (2010). Indeed, one volunteer explains how their sensibilities to the conditions of food production have changed as a result of these experiences;

> "I was living in a kind of a city and I was not aware what was happening, you know, like, the climate change, and all of the things. So, and also like how important it is to eat real food, you know, because when you are in a city, you just go to supermarket and you just buy food that the quality is not really good, you know? So when I was here, also, I realised all the work that supposed to grow vegetables. So yeah, for me is more to be more aware about climate change, what can I do to just to help about that. Yeah, and also be more aware about what I eat." (Interview 7)

Therefore, by actively engaging in a community's food system through volunteer tourism, volunteers experience and learn about the conditions behind food products and the social role of a farmer, thereby reducing mental distance and contributing to a decommodified understanding of food. Specifically, the experiences at CJEV confronted volunteers with new realities which forced them to re-think both how they understand food systems as well as how they might interact with food in a more environmentally friendly way. In such a way they act as agents of the decommodification of food and therefore enact a piece of FS as they challenge the idea of food as a commodity (principle 1).

The experiences of volunteer tourism here connect to the theme of transformational tourism. Here, transformational tourism leans on quite a similar logic as that of the 'empathetic leap' (Vail, 2010) mentioned earlier. Both Vail (2010) and Reisinger (2013) see transformational change occurring in people as a result of experiences which jolt them into re-thinking old conclusions. Therefore, it seems that such a sort of volunteer tourism which engages directly with alternative food production can be transformational in the sense that it allows the volunteers to bridge an ethical gap, a distance or a lack of transparency within food systems. Specifically, such experiences confront the volunteer with new social and ecological realities, causing them to re-think food systems and motivate them towards more ecologically and socially responsible practices. In this sense, tourism provides FS with a means to bring together consumers and producers of food (principle 3) in order to bridge a gap of knowledge between the two and thus contribute to denying food as a commodity (principle 1). On the other hand, FS infuses the volunteer-farmer's experience with new realities and therefore brings about a transformational experience which is oriented around the social and ecological aspects of food.

5.2.3 Theme 3: Encountering FS. Valuing of Volunteers as Food Producers

The mainstream industrial food system is replete with examples of the mistreatment of agricultural workers (Gertel & Sippel 2014). The exploitation that farm workers can face in terms of working conditions within such systems highlights the economic imperative of industrial agriculture (ibid.). Volunteer tourists in CJEV, on the other hand, encounter FS in a way that values them as food

producers (principle 2) by the host community. One respondent within this study has experiences with working as a commercial farmer and explained his experiences;

> "I grew for supermarkets, I had 16 supermarkets I was growing for - they wanted one crop, one person. Even two crops, one person. Less they have to deal with, the better. And then of course, that meant I was going the bulk. And then if I had a glut, they would take it, but they don't give you half the money. So you're working for half the money. So actually, you wouldn't appreciate it at all. And the commitment they had to you was zero. It was all based on economics." (Interview 4)

A significant aspect of the CCF is very much an opposite approach to the relationship between farmers and customers. Indeed, the same respondent continues on to say that the community and the farmers are committed to one another (Interview 4). Such commitment can be seen through supportive actions that have occurred between the membership and the farmers in the past: the members have supported the farm even in times when harvests were weak, and the farmers have voluntarily lowered their wages to help finance the farm.

There are two more significant aspects which contribute to valuing the farmers of the CCF. The farm provides for a captive market - a set of members who provide a steady income - who understand the 'ethos' of the CCF. By removing itself from the free market the CCF is not exposed to market logic. Thus, it does not compete with nearby producers, nor is it vulnerable to pressures from intermediaries such as distributors and retailers. This is one way in which FS is present, through localising food systems (principle 3). Furthermore, members are supportive of the project as they align with the CCF's vision and goals. A significant outcome of this combination of autonomy from markets and member support is that the farmers have a considerably high autonomy in on-farm decision making. While of course, the farmers are kept in check by both the license outlining their responsibilities and by the membership of the farm, they nevertheless have the freedom to practice sustainable farming as they best know how. Concretely this means that famers are largely free to farm as they wish (Interview 4) - they do not face pressures to plant specific crops, use specific farm inputs nor to harvest at specific times. Furthermore, the farmers are not pressured to produce as much as possible but rather only what the community needs.

The working conditions of volunteers are very much influenced by these previously mentioned factors. Taken together, the support and freedom that farmers receive is one way that they are recipients of principle 2 of FS, that of valuing food producers. For example, we can see such freedom in how work is organised on the CCF each day;

> "So first, we start with a check in. Okay, and the check in is our moment to say how we are how we feel in that moment, [the head farmer] is there as well some days, and then we have

> the task, and we say okay, what do you feel if you do this? So if the person says yes, I'm doing this, because he or she will do it, you know? So but first we ask." (Interview 7)

Most importantly, volunteers expressed satisfaction with their work, expressing that they are relaxed and respected. Their opinions showcase a welcome and relaxed working atmosphere, one in which they feel that they are valued and respected fairly;

> "...the work in the farm is very chill, you know? Like, no one is telling you 'Oh, you have to be here and you have to do this for four hours'. No, it's like, okay, are you tired? Okay, take a rest or you can change if you want. They are always asking you how are you, you know, if you are okay, doing that, and they also, they want it that you enjoy in the farm. So it's not like a job. You know? […] So for me, it's like they are taking care a lot of me." (Interview 7)

> "…we have like 24 days of holidays. So that's also really good to travel like if some family came or to go to somewhere. Some take a rest. Also like for example, we if we want to travel, okay, and we say look [to the head farmer], we want to travel, can we - and we want to travel all the volunteers - Can we don't work Friday? And he says Yes, don't worry, like, okay, let's work a bit more on Thursday. So he doesn't have any problem so it's very good." (Interview 6)

Additionally, volunteers are provided with accommodation, bicycles, free vegetables form the farm, local free range eggs, locally produced bread, and some pocket money (Interview 6&7). Such a supportive environment was further emphasised when the volunteers fell ill with Covid-19. As they had to quarantine, they recall receiving support from the community who brought them food and were at their disposal for anything else that the volunteers might need. Such experiences led volunteers to feel welcome with the community as part of a family. Their experiences within the community even extended to cultural education with workshops about Saint Bridget's Cross, an Irish tradition.

Therefore, it can be understood that the volunteers were valued, supported and respected in a plethora of ways by the CJEV community. Such an attitude towards the volunteer tourists can therefore be understood as a strong embodiment of the second principle of FS, that of valuing food producers. These example shows how tourism encounters FS, as the valuing of food producers is expressed onto tourists. Especially when viewed in the context of the previous sections, such relationships highlight the hosts appreciation for tourists and indicate the value of a tourism that is organised to serve the interests of the hosts. Apart from being just food producers, the tourists make up a heterogenous group of foreigners and thus come with needs specific to their purposes. Through the examples above we can see how the way that volunteers are valued is reflective of their needs. By receiving a wide range of support, the volunteers are enabled to experience through traveling, learning about traditional culture, meeting the local community, all while feeling safe and accepted working at the CCF. Thus, the specific characteristics of volunteer tourists can influence the way that the FS principle 2 is expressed.

The practice of valuing food producers (principle 2), further imbues the volunteer experience with a very unique element of authenticity. While the idea of authenticity is something that is very much debated, in general it reflects the search for a "genuine, unadulterated 'real thing' " (Heitmann:45). One way that we can understand authenticity is in stages where the tourism experience is either staged, as in spaces that are developed for the accommodation of tourists, or authentic, as in the spaces where private lives of the hosts really occur (Heitmann:49 see MacCannell 1999). Through the perspective of staged authenticity, we can understand the volunteer experience as showing signs of a truly authentic experience as the experience is rooted in an existing, working community farm. While absolute authenticity might not be present given that the volunteer tourists themselves compromise the core of some experiences, my research indicates that neither the CCF, CJEV, nor the roles that the volunteers play are fabricated, rehearsed or designed as tourism offers. The social ties that volunteer tourists develop through their socialisation and experiences alongside residents of CJEV and members of the CCF are very much experienced as honest, real and fulfilling. Furthermore, authenticity can also be seen through the knowledge and skills that the tourists have gained through farming (see section 5.2.1) as these are very much key elements employed every day at the CCF. Therefore, this example highlights how the valuing of food producers imbues the tourism experience with unique characteristics.

5.3 Educational Group Tourism

The second form of tourism which occurs at the CJEV is an educational group tourism. The groups that visit, come from a wide spectrum of social areas from both internationally and domestically and have various interests which motivate their visit. Educational group visits are one of the processes within CJEV that are organised by the Village Education and Research Team (VERT). A key role of VERT's is to contribute to the educational remit of CJEV. While the topics covered on educational group visits often cover a wide range, food can feature prominently. Groups interested in food may immerse themselves in CJEV's community food culture in many ways. These include by eating locally produced and prepared food, by learning about food production, the importance of local suppliers, by visiting working farms and by learning about local food initiatives.

5.3.1 Theme 1: VERT for Tourism and Food Sovereignty

In organising education group visits, VERT balances the wants of tourists with what the CJEV community can provide, and in doing so, organises a customised

educational experience. A respondent explains that the role of VERT in organising educational group visits;

> "… is very much kind of trying to understand what the different groups are trying to learn and trying to understand and then meet their needs, their learning needs as opposed to necessarily their expectations, because they may not have expectations, but their learning needs as to what it is they're trying to understand" (Interview 1)

When trying to meet the learning needs of the visiting groups, VERT organises the tourism offer in coordination with the local CJEV community working or living in the eco village. In this sense, VERT can be seen as a mediator between tourists and the CJEV members. A key outcome of such a process of organising tourism is that its practice becomes tied to the interests and capabilities of the host community. For example, VERT explicitly takes into consideration an ongoing concern of CJEV residents that tourists might impact their private lives by looking through windows and making residents feel as if they are living in "some kind of fishbowl" (Interview 1). Moreover, although the challenge has not yet arisen, VERT has expressed awareness about the possible negative environmental impacts of group tours on various paths and fields within CJEV. Finally, VERT acts cooperatively with projects within CJEV in tailoring the educational group offer. This can be seen in the fact that while tourists show an interest to volunteer on farms, VERT does not organise such activities because they have not been able to organise them in a way that is helpful for the farmers. One respondent (Interview 1) emphasises the balance in organising tourism which is respectful for the host community;

> "Because there's a balance around having the quality of life of the people that live here and the cost of, as you say, the ground and people walking on the biodiversity trail and walking down to the farm and visiting the RED gardens. That is, there's a balance there and our highest priority is of course not income generation. […] So there's a very subtle balance here and that challenge has not happened yet but it's something I'm very conscious of. […] there is a limited number of people that can come here without degradation of the ground, or without members who live here not being happy about the amount of people looking through their windows." (Interview 1)

What these examples showcase is an approach to the management of tourism which is community-owned, responsive and considerate of the interests of residents and projects within the CJEV. Because of this, the management style can be seen to show signs of sustainable and community-based tourism. A prominent aspect of sustainable tourism is in ensuring equity and fairness within the processes of tourism (Oriade & Evans 2011). Sustainable tourism therefore suggests that communities be involved in decision making about tourism activities (ibid.). By keeping in contact with the residents of the CJEV and members of the projects which participate in the tourism offer, VERT does just this as it takes into account

the needs and wants of other relevant ‘stakeholders’ when organising educational groups. Oriade & Evans offer a further understanding of sustainable tourism, suggesting that it should encompass “the management of all resources in a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems are maintained”. (Oriade & Evans 2011, see Inskeep 1991). Again, VERT can be seen respecting elements of such a conception of sustainable tourism as it shows a regard for ecological and social wellbeing as well as an awareness of the pressures that tourism may put on these factors. Perhaps the clearest example of this is VERTs rejection of tourists’ wish to work on farms due to the organisational difficulties this poses for farmers whose farms would be affected. VERT likewise resembles community-based tourism as it is a CJEV organisation whose members are part of the community.

This example is relevant as it helps understand how sustainable and community-based tourism management can have a significant impact on the outcomes of FS-T interaction. Through a sustainable and community-oriented approach to tourism, the governance of tourism at CJEV protects local food systems and orients tourism in ways that may help promote the goals of food producers. Thus, such approaches to tourism are significant as they orient tourist activity towards valuing food producers (principle 2) and put control locally (principle 4). In the context of a food system which is embedded with many aspects of FS (see section 5.4.2), VERT’s role is even more interesting as it indirectly supports FS goals through supporting the local food providers and organisations which promote FS. In this way such management approaches exemplify how tourism might be made responsive to the interests of alternative rural food producers and organisations.

These examples indicate that community-based and sustainable educational group tourism governance can enact FS by orienting tourism activities towards supporting and respecting local producers and their goals. Moreover, they indicate that FS characteristics imbue the practice of tourism governance with a social and ecological character as tourism management assumes a role supportive of the ecological (see section 5.2.1) and social (see section 5.4.2) interests of local food providers.

5.3.2 Theme 2: Cuan Beo, A Potential New Space for Tourism and FS.

While the previous examples portray the enactment of food sovereignty, a third example shows rather a potential area of both enactment and encountering of FS. This potential lies in the interests of group tourists to volunteer on the local farms and therefore personally experience ecological food production. Respondent 1 explains that many of the educational tourism groups whose experience is organised

by VERT, are interested in volunteering on-farm. However, such volunteering often does not materialise given that it is difficult for VERT to organise volunteering in a way that is helpful for the farmers at CJEV;

> "But if you actually talk to people [the farmers], […] it's actually not particularly helpful to have 30 students down in their wellies for the afternoon to get digging." (Interview 1)

As discussed in section 5.2.1 concerned with how volunteers enact food sovereignty, the act of volunteering could be considered a significant act of FS. By volunteering, groups could for example, practice nature-oriented farming (principle 6), actively participate in valuing farmers by helping them on farm (principle 2), bring consumers and producers closer together (principle 3), and challenge food as a commodity (principle 1).

The rejection of such volunteering through, highlights a contradiction between FS and tourism in this specific case. The interests of group tourists to volunteer and therefore possibly interact with FS principles in the aforementioned ways are denied due to a style of governing tourism which enacts FS through valuing food producers (principle 2) and putting control locally (principle 4).

In order to solve this contradiction, VERT and CCF have collaborated in order to enable group tourists to indeed immerse themselves in the practice of farming by developing a new farming educational centre called Cuan Beo. While not yet operational, this centre would serve to provide hands on experiences and education for educational groups regarding farming. While it is not yet clear to what extent the groups would be able to enact or encounter FS through Cuan Beo due to the fact that it is not yet operational, the centre could be utilised for teaching nature-oriented farming, thus building on knowledge and skills of local food providers (principles 5) and enabling tourists to work with nature (principle 6). It could moreover serve as an entrance for tourists to experience what it means to produce food and might therefore contribute to rejecting food as a commodity (principle 1). Respondent 1 explains;

> "Now we have a cabin now called Cuan Beo that's kind of a setup by the farm, and we're looking for ways to create experiential experiences for visiting groups so that they can plant seeds and work in the forest clearing around the oak trees. But in a way that is very useful to the organisation so at the moment I would say that's still kind of in the idea stage and we've done it a few times. We've had a wonderful group of […] students […] who came for nine days and they really wanted to help so we had them out in the forests, clearing the weeds around the oaks and at one point they cleared a whole polytunnel for us. And that was great. But because we're not creating work for them to do, then it's not necessarily there for when the groups come. So it's kind of balanced. It's hard to coordinate." (Interview 1)

Cuan Beo may therefore provide the opportunity for more tourists to engage with FS by either enacting it through practice or by encountering it through a practical

educational experience. On the other hand, the educational group tourist experience may therefore assume some characteristics of FS which volunteer tourism already shows; that of being ecologically and sustainability oriented, contributive to local food systems, as well as educational in developing practical knowledge and skills.

Cuan Beo, at least as an idea, therefore exemplifies the role of VERT in creating tourism activities which work with the local communities interests. Cuan Beo resembles the outcome of tourism and FS interactions where tourism is organised in a way that becomes responsive and respectful to local food producers interests and therefore takes on a specific character as it serves to further the goals of the hosts.

5.3.3 Theme 3: Encountering Food Sovereignty Through Education and Food

Finally, we can turn our attention to how educational group tourists encounter FS. Again, in a similar way to volunteer tourists, one of the primary ways is through education. Particularly, by learning from local food providers, group tourists build on the skills and knowledge of local food providers (principle 5). However, where in volunteer tourism the education happened more informally mostly though experiences, in group tourism the education happens more formally, as a tourism offer. While the exact knowledge that groups receive depends on their interests and what's possible at any given moment, there is nevertheless a range of food related content that deserves particular attention.

One such example is learning about the Open Food Network (OFN) Ireland, an open-source online farmers market which connects producers and consumers. Furthermore, on the OFN, the Cloughjordan Food Hub has been opened, a farmers market which is organised on the basis of the North Tipperary Region. Every second week, producers participating within the hub bring their orders to CJEV where the orders are picked up by buyers. One participant explains that the food hub;

> "…acts as a model for regional Food Hubs enabling communities to strengthen food security and local economic resilience with a focus on the distribution of local food." (Interview 2)

The Food Hub therefore contributes to localising food systems (principle 3) by bringing providers and consumers of food closer together. Furthermore, the Food Hub provides training to farmers, producers and other hubs and therefore builds on the skills and knowledge of local organisations and food providers (principle 5). By bringing together a wide range of diverse producers and consumers into a single market, the Food Hub increases the availability of locally produced foods for buyers, but also provides them the chance to enter the regional market as producers

of value-added goods (Interview 2). In this way, the Food Hub can be understood as localising food systems but also as focusing on food for people (principle 1) as it improves the availability of local foods for the region. Finally, the food hub puts control locally (principle 4). This can be seen in the Food Hub's relationship to the CCF which sells food on the Food Hub as well. Far from having a relationship where the CCF is obliged to produce certain amounts for the customers in the Food Hub, the CCF is instead completely free to dictate what and how much it will sell on the market. Indeed, one of the main benefits of the Food Hub for CCF is that it provides a market through which the CCF has an outlet for gluts without a commitment which could dictate the operations of the CCF. Perhaps it is due to these wide-ranging benefits that the Food Hub has been described as a "one stop shop for food sovereignty" (Interview 2). While the Food Hub makes up only one of the talking points for educational groups interested in food, it is clear that it has a complex and very much food sovereign story to communicate to tourist groups.

This example is unique within the context of CJEV as tourists build on the knowledge of local organisations that manage part of the food system. Given that the OFN in this example embodies many of the FS principles and explicitly supports FS, the tourism experience is thus imbued with an almost activist character where alternative orientations to food are communicated through education to tourists. On the other end, tourism facilitates the sharing of such ideas to groups of interested and diverse people. Through this interaction we can again see an emphasis on achieving CJEV's goals of educating and inspiring people by the example of a sustainable model of living.

A second way in which FS is received by groups is through catering provided by the Night Orchard. The meals are produced with local foods, grown either by the Night Orchard or by nearby local producers, such as the CCF and the RED Gardens within CJEV. The meals, far from being simply a moment to eat, make up a significant element of group visits as they are utilised to enhance the learning experience. One respondent explains;

> "Then of course people actually eat this incredibly incredible food which is such a high quality and that reaffirms their understanding of the fact that the food was grown locally and it's really high quality and it's really nutritious. So it's very multi layered, and really satisfying actually, that we can offer - not only thanks to these organisations that have come around us - that we can offer that level, that level of learning that level of, visceral kind of experience of what it actually means to talk about food sovereignty and local food systems and all of those things by actually eating quality while learning. So it's, it's a really, really special part of what we do here." (Interview 1)

The meals are furthermore accompanied by the caterer who tells a story behind the food. These moments are a chance for the producer to build relationships with the groups through sharing food, philosophies and ideas. Often, these moments turn

into conversations regarding the European Solidarity Corps volunteers present at the Night Orchard, the importance of knowing your suppliers, of buying local, of eating in season, and of being aware of the story of the food in front of you. These conversations moreover provide a great deal of satisfaction to the caterer who comments that;

> "...that's a very big reward. […] Is getting to know the people who eat my food. And the people who are coming here to see something to learn something," (Interview 5)

Through these ways, the tourists can build closer relationships while learning from food producers therefore contributing to the localisation of food systems (principle 3). The catering event further allows tourists to express the valuing of food producers (principle 2), to learn and therefore build on the knowledge of local food producers (principle 5). Finally the catering contributes to challenging food as a commodity (principle 1) by increasing market transparency as tourists are guided to re-imagine food as a socially and ecologically embedded product.

These experiences of tasting food and learning the story behind it, relate strongly with the theme of gastronomic tourism. Through the tasting of food, visitors are seen as actually "consuming the destination itself" (Povey 2011:233) as the "roots of food and drink are literally deep in the 'terroir' " (ibid.). As just one example of many, the foods served include ingredients from the CCF, who's activities and alignment with FS extend from the ecological production of food through to the democratic governance of a decommodified food system. This example makes visible how the characteristics of FS of ecological production and localised food systems, translate into the tourism offer. Through the meals then, the Night Orchard communicates the very result, captured in a meal, of a complex and interwoven alternative approach to food.

Tourism here plays a central role in presenting and communicating FS. The moments when meals are being experienced and conversations developed around topics of food represent a key junction in the interaction of FS and tourism. It is through these moments that the tourists experience the result of an alternative food system through taste and conversation as the culmination of what they have learnt throughout the tourism offer. This example highlights the importance of the moment of communication with tourists during catering as it is the messages communicated during this moment that serve to solidify and formulate the tourists interpretation of the meal.

This topic then leads us to a point where we can look beyond singular interactions between tourism and FS, such as I have been doing for now, and instead see a larger picture of how the many separate food processes within CJEV constitute a unique food system. One which integrates both FS and tourism and functions through a unique logic of a Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE). To get my point across, I will now first explain how VERT embeds FS-T interactions within the

food system at CJEV and also follows a logic of SSE in doing so. I will then exemplify the many places that FS and tourism fill within the food system at CJEV by following an exemplary food chain from production to consumption. Finally, I explore to what extent the relationships amongst actors are indicative of SSE.

5.4 Food Sovereignty and Tourism in a Social and Solidarity Economy

At its core, the idea of SSE, writes Utting (2015), is about re-orienting economic activity towards a prioritization of social and environmental goals over economic ones. By viewing the interaction of FS and tourism from a wider perspective through the idea of SSE, a unique picture emerges. From the clashing of FS and tourism, the two forces come to mutually coexist and create a food system characterized by social and ecological motives. This food system further serves to achieve the goals of CJEV, that of experimenting with sustainable living and of sharing a vision of a sustainable future. To make my point I will first explain VERT's management role as indicative of SSE. Next, I will detail how the process from the production of food to the consumption of prepared meals includes a plethora of steps which showcase the many FS and tourism relationships inherent in CJEV's food system. These relationships, I contend, are organized by a logic similar to that of the SSE and can help explain how tourism and FS merge together with CJEV's food system.

5.4.1 The Protection and Creation of Decommodified Economic Circuits.

We can begin here with the Village Education and Research Team (VERT) and their approach to managing tourist groups. I have previously (see section 5.3.1) outlined the process VERT undergoes when planning educational group tours and have also linked it with sustainable tourism and the achievement of FS principles. Approaching this topic through the perspective of SSE, we can see that VERT contributes to decommodifying the practice of tourism. By doing so, VERT promotes SSE as it contributes to establishing decommodified economic activities and circuits (Utting 2015). This is done in several ways.

As VERT is a community working group which controls the management of educational group tourists visiting CJEV, they represent a boundary which protects from market encroachment. Vail (2010) lists boundary protection as one means of decommodification, as it shields social, cultural and political life from market 'predation'. VERT does just this. By utilising close personal ties with the residents of CJEV, and creating a unique tourism offer, VERT establishes itself in a key position which allows them to manage the educational group tourists in a socially

and ecologically responsible way. Examples of this include VERT's key role in organising volunteering, catering, or lectures provided by members of CJEV. In such a way, market demand for what could be considered 'products and services' such as volunteering, or education, does not dictate the supply and cannot commodify CJEV as a place for tourist exploitation. Instead, the tourism offer provided by CJEV is very much controlled by residents. A very much identical understanding can be applied to the process of organising volunteer tourists by the CCF, who open their doors to a specific type of tourist and thus control the flow and purpose of volunteer tourism in a way that contributes to their needs.

In regards to FS, such boundary protection forestalls market action, disallowing a free market tourism to negatively impact the food system of CJEV. Instead, by protecting the structures and relations within the food system, boundary protection only allows a form of tourism which contributes to the interests and goals of the hosts. Thus, for example, VERT denies volunteering requests when such volunteering would not be useful to the farms and farmers of CJEV. The management of tourism itself then becomes a way of expressing FS principles as it places the control of farming in the hands of local food providers (principle 4). In this way, VERT avoids commodifying the farm and the food system as a tourist attraction and therefore it challenges food as a commodity (principle 1).

Another way in which decommodification is visible is through the creation of socially embedded, decommodified circuits. Such circuits can be recognised by their influence on other economic actors to promote social priorities rather than market rationality (Vail 2010). VERT creates an alternative circuit in that it influences the organizations participating in the tourism offer to be responsive to collective community interests. It does this by prioritizing CJEV's educational remit and through coordinating the tourism offer in a way that respects the communities social and environmental wants and needs. This is done specifically by cooperating with the various organizations participating in the offer. In this way, the tourists themselves then engage in activities which have been pre-arranged to ensure that their visit is responsible and supportive towards the communities interests.

Thus, VERT's organizational process is indicative of SSE in that it protects and promotes socially embedded and decommodified economic circuits. By establishing boundaries to the practice of educational group tourism, VERT both protects the present food system and aligns with two principles of food sovereignty, that of putting control locally and of challenging food as a commodity. By organizing the tourism offer to suit both tourists and hosts, VERT promotes economic circuits based on social priorities where tourism is practiced responsibly, and the offer reflects CJEV's educational remit.

5.4.2 Tracing the Embeddedness of FS-T Interaction Through a Meal

We can approach thinking about how a larger SSE food system within the CJEV is infused with FS-T interactions by examining the relationships embedded within a meal produced by the Night Orchard and served to group tourists.

The first stage is the production of the food. In this case there are two significant suppliers, the CCF and RED Gardens. We can here look at how the CCF manages volunteer tourists as one example of contributing to SSE. Specifically, the CCF manages volunteers in a way that suggests the prioritization of social and ethical goals. This is seen in how the volunteers are free to choose which activities they would like to do before the working day, in how CCF members come to help the volunteers when there is extra work to be done and in how the volunteers are flexible in organizing free days on the farm (see section 5.2.3). By providing volunteer farmers with such working conditions instead of pushing them for profits, the CCF signals that it prioritizes ethical and social goals over economic ones and therefore contributes to ideas of SSE. Furthermore, by doing so, the CCF values food producers and thus practices principle 2 of FS.

Likewise, the RED Gardens can be understood to contribute to SSE. The clearest point here is the Veg Fridge which partly supplies the Night Orchard. The Veg Fridge is a refrigerator located on the side of a road within CJEV which is regularly stocked with vegetables from the RED Gardens. There is no pricing nor oversight, instead residents take food and pay what they deem it is worth. Thus, the Veg Fridge supports principle 1 of FS, that of focusing on food for people by providing sufficient, healthy and nutritious food to all irrespective of their personal characteristics. More than serving to provide sufficient and healthy food to villagers at any cost, the Veg Fridge also engages buyers in reflection of the social and ecological value of food. One participant explains that the honour payment system pushes the buyer to think about the social, ecological and economic values of having such a producer in the near vicinity (Interview 8).

> "…at a deeper philosophical level, or a deeper social commentary level, the reason I do this [implement an honour pricing system], and I have really resisted providing any kind of pricing - is to force people to think about it. What is it? What is this food worth?" (Interview 8)

Solidarity can thus be expressed in two forms; by providing the option of free, or relatively cheap produce to financially vulnerable households, and by allowing buyers to show solidarity by paying extra for perceived social and ecological values. In the second case, FS can be expressed through principle 2, that of valuing food producers. The social tendencies behind the honour pricing system of the Veg Fridge are further emphasised in that the system prevents the producer and buyers from entering into disagreements over price. One participant explains that prices

create two scenarios for confrontation between the producer and buyer. The first being where buyers stock up on more food than they need due to a price that is perceived low, and the other being where buyers cannot afford sufficient food, or express a disagreement over the value of food due to perceived high prices (Interview 8). By engaging buyers in critical reflection, the Veg Fridge can be understood as contributing to reducing mental and physical distance between buyers and producers and therefore contributing to principle 3 of FS, that of localizing food systems. Furthermore, such a value on maintaining positive social relations between producer and buyer as well as providing a model for solidarity is all the more significant considering that the producer makes below minimum wages. Clearly then, this example shows a prioritizing of social objectives over economic, and a highlighting of social and ecological conditions behind food production. The Veg Fridge, with its pricing system can be seen as rooting a bias towards equality in food distribution as it does not exclude anyone. In these ways, it signifies the existence of an SSE.

The second stage which we can identify here is the choice of suppliers, and the relationship between suppliers and buyers. The Night Orchard often emphasized the importance of knowing their suppliers. One respondent explains that through building closer ties with suppliers, they become informed about how their suppliers farm and therefore find it easier to make an informed decision when purchasing (Interview 5). One unique example occurred when the same participant spoke about how such close relationships bypass the need for organic certification;

> "I don't believe in the organic label. […] I believe in knowing people, and knowing what they're doing." … "But [the Red Gardens] is not organic. The farm is not organic. We [the Night Orchard] are not organic. But we are farming organic. And that's worth everything." (Interview 5)

These close relationships have further resulted in the sharing of knowledge, ideas and farming practices between the food providers. For example the same respondent mentions;

> "… So with staying within the season, and really trying to, to use what is there - which I learned being in close contact with my suppliers - it's definitely a bit more work, because, you know, you have to plan it much more exact instead of just going to Lidl where you can have everything…" (Interview 5)

Such examples highlight the prioritisation of social and ecological considerations in economic activities and in such a way resemble SSE. By building close relationships with local, and ecological suppliers, the Night Orchard localizes food systems (principle 3), supports farmers who work with nature (FS principle 6) and builds on the knowledge and skills of local food producers (FS principle 5). In

doing so, the Night Orchard shows a significant emphasis on social ties and ecological objectives when choosing suppliers.

Having discussed how tourism and FS resemble SSE in the stage of production, and through the choice of suppliers, a third step is to look into the preparation and finally, the serving of meals. The Night Orchard, like the CCF, has six volunteer tourists working with them who have likewise come through the European Solidarity Corps (ESC) programme. These volunteers help with farming and cooking and learn about nutrition, catering and farming. A significant aspect of the ESC programme for the Night Orchard is providing a relaxed and practical education regarding not just farming and cooking but a more holistic approach to sustainable living.

> "We want to try to be a model enterprise [..] that facilitates some education, with the cooking, with the growing, but […] it's not just the cooking and growing, it's a lifestyle." (Interview 5)

The data shows that participants consistently spoke of volunteer tourists not through an economic perspective but rather an educational and social perspective. Such a stance towards volunteer tourists further supports the presence of an SSE given that volunteers serve the social goals of supporting a local food system and of learning through participating in a sustainable food system. Here too, tourism interacts with FS as volunteers build on the knowledge and skills of local food providers (principle 5).

Furthermore, the Night Orchard is largely free in choosing what food to prepare, which is significant as it signals that they have autonomy and control as local food providers (principle 4). Instead of taking specific orders for meals, the Night Orchards meals are seen as an opportunity for tourists to taste local food. Despite having such freedom to prepare meals, the Night Orchard specifically focuses on cooking with what is locally available in any given season and in adjusting meals to the specific people who need them.

> "… most of the visitors in the Eco village are vegetarian so I definitely have to account for that as well. […] What makes a good plate that actually fulfills you as well? And it depends on the reasoning why people are coming. Is it for a very long course on permaculture so people are, I see, okay, today they're digging the whole day, a [garden] bed or whatever. So I know, okay, I put more carbohydrates into the food" (Interview 5)

By focusing on providing in-season, healthy and sufficient food, the Night Orchard partially aligns with the sixth and first principles of FS. This further indicates another point of presence of SSE as food is seen not through the lens of economics as a commodity to be traded and profited from, but rather as an ecologically and socially relevant process.

Finally, when seeing these meals and presenting them, the caterer brings together these embedded conditions and presents a picture of the meal to visitors. This is a significant moment as it resembles the end of the food chain, a final moment of interaction between FS and tourism as tourists consume the meals within which all of the previously mentioned FS traits and tourism activities are embedded. The moment is utilised by the Night Orchard to speak about many different topics from education and the ESC project to the importance of knowing local food providers.

> "In my 20 minutes talk that I give there, it's really this awareness, just being aware […] not being blind to what actually is on your plate." … "But also I tell those people […] just how important I find it to be in contact with the growers and how important I find it to try to stay within season […]. I always go into the origin as well…" … "I really look for that mindset to change, to just have the awareness, of course, but with having awareness, you might change behaviour." (Interview 5)

This moment can be seen as crucial as the educational goals which motivate CJEV finally come to be expressed through providing a visceral insight into the conditions behind the food being eaten. It is at this moment that the entire weight of the food system beings to reach the consumers as they engage in consuming these meals and conversing with the cook. Through this process, apart from simply conversing with the cook, the tourists are broadening their perspectives and learning a lesson to take home, almost like a souvenir. The difference is that this souvenir is specifically intended to induce social and ecological changes which lead towards a more sustainable future, a goal very much at the core of CJEV.

> "…if we can inspire people to go back and enact social change in their societies then we benefit from that because that is what we want." (Interview 1)

In summary, the examples constituting this example of a food chain, highlight many spaces where FS principles are present in alignment with tourism and where both are practiced through a logic indicating the presence of SSE. Taken together, we can see that from early on in the process of food production there is a prioritization of social, ethical and ecological over economic goals. This is further present in the choice of suppliers, the preparation of food and finally in the communication of the food. In the previous section, dealing with the role of VERT, it is further visible that tourism is organized in a cooperative and focused way to ensure social and ecological goals of the residents and organizations present within CJEV. Therefore, such examples outline how the specific forms of tourism outlined thus far act in tandem with practices and principles of FS to co-create a food system which resembles an SSE.

Analytical Conclusion: Food Sovereignty, Tourism and Rural Development

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study details how FS and tourism are present together within CJEV. It does this firstly by detailing how volunteer tourism and educational group tourism occur, and secondly by looking into how these occurrences enact or encounter principles of FS which are present at the study site. Volunteer tourism was found to occur through working with food as volunteers assumed the roles of farmers, and cooks. These roles are seen as educational for the tourists and beneficial to the goals of the hosts. Food sovereignty principles were found to be present in relation to the practice of volunteer tourism as volunteers enacted nature-based farming practices (principle 6), received education on nature-based farming (principle 5), contributed to rejecting food as a commodity (principle 1) and experienced FS through being valued as food producers (principle 2).

On the other hand, educational group tourism occurs through a unique organizational structure governed by a working group within CJEV which customizes the visit according to the needs of tourists and the capabilities of CJEV. Oftentimes, the group tours focus on the topic of food where groups receive an educational experience about the food system at CJEV. Here, FS principles were found occurring through the management of tourism as those organizing tourist groups showed a valuing of food producers and their working areas (principle 2) and placed control over farm and farm processes in the hands of food producers (principle 4) by prioritizing farmers' wants and needs over those of the tourists. Educational group tourists were also found to be contributing to the rejection of food as a commodity (principle 1) and to receiving education from local food producers and their organizations (principle 5).

Furthermore, the analysis shows that FS influences tourism by imbuing it with certain characteristics, while tourism provides the means to enact or encounter FS. Practices indicative of FS provide specific characteristics and foci to the tourism experience. Through working with nature (principle 6) and building on the

knowledge and skills of local food providers (principle 5) volunteer tourism resembles ecotourism characteristics. Bringing tourists closer to the realities of food production, tourists underwent a transformational experience which helped them reject food as a commodity (principle 1) and which relates to the topic of transformational tourism. By valuing volunteer tourist farmers (principle 2) as core members of the community, the tourism experience was infused with an element of authenticity as tourists met and experienced the working and living places of their host community. Finally, through building on the knowledge and skills of local food providers and their organizations (principle 5), through the group tourism experience, especially through the tasting of local meals, FS promotes a unique gastronomic tourism. Throughout these examples, it is in relation to the practice of tourism that FS is realized in these specific ways.

On the other hand, the analysis showcases how tourism can both support FS and become a vulnerability for the system within which it is situated. The temporary nature of tourism can hamper the long-term ability of the hosts to teach volunteers the knowledge and skills of local food providers (principle 5) and to recruit them as permanent farmers. Despite this, volunteer tourists make up a significant portion of on-farm labour. Thus, volunteer tourism creates a situation where the achievement of some FS principles is dependent on the yearly arrival of volunteers.

Through the case of CJEV we can see how interaction of FS and tourism contribute to a mutually beneficial relationship whereby the food system and tourism are together shaped into processes which prioritise social and ecological goals. This synergistic relationship helps sustain a food system which breaks with capitalistic logic and priorities healthy, ecologically produced food and benefits the social goals of the local community. It further likewise reorients tourism from a predominantly economic conception to one which instead respects and achieves the ecological and social goals of the community's food system. Thus, the FS-T interaction supports the production and consumption of healthy and ecologically produced foods through the interaction of an agroecological farm and volunteer tourists. It further provides income for rural areas and thus supports the local food system through the interaction of an alternative food system and educational group tourists. Finally, it makes tourism more responsive to rural agriculture through tourism governance mechanisms which orient tourism activities to be respectful of the autonomy of farmers and valuing of their work. Thus, the FS-T interaction formulates a new situation, a sort of 'food-sovereign tourism' where tourism is structured to support a synergistic relationship with the principles of FS.

6.2 Contributions and Outlook

This study adds to the literature dealing with FS-T interactions in several ways. Firstly, the study provides a rare and unique insight into the FS-T interactions within an Eco Village. By focusing on CJEV, it uncovers ways in which the unique collective, and participatory governance present within an Eco Village contribute to formulating the character of FS-T interactions. Furthermore, by investigating what sort of character tourism experiences are imbued with as a result of interaction with FS, this study has shown the potential ways that FS effects the tourism experience. By doing so, this study expands the literature to consider how a 'food sovereignty tourism' might look. The educational, transformational, environmental, and gastronomic aspects of a 'food sovereignty tourism' seem particularly relevant in regard to FS-T literature. Specifically, the interactive and immersive, educational, and transformational experiences of volunteer tourists suggest that another way of teaching FS may be achieved through practicing FS by undertaking key roles, rather than less immersive experiences. These ideas therefore add onto the findings of Naylor (2019) who investigates how incoherent ideas of FS were developed by a group of tourists seeking to understand FS through predominantly passive roles.

Furthermore, the gastronomic aspect of the educational group tourist experience suggests that ecological and local food chains are unique enough to elicit an educational and appreciated food tourism experience. While other FS-T literature deals specifically with places that have notable, popular and traditional food and food cultures - such as a valued wine valley in Canada (Robinson 2021), indigenous gardens in Ecuador (Santafe-Troncoso & Loring 2021), or the Catalan food culture (Naylor 2019) - there was no indication that the absence of such characteristics hampered tourism satisfaction in CJEV. Finally, the analysis showcases the practical organization of tourism activities and the ways in which such practices resemble FS principles. By doing so, unlike the other literature on the topic of FS-T, this study highlights and exemplifies possible approaches to *enacting* FS through tourism governance. Finally, by situating the FS-T interactions within a larger context of a Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE), the analysis highlights the ways in which the specific instances of FS-T interactions contribute to developing more socially and ecologically oriented food systems.

The analysis further shows that tourism can play a significant role in helping sustain rural food systems. Tourism, although often criticised for its negative effects, when interacting with FS principles and in contributing to formulating a SSE, was shown to be to able of supporting the achievement of local rural food systems which increase biodiversity, provide good working and living conditions for farmers, involving consumers and producers in democratic governance of food systems, reducing reliance on external inputs and machinery and promote the

involvement and education of youth in sustainable methods of farming. Not only did tourism provide financial benefits for a rural area but it also provided an additional labour required for the achievement of agroecological food production. These findings are significant for rural Ireland. They highlight the possibility of alternative ways of producing and consuming food which contribute to decreasing the heavy carbon footprint of Irish agriculture, bringing in young farmers to counter ageing rural populations involved in agriculture and to increasing farm-biodiversity in a heavily industrialised agricultural context, all recognised as major impediments to social and ecological wellbeing in rural Ireland (Government of Ireland 2021a&d, Talamh Beo 2021, EU 2020, Regenerative Farming Ireland 2019). Finally, through a specific case, the analysis shows that two crucial sectors in Ireland, that of tourism and agriculture, can coexist in a way that does not jeopardise the well-being of rural areas but in fact seems to promote equitable and ecological rural development. To achieve rural development in such a way, it seems rural areas can make use of tourism to advance the realisation of FS principles, and vice versa, make use of the presence of FS principles to encourage a unique form of tourism.

Both food systems and tourism practices have been criticized for their roles in producing environmental degradation and pollution, contributing to damage of cultural integrity, and disempowering local communities (Garcia-Llorente et al. 2019, Reid 2014, Ryan 2003). In both food systems and tourism there has arisen, in reaction to these systems, alternative approaches to food systems and tourism practices which espouse the reorientation of food and tourism processes to benefit and respect the ecological and social systems of local actors. This thesis shows through a specific example how an alternative rural food system and tourism may work together to promote such alternative orientations in both fields. In short, this thesis, while highly contextual, suggest that rural areas aspiring to develop more ecologically and socially sound food and/or tourism practices may do so simultaneously. Moreover, the findings suggest that tourism may be utilized to support transitions to more sovereign food systems and that a food system characterized by FS principles does in fact provide tourism appeal. Together, these findings signify a possible means by which rural areas may utilize the FS-T interaction to break with the environmental and socially damaging effects of mainstream agricultural and tourism practices and instead develop in more ecologically oriented and community-controlled ways. Seeing rural development as ‘an imminent process of social change’ (Pain and Hansen 2019:9, see Cowen & Shenton 1998:50), the FS-T interaction therefore provides a specific orientation to processes of rural development. It does this by bringing together alternative approaches to mainstream food and tourism which emphasise the social control and ecological responsibility of agriculture and international travel.

Food sovereignty is highly situated and contextual and therefore provides a limited lens through which to make general assertions. I thus invite other scholars to expand on this analysis to encompass also other food producing regions. Such complementing explorations would provide valuable comparative points for understanding how food sovereignty and tourism interactions operate across scales and geographies. This study is a first exploratory endeavour to build such an understanding, pointing to important trends and possible avenues for future development of both local rural economies and social research. Industrial agriculture and tourism have serious issues to overcome and perhaps these can be tackled simultaneously by employing the synergies between alternative approaches to both. Such an agenda shows promise for reorienting agricultural and tourism practices towards socially and ecologically responsive rural development.

References

Anderson, C.R., Bruil, J., Chappell, M.J., Kiss, C. & Pimbert, M.P. (2021). Agroecology Now! Transformations Towards More Just and Sustainable Food Systems. Cham: Springer Nature

Bruce, A.B. & Som Castellano, R.L. (2017). Labor and alternative food networks: challenges for farmers and consumers. *Renewable agriculture and food systems*, 32 (5), 403–416. https://doi.org/10.1017/S174217051600034X

Callan, M., & Thomas, S. (2005). Volunteer Tourism. In: Novelli, M. *Niche Tourism.* Oxford, UK: Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Niche-Tourism/Novelli/p/book/9780750661331

Chiafetz, A. & Jagger, P. (2014). 40 years of dialogue on food sovereignty: a review and a look ahead. *Global food security*. 85-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2014.04.002

Clapp, Jennifer. (2016). *Food.* 2, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Cloughjordan Ecovillage (2021). Research Guidelines. https://www.thevillage.ie/research-guidelines/. [6.1.22]

Creswell, J.W. & Creswell, J.D. (2018). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. 5th edn, Los Angeles: SAGE

Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (2021). Annual review and outlook for agriculture, food and the marine 2021. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/91e7e-annual-review-and-outlook-for-agriculture-food-and-the-marine-2020/

Despotovic, A., Joksimovic, M., Svrznjak, K & Jovanovic, M. (2017). Rural Areas Sustainability: Agriculture Diversification And Opportunities For Agri-tourism Development. *Agriculture & Forestry*. 63. 47-62. https://doi.org/10.17707/AgricultForest.63.3.06

European Coordination Via Campesina (2018). *Food Sovereignty Now!*. [Pamphlet]. Brussels: European Coordination Via Campesina. https://viacampesina.org/en/food-sovereignty-now-depth-guide/

Environmental Pillar (2021b). The environmental pillars withdraws from problematic 2030 agri-food strategy committee. https://environmentalpillar.ie/the-environmental-pillar-withdraws-from-the-problematic-2030-agri-food-strategy-committee/. [27.11.21].

EU (2020). Farm to fork strategy. [Booklet]. https://ec.europa.eu/food/system/files/2020-05/f2f_action-plan_2020_strategy-info_en.pdf

Failte Ireland (2016). Tourism development and innovation: a strategy for investment 2016-2022. [Booklet].

https://www.failteireland.ie/FailteIreland/media/WebsiteStructure/Documents/Irelands%20Ancient%20East/FI-Tourism-Investment-Strategy-Final-07-06-16.pdf
Failte Ireland (2018). Food and drink strategy 2018-2023. [Booklet]. https://www.failteireland.ie/FailteIreland/media/WebsiteStructure/Documents/Publications/FI-Food-Strategy-Document.pdf
Figuerido, E. & Raschi, A. (2013). *Fertile links?* Firenze: Firenze University Press. http://digital.casalini.it/9788866553892
García-Llorente, M., Pérez-Ramírez, I., Portilla, C.S., Haro, C. & Benito, A. (2019). Agroecological Strategies for Reactivating the Agrarian Sector: The Case of Agrolab in Madrid. sustainability. (11), 1181; doi:10.3390/su11041181
Gertel, J, & Sippel, SR. (2014). *Seasonal Workers in Mediterranean Agriculture: The Social Costs of Eating Fresh.* London: Taylor & Francis Group. ProQuest Ebook Central. [19 May 2022].
Gliessman, S., Friedmann, H. & Howard, P. (2019). Agroecology and Food Sovereignty. In: Harris, J., Anderson, M., Clement, C. & Nisbett, N. *The political economy of food.* Online: Institute of development studies. 91-109. https://bulletin.ids.ac.uk/index.php/idsbo/article/view/3038/Online%20article
Government of Ireland (2021a). Our rural future: Rural development policy 2021-2025. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/4c236-our-rural-future-vision-and-policy-context/
Government of Ireland (2021b). Food vision 2030: A world leader in sustainable food systems. [Booklet]. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/c73a3-food-vision-2030-a-world-leader-in-sustainable-food-systems/
Government of Ireland (2021c). Public health measures in place right now. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/3361b-public-health-updates/. [6.1.22]
Government of Ireland (2021d). Draft needs assessment: preparations for Ireland's CAP strategic plan 2023-2027. https://assets.gov.ie/137581/ebffd032-b2f1-4831-a47f-261a17456cd0.pdf
Government of Ireland (2021e). Ireland - Rural development programme (national). https://www.gov.ie/en/collection/6606a-rural-development-programme-rdp-2014-2020/
Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Carnicelli, S., Krolikowski, C., Wijesinghe, G. & Boluk, K. (2019) Degrowing tourism: rethinking tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* 27:12, 1926-1944, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2019.1601732
Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Doering, A. & Bigby, B.C. (2022). Introduction. In: *Socialising Tourism*. 1st ed, London & New York: Routledge. pgs: 1-21. DOI: 10.4324/9781003164616-14
Inglis, D. & Thorpe, C. (2012). Phenomenological Paradigms. In: An Invitation to Social Theory. Cambridge. Polity Press.
International Forum for Agroecology (2015) 'Declaration of the International Forum for Agroecology', Nyéléni, Mali, www.foodsovereignty.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Download-declaration-Agroecology-Nyeleni-2015.pdf (accessed 9 April 2019)

Kanazawa, M. (2018). Data collection II: Interviewing. In: Research methods for environmental studies; a social science approach. Oxon, Routledge.

Levkoe, C.Z., Brem-Wilson, J. & Anderson, C.R. (2019). People, power, change: three pillars of a food sovereignty research praxis. *The journal of peasant studies.* 46:7, 1389-1412, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2018.1512488

Gimenes-Minasse, M. (2017). Food and Beverage. In: Lohmann, G. & Panosso Netto, A. *Tourism Theory.* Oxfordshire: CABI. 30-33. ISBN-13: 978 1 78064 715 9

MacCannell, D. (2010). *The ethics of sightseeing*. Berkeley: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520948655

Marson, D. (2011). From Mass Tourism to Niche Tourism. In: Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. & Dieke, P. *Research Themes for Tourism.* UK & USA: CABI International. 233-248. ISBN 978-1-84593-684-6

McMichael, P. (2013). *Food Regimes and Agrarian Questions*. *Agrarian Change and Peasant Studies.* Practical Action Publishing, Fernwood Publishing.

Naylor, L. (2019). Food sovereignty in place: Cuba and Spain. *Agriculture and human values.* 36. 705-717. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-019-09938-x

Nicholls, C.I., Altieri, M.A. & Vasquez, L. (2016). Agroecology: principles for the conversion and redesign of farming systems. *Journal of ecosystem & Ecography*. S5: 0-10. doi:10.4172/2157-7625.S5-010

Ojong, N. (2021). Social and solidarity economy and access to food: Insights from Cameroon. *Revista Nacional de Administración*. Volume (12), 23-29. DOI: 10.22458/rna.v12i2.3768

Oriade, A. & Evans, M. (2011). Sustainable and Alternative Tourism. In: Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. & Dieke, P. *Research Themes for Tourism.* UK & USA: CABI International. 233-248. ISBN 978-1-84593-684-6

Pachon-Ariza, F. A. (2013). Food Sovereignty and Rural Development: Beyond Food Security. *Agronomía Colombiana.* 31(3). 362-377. https://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/332286/

Pain, A. & Hansen, K. (2019). Rural Development. New York & London: Routledge.

Palomo-Campesino, S., Garcia-Llorente, M. & Gonzalez, J.A. (2021). Characterizing agroecological and conventional farmers: uncovering their motivations, practices, and perspectives toward agriculture. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems. 45:9, https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2021.1933671

Patel, R. (2009). Food sovereignty. *The Journal of Peasant Studies.* 36:3, 663-706. DOI: 10.1080/03066150903143079

Povey, G. (2011). Gastronomy and Tourism. In: Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. & Dieke, P. *Research Themes for Tourism.* UK & USA: CABI International. 233-248. ISBN 978-1-84593-684-6

Regenerative Farming Ireland (2019). Farm 2 Fork 2030; a truly green farming, food and rural vision of Ireland. https://www.regenerativefarmingireland.com/download-the-vision

Reid, V. (2014). Agriculture, agroecology and biodiversity. Biodiversity. (15), 239-240. DOI:10.1080/14888386.2014.980441

Reisinger, Y. (2013). *Transformation and Transformational Learning Theory*. CABI International, Oxfordshire. ISBN 978-1-78064-209-3

Reps, P. (2009). *Writings from the Zen Masters.* Australia: Penguin Books.

Robinson, D (2021). Rural food and wine tourism in Canada's South Okanagan Valley: Transformations for food sovereignty?. *Sustainability.* 13, 1808. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041808

Robinson, P., Heitmann, S., & Dieke, P. (2011). Research themes in tourism: an introduction. In: Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. & Dieke, P. *Research Themes for Tourism.* UK & USA: CABI International. 233-248. ISBN 978-1-84593-684-6

Robinson, P., & Wiltshier, P. (2011). Community Tourism. In: Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. & Dieke, P. *Research Themes for Tourism.* UK & USA: CABI International. 233-248. ISBN 978-1-84593-684-6

Robson, C. & McCartan, K. (2002). Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers. Wiley-Blackwell.

Ryan, C. (2003). *Recreational Tourism: Demands and Impacts.* Channel View Publications, Limited, Bristol. Available from: ProQuest Ebook Central. [15 April 2022].

Santafe-Tronosco, V., Loring, P.A. (2021). Indigenous food sovereignty and tourism: the Chakra Route in the Amazon region of Ecuador. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* 2 (2), 392-411. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1770769

Sznadjer, M., Przezborska, L., Scrimgeor, F. (2009). Agri Tourism. Oxfordshire: CABI. https://www.cabi.org/cabebooks/ebook/20093120380

Talamh Beo (2021). Local food policy framework. [Pamphlet]. http://www.talamhbeo.ie/local-food-policy.html

Talamh Beo (2020). Interview with Fergal Anderson of Talamh Beo. http://www.talamhbeo.ie/statements-and-press/december-03rd-2020#comments [2.1.2022]

Teagasc (2016). Rural tourism. [Booklet]. https://www.teagasc.ie/media/website/publications/2016/Rural-Tourism-Booklet.pdf

Terry, W. (2014). Solving labor problems and building capacity in sustainable agriculture through volunteer tourism. Annals of tourism research, 49, 94–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.09.001

Trauger, A. (2017). Re-Territorializing Food Security: Manoomin gift economies. In: Trauger, A. *We Want Land to Live: Making Political Space for Food Sovereignty*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 85-101. ISBN 9780820350264

Utting, P. (2015). *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe.* London: Zed Books.

Vail, J. (2010). Decommodification and Egalitarian Political Economy. *Politic and Society.* 38(3), 310-346. DOI: 10.1177/0032329210373069

White, B., Borras Jr. Santurino M., Hall, R., Scoones, I. & Wolford, W. (2012). The new enclosures: critical perspectives on corporate land deals. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39:3-4, 619-647, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2012.691879

Wearing, S.L. & McGehee, N.G. (2013). Alternative Tourism Experiences. In: Wearing, S.L. & McGehee, N.G. *International Volunteer Tourism.* Oxfordshire: CABI. 18-38.

Weaver, D.B. (2007). Ecotourism. 2nd ed. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons.

Acknowledgements

I firstly want to thank my mentor Linus Rosén for the punctual and brilliant straight-to-the-point comments and suggestions that made this thesis possible.

A što se tiče ostalog... ovaj rad je za sve one tvrdoglave u mom životu. Od dede Hilme do malog Zenića. Ako sam išta naučio od vas tvrdoglavih, to je da iako ponekad radimo glupe stvari u životu, uvijek ih završimo!

A najviše se imam za zahvaliti mami i tati, koji kroz ovo cijelo razdoblje, dok sam se ja pravio bitan i pametan, su dali sve od sebe i sve što imaju da meni bude lijepo u životu. E, da su svi kao vi!

A najmanje se imam zahvaliti ovom kompjuteru koji mi je skinuo barem deset godina života. E, što bih mu napravio da nije tako skup!

Rekao bi čovjek da se u ovih dvije godine dogodilo sve što se da zamisliti, ali ja sam nažalost malo premaštovit. Zamislio sam ja puno toga tijekom dugih noći ispred kompjutera u mračnoj Švedskoj, mokroj Irskoj ili u ljutoj našoj. Uključujući život u skladu s prirodom i jednakost i ravnopravnost na svijetu. Ali eto, nekako dok svi mi koje to zanima smo zakopani na računalima, izgleda da svi oni koje to ne zanima rade na obrnutom. Pa sam i zamislio što bi bilo da malo manje pričamo i da malo više radimo.

Izgleda da ima nešto u tome kada kažu ‘nemoj filozofirati’.

Život je prelijep i bitan da se provede ozbiljno i sjedeći ispred kompjutera. Zato evo malo mudrosti za bolji svijet;

“It is too clear and so it is hard to see.
A dunce once searched for fire with a lighted lantern.
Had he known what fire was,
He could have cooked his rice much sooner.” (Reps, 2009)

Appendix 1

The Principles of Food Sovereignty as taken from European Coordination Via Campesina (2018:14).

1. **Focuses on Food for People**: Food sovereignty puts the right to sufficient, healthy and culturally appropriate food for all individuals, peoples and communities, including those who are hungry, under occupation, in conflict zones and marginalised, at the centre of food, agriculture, livestock and fisheries policies; and rejects the proposition that food is just another commodity or component for international agri-business.
2. **Values Food Providers**: Food sovereignty values and supports the contributions, and respects the rights, of women and men, peasants and smallscale family farmers, pastoralists, artisanal fisherfolk, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples and agricultural and fisheries workers, including migrants, who cultivate, grow, harvest and process food; and rejects those policies, actions and programmes that undervalue them, threaten their livelihoods and eliminate them.
3. **Localises Food Systems**: Food sovereignty brings food providers and consumers closer together; puts providers and consumers at the centre of decision-making on food issues; protects food providers from the dumping of food and food aid in local markets; protects consumers from poor quality and unhealthy food, inappropriate food aid and food tainted with genetically modified organisms; and resists governance structures, agreements and practices that depend on and promote unsustainable and inequitable international trade and give power to remote and unaccountable corporations.
4. **Puts Control Locally**: Food sovereignty places control over territory, land, grazing, water, seeds, livestock and fish populations on local food providers and respects their rights. They can use and share them in socially and environmentally sustainable ways which conserve diversity; it recognizes that local territories often cross geopolitical borders and ensures the right of local communities to inhabit and use their territories; it promotes positive interaction between food providers in different regions and territories and from different sectors that helps resolve internal

conflicts or conflicts with local and national authorities; and rejects the privatisation of natural resources through laws, commercial contracts and intellectual property rights regimes.
5. **Builds Knowledge and Skills:** Food sovereignty builds on the skills and local knowledge of food providers and their local organisations that conserve, develop and manage localised food production and harvesting systems, developing appropriate research systems to support this and passing on this wisdom to future generations; and rejects technologies that undermine, threaten or contaminate these, e.g. genetic engineering.
6. **Works with Nature**: Food sovereignty uses the contributions of nature in diverse, low external input agroecological production and harvesting methods that maximise the contribution of ecosystems and improve resilience and adaptation, especially in the face of climate change; it seeks to heal the planet so that the planet may heal us; and, rejects methods that harm beneficial ecosystem functions, that depend on energy intensive monocultures and livestock factories, destructive fishing practices and other industrialised production methods, which damage the environment and contribute to global warming.

Appendix 2

Six ecological principles of agroecology as presented by Nicholls et al. (2016:4).

1. Enhance the recycling of biomass, with a view to optimizing organic matter decomposition and nutrient cycling over time
2. Strengthen the "immune system" of agricultural systems through enhancement of functional biodiversity – natural enemies, antagonists, etc., by creating appropriate habitats
3. Provide the most favorable soil conditions for plant growth, particularly by managing organic matter and by enhancing soil biological activity
4. Minimize losses of energy, water, nutrients and genetic resources by enhancing conservation and regeneration of soil and water resources and agrobiodiversity
5. Diversify species and genetic resources in the agroecosystem over time and space at the field and landscape level
6. Enhance beneficial biological interactions and synergies among the components of agrobiodiversity, thereby promoting key ecological processes and services

Appendix 3

Table outlining practices and the ecological principles of agroecology which they contribute to as provided by Nicholls et al. (2016:4)

Management practice	**Principle to which they contribute***					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Compost application	x		x			
Cover crops and/or green manures	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mulching	x		x	x		
Crop rotation	x		x	x	x	
Use microbial/botanical pesticides		x				
Use of insectary flowers		x			x	x
Living fences		x	x		x	x
Intercropping	x	x	x	x	x	x
Agroforestry	x	x	x	x	x	x
Animal Integration	x		x	x	x	x
*Each number refers to an agroecological principle listed in Table 1						

Publishing and archiving

Approved students' theses at SLU are published electronically. As a student, you have the copyright to your own work and need to approve the electronic publishing. If you check the box for **YES**, the full text (pdf file) and metadata will be visible and searchable online. If you check the box for **NO**, only the metadata and the abstract will be visible and searchable online. Nevertheless, when the document is uploaded it will still be archived as a digital file. If you are more than one author, the checked box will be applied to all authors. Read about SLU's publishing agreement here:

- https://www.slu.se/en/subweb/library/publish-and-analyse/register-and-publish/agreement-for-publishing/.

☒ YES, I/we hereby give permission to publish the present thesis in accordance with the SLU agreement regarding the transfer of the right to publish a work.

☐ NO, I/we do not give permission to publish the present work. The work will still be archived and its metadata and abstract will be visible and searchable.