Building Solidarity in the Slow Food Movement

Paper first received: 20 June 2022; Accepted: 30 January 2023; Published in final form: 04 April 2023
https://doi.org/10.48416/ijsaf.v28i2.489

Noha SHAWKI[1] and Gina L. HUNTER[2]

Abstract

Collective transnational efforts to create a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world must confront the diversity and inequities associated with differential positions and power. How movements deal with social disparities among participants impacts movement persistence, legitimacy, and efficacy. Slow Food International is a transnational movement that envisions good, clean, and fair food for all. Slow Food's mobilization takes various forms across the globe, and its millions of participants are highly diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, and other dimensions of identity. In this article, we use the framework of active solidarity to consider the ways in which the international Slow Food movement has mobilized its diverse participants across global disparities, and the implications thereof. Between 2018 and 2021 we conducted semi-structured interviews with 24 movement leaders, Slow Food staff, and representatives from international development partners. Drawing on these interviews, we consider the specific discourse, practices, procedures, and organizational structures that the Slow Food movement has used to address inequities and to centre the identities and experiences of marginalized communities. The Slow Food case provides an example of how civil society groups might adopt processes and practices that will not only deepen solidarity and inclusion, but also position them to realize their goals.

[1] Department of Politics and Government, Illinois State University
[2] Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ilinois State University

Corresponding author: Noha Shawki, nsshawk@ilstu.edu

Bibliographical notes

Noha Shawki is a Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at Illinois State University. Her research focuses on transnational social movements and advocacy networks, international norms, and global governance, with a substantive focus on human rights and sustainable development.

Gina L. Hunter is Associate Professor of Anthropology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Illinois State University. Her current research interests include local food movements, food as cultural heritage, and food and ethnicity. She is the author of Edible Insects: A Global History (2021, Reaktion Books).

Introduction

Transnational social movements are global networks that bring together people at different levels of governance working towards a shared goal (Smith, 2013). As globalization and interdependence expand, social movements have organized across borders to address global problems. Collective efforts to create a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world are challenged to create solidarity across class, racial, ethnic and gender differences. Transnational movements face the additional task of bridging differences of national origin, language, North-South divides, and the legacies of colonialism (Tormos and Weldon, 2016). How can movements create solidarity despite social disparities among participants, and what are the implications thereof for these movements' persistence and efficacy? These are the main questions we address in this article, using the Slow Food (SF) movement as an example to illustrate our broader arguments.

Some research suggests that downplaying difference in favour of universal aspects of participants' identities may strengthen social movements. For example, Rupp and Taylor (1999) show how, during the first decades of the transnational women's movement, essentialist notions of womanhood helped establish a sense of transnational solidary and collective identity among feminist activists who had strong personal affiliations and loyalties to their own organizations, as well as very different goals, priorities, and perspectives about what it meant to be a feminist. These essentialist identities helped them overcome some of these differences and develop a collective identity as a transnational movement to which they all belonged. However, other research has found that long-term effective cooperation within transnational social movements can only advance through active confrontation and mitigation of the exclusion, discrimination, and injustice that difference entails (Weldon et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018). Active solidarity (Einwohner et al., 2016) is an approach for intentionally contending with difference and inequality. Scholars emphasizing the significance of active solidarity (e.g., Tormos and Weldon, 2016) counter Rupp and Taylor's study (1999) and similar arguments, stressing that a preoccupation with essentialist identities can unintentionally silence marginalized voices. In this article, we apply the framework of active solidarity to the SF movement to consider the extent to which the movement is inclusive and fosters active solidarity among its diverse participants, and the implications thereof.

SF is a transnational movement that seeks to transform the global food system to ensure it produces "good, clean, and fair food for all", a phrase that captures the movement's philosophy. SF opposes the social and ecological destructiveness of corporate industrial agriculture and supports small-scale agri-food systems (Petrini, 2001). With origins in northern Italy and a strong base in Europe and the United States, some critics claim that the emphasis on food that is pleasurable and healthy ("good"), environmentally sustainable ("clean"), and socially just ("fair"), caters to only the privileged few and will not provide "for all". Yet, in its four decades of existence, SF has expanded its programmes, reach, and membership to become a global movement with millions of participants in over 160 countries (Slow Food, n.d.a). In particular, it has facilitated connections with thousands of small-scale peasants and with indigenous peoples worldwide through the Terra Madre (TM) and Indigenous Terra Madre (ITM) networks.

To what extent does the SF movement build meaningful solidarity among participants that are so highly diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, national origin, and other dimensions of identity? Can marginalized groups (e.g., indigenous groups) find their voice and assume leadership roles in the movement? To what extent can they shape the movement? And what is the impact of any conscious efforts to make the movement truly inclusive? To address these questions, we interviewed movement leaders and SF partners from around the world and analysed SF declarations and public documents. We illustrate many of our findings using ITM as an example.

Our research extends the range of cases to which the framework of active solidarity has been applied. SF, at its inception, was considered by many to be largely a lifestyle movement, rather than a movement with explicitly political goals (Haenfler et al., 2012; see also Chrzan, 2004 for an account of the movement that views it as not explicitly political). Lifestyle movements, as we dicsuss in greater depth below, are movements that *"con-*

sciously and actively promote a lifestyle, or way of life, as their primary means to foster social change" (Haenfler et al., 2012: 2 - emphasis in the original). Our research examines the mechanisms of SF's intentional efforts to build meaningful solidarity and inclusion in the movement. Our most original contribution is the finding that to be truly inclusive and foster solidary across North-South divides, a lifestyle movement must reconsider its focus on personal lifestyle choices and expand its agenda and activities to unequivocally attend to political issues. Our article documents this shift in the SF movement over time, to focus on more explicitly political issues.

We begin with a brief overview of the SF movement and its activities, and discuss the theoretical framework that informs our study. We then describe our methods of data collection and SF's efforts towards active solidarity in discourse, structure, and practice, and their implications for the movement. We conclude with suggestions for further research.

Slow Food: Lifestyle Movement or Social Movement?

Introducing the Slow Food Movement

SF is a multi-faceted entity. As a non-governmental organization, it creates large-scale events and coordinates congresses where elected members deliberate and vote on position statements, policies, and campaigns. Additionally, it cooperates with philanthropic organizations and international organizations for development activities, mostly in the Global South. SF is also a grassroots network of millions of members working within 1600 local chapters and 'food communities'.

The movement started in the 1970s with a group of Italian leftist activists, led by Carlo Petrini, who were concerned with the threat that industrial processing and large agricultural conglomerates posed for food and wine quality and for the survival of small-scale producers. Catalyzed by the establishment of a McDonald's fast-food franchise near the Spanish Steps in Rome, activists mobilized in defense of local, artisan foods and traditional food purveyors against the "Americanization" of Italy. In 1989, the international SF movement was born. Slow Food (always written in English) opposed not only the standardization and industrialization represented by "fast foods" but also the increasing frenetic pace of life (Andrews, 2008).

In the 1990s and 2000s, community-based chapters (called convivia, signaling the notion of conviviality and the shared table) spread across Europe, and national coordinating offices were established in countries where the movement was strongest (e.g., Germany, USA, Japan) (Slow Food, n.d.b). Today SF remains headquartered in Bra, Italy, and is led by an International Council and an Executive Committee. Members of these bodies are elected by national delegates at international congresses held every four years (Slow Food, n.d.c).

In 2004, SF established the TM network of small producers to give them "voice and visibility, to raise awareness of the true value of their work, and provide them with the tools needed to be able to work in better conditions" (Terra Madre, n.d.). The ITM network was established in 2011, and an ITM Advisory Board in 2018. Since 2012 (with the exception of 2020) representatives of these global networks have met biennially at the Terra Madre event in Turin in conjunction with SF's Salone del Gusto (Italian producers' exhibition) (Terra Madre, n.d.).

SF describes its own philosophical evolution as moving from eno-gastronomy, eating to appreciate wine and food, to eco-gastronomy, eating that is concerned with the health of the planet, to, most recently, neo-gastronomy, or new gastronomy, "a multidisciplinary approach to food that recognizes the strong connections between plate, planet, people and culture" (Slow Food, n.d.d). The motto, "good, clean and fair for all", which has represented the movement since 2005, conveys the approach. "Good" refers to both taste and quality of foods that result from traditional production methods and ingredients. "Clean" food is produced and distributed in ways that minimize harm to the environment (e.g., agro-ecological production and local consumption). The emphasis is on food produced via sustainable methods that protect crop biodiversity and the ecosys-

tems needed to support traditional foods and small-scale producers. Through its projects with producers, SF efforts encompass the broader contexts of small producers' lives and working conditions. Thus, "Fair" food is socially just; it respects small producers' rights to fair prices and working conditions, and emphasizes fair prices for consumers (Slow Food, n.d.e).

SF's programmes for the preservation of agri-food practices connect cultural and biological diversity with economic development. The non-profit Slow Food Foundation for Biodiversity coordinates international projects, such as the Presidia programme (Presidia meaning strongholds or bastions), aimed at preserving biodiversity while enhancing artisanal production processes (Slow Food n.d.c). Established in 1999, the Presidia programme invites small groups of producers to work with SF to identify and protect an at-risk food product, breed/species, or ecological niche (see Milano et al., 2018). Through the Presidia, cultural aspects of small producer groups, distinctive habitats, and terroir are highlighted in a narrative label that identifies a product's unique qualities. As "examples to follow and models for action", Presidia products serve as "a means to transform the movement's philosophy into something concrete" (Sinichalchi, 2013: 299). Producers work with SF experts to develop strict protocols that producers must follow in order to use (for a fee) the SF label and promotional apparatus. By establishing Presidia, SF offers training, technical expertise, and networks but also functions as a kind of regulatory body for the Presidia designation.

SF's commitment to taste and epicurean pleasure, as well as to social and environmental justice, aims to turn consumers into "co-producers". SF's "approach to gastronomy is one of critical reflection in which consumers are encouraged to recognize their potential to recreate the global agriculture infrastructure" and "the dinner table is literally the seat of power in which consumer behaviour is portrayed as being capable of altering the globalised food infrastructure" (Dunlap, 2012: 42). The premise is that when people learn, through taste education, to enjoy local and sustainably produced food and to appreciate the process and context in which it was produced, they will choose to buy it, thereby supporting local farms and the "regional livelihoods that create local cultures and societies" (Chrzan, 2004: 123).

Slow Food: A Lifestyle or a Social Movement?

From its very beginnings, the movement wed gastronomy and politics, commerce and preservation in unusual ways that have generated much criticism. Historian Rachel Laudan (2004) has argued that SF invents culinary patrimony as much as preserving it. Peasant life is often meager and poor, as are the diets of still too many in the world. It is only due to Culinary Modernism, she notes, that so many can partake in the kind of traditional, artisanal gastronomy that SF promotes (Laudan, 2001). Similarly, another scholar argues that SF's efforts to save foods and cooking techniques from the onslaught of industrial processes and their effects, "negates the possibility of and the right to modernization of whole sectors of the Global South for the sake of an 'organic' and 'authentic' lifestyle of European and American consumers" (Schwaderer, 2021). Some argue that SF, with its focus on unique, local products and 'good taste', is as much about the creation of luxury goods and social distinction for elite consumers as it is a space of resistance for the disfranchised in the global food system (Chrzan, 2004; Laudan, 2004; Pietrykowski, 2004). As such, SF may be seen as a lifestyle choice rather than a politically engaged movement.

Wexler et al., for example, describe SF as a lifestyle movement with a "big tent" ideology that "integrates principles espoused by other ideologically rooted lifestyle movements" (Wexler et al., 2017: 4), including the voluntary simplicity movement. They distinguish lifestyle movements from protest movements. While the latter are explicitly engaged in protest targeting an "institutionalized entity" (Wexler et al., 2017: 5), such as a multinational corporation or a government agency, the former focus more on lifestyle choices and educating the public about both their benefits and broader potential to bring about change (Wexler et al., 2017).

Haenfler et al. (2012) also consider SF to be a lifestyle movement. They argue that lifestyle movements do

seek broader social and political change, but that they work towards that change by developing personal lifestyles and identities, and by targeting and changing cultural habits and practices. In so doing, these movements do not engage in contentious politics that explicitly challenge the state or other institutions or sites of political authority and targeting policy (Haenfler et al., 2012: 3). They involve ongoing individual action in the private sphere and daily life – individual action that is ultimately intended to cumulatively bring about social change and that expresses a set of personal values and fosters and supports a morally consistent and individually rewarding identity. Lifestyle movements tend to be ongoing, decentralized, and anchored in informal networks (versus formal organizations) and lifestyle movement organizations. They are also oriented towards cultural practices and norms (Haenfler et al., 2012: 5, 6-7, and 10-12). In short, lifestyle movements involve "lifestyle action undertaken by (primarily) individuals with the self-conscious agenda of change" (Haenfler et al., 2012: 3) but without joint coordination, public protest, or an explicit political agenda.

In contrast to these scholars, we show that through its engagement with diversity and efforts towards inclusion, SF has become more overtly political and can no longer be characterized as simply a lifestyle movement. We examine the ways the movement has grown among historically marginalized groups (in particular indigenous peoples) and how these groups have been able to shape the orientation of the movement. As one critic put it, the challenge for SF was "to recognize its own heritage of privilege derived from an economic system shaped by imperialism and to actively resist nostalgic renderings of the 'other' …which fetishize cultural difference and sentimentalize the struggle for cultural or economic survival. This requires more meaningful dialog between Slow Food and those it seeks to support in order to create a space of mutual respect and recognition of difference" (Donati, 2005: 239). We argue that SF has approached this challenge in part through the establishment of the TM and ITM global networks and the ITM Advisory Board. A document that reflects these changes is the Declaration of Chengdu adopted at the 7th Slow Food International Congress, held in Chengdu, China, which stated:

> *Only by radically renewing the organization of Slow Food, only by making it more open and inclusive, and only by trying out new forms of aggregation, involvement and participation can we address the challenges that await us in the future in the best way possible and thwart those—the very few—who possess power and wealth and decide the fate of the world's food and of humanity itself (Slow Food, 2017a).*

Before examining the mechanisms through which SF has sought to create solidarity across cultural difference and social inequity, we turn to the theoretical framework that guides our analysis.

Analytical framework for Active Solidarity

Solidarity refers to the "ties between social groups, their ability to act in concert, to cooperate, and act together in pursuit of social change" (Wright et al., 2018: 4), and solidarity is political when it involves groups working to coordinate their political behaviour (Einwohner et al., 2016: 3). According to the scholars who have devised the concept of active solidarity, solidarity takes different forms which vary in two respects: the degree of active engagement (vs. passivity), and the approach to diversity. The first refers to "*the degree to which activists are actively engaged in communication, in defining movement goals and discourse*" (Wright et al., 2018: 5-6 - emphasis in the original; see also Einwohner et al., 2021: 708). For example, these scholars argue that honoring a picket line is a passive form of solidarity, and while it can be significant, it is still quite limited as it does not entail active engagement, cooperation, and deliberation with others towards developing goals, a joint message, or an action plan (Einwohner et al., 2016: 4). Because it involves little active engagement and coordination, it is unlikely to be sustained in the long term, particularly in diverse social movements whose members and participants may, at least initially, lack a shared identity and mutual trust (Einwohner et al., 2016: 4). The second form of solidarity relates to "*the recognition or sublimation of difference, whether movements intentionally and explicitly* act to counter the distorting effects of power expressed in such differences" (Wright et al., 2018: 6 - emphasis in the original). A typology of solidarity that encompasses four forms of solidarity is

based on variations in both these two respects (see more on these forms in Wright et al., 2018; Einwohner et al., 2016).

Active solidarity, the most robust form, is cultivated deliberately and purposefully. It is designed to cultivate diversity and inclusion and challenge relationships of domination between powerful and marginalized groups (Wright et al., 2018; Einwohner et al., 2016; Einwohner et al., 2021: 706). Active solidarity is intended to foster critical diversity, which focuses on "interrogating differences that may be the basis for power differentials to reveal the perspectives of dominated or excluded groups on the political issues in question" and to develop "concepts and forms of political action that are reflective of these previously repressed and sublimated points of view, interests and identities" (Einwohner et al., 2016: 7). Rather than assuming shared identities or interests, active solidarity entails efforts to recognize and affirm differences between groups, and their corresponding differences in interests and identities: "more solidarity does not mean more sameness" (Einwohner et al., 2021: 707).

Another key feature of active solidarity is the intentional acknowledgement of difference and engagement with the power asymmetries and intersectional marginalization it entails (Einwohner et al., 2021: 705; see also Herring and Henderson, 2011). Active solidarity requires deliberation and the active participation of members and constituents in the movement's activities and decision-making processes based on the principles of respect, inclusion, and reciprocity. Giving marginalized groups voice entails more than listening. Dominant groups must actively engage in interactive discussions while safeguarding against the potential to simply reproduce power differentials (Einwohner et al., 2016: 8-9; Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 11; Einwohner et al., 2021: 709). In other words, formal inclusion is not sufficient. Once included, marginalized groups must have meaningful opportunities to take on leadership roles, shape a social movement, and engage with other movement participants (Einwohner et al., 2016: 10; Weldon et al., 2018: 3-4). This kind of truly inclusive deliberation "requires the development of specific norms of decision-making that work to diminish the role of power and domination in discussion, and that empower the marginalized in their efforts to articulate and communicate about their perspectives and concerns" (Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 3). Different and new issue frames could emerge from such deliberation, setting the stage for mobilizing a broader coalition of diverse groups (Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 11).

The Requirements and Impacts of Active Solidarity

Active solidarity can ensure that diversity within social movements will go beyond the presence of diverse groups in a movement and will position historically marginalized groups to play leading roles. Previous research has posited that only when movements address the diversity of their membership in genuine and meaningful ways, and acknowledge power differentials between the movement participants, can they harness the power of diversity and use it to have significant political impact and remain organizationally viable over the long term (Wright et al., 2018; Einwohner et al., 2016). It is essential to have formal rules in place that reflect a commitment to diversity and inclusion. While it is unclear what rules, exactly, can be effective in facilitating this kind of active solidarity (Einwohner at al., 2016: 8), three avenues to inclusive, substantive deliberation are to: 1) create separate, autonomous spaces for marginalized groups to self-organize within the movement and to develop their priorities and proposals (e.g., caucuses); 2) give additional weight to concerns raised and priorities defined by marginalized groups to ensure that a movement's agenda will include and reflect their concerns and priorities; and 3) ensure that there will be regular opportunities for dissent (Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 14).

The theoretical formulations we use here posit that building active solidarity can have significant positive impacts on a social movement. Movements that achieve a high level of active solidarity enjoy greater legitimacy, tend to be more innovative, possess organizational persistence, and have greater political and cultural influence. Contrary to arguments that difference and critical diversity can weaken and fragment a movement (see the review of these arguments in Weldon et al., 2018: 2-3; Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 2 and 5-6), the fra-

mework we use here views diversity as a potential resource. Inclusion can broaden social movement participation, and expand the range of experiences, perspectives, and ideas around which movement building unfolds (Wright et al., 2018: 4; Einwohner et al., 2016: 7 and 29; Einwohner et al., 2021: 708-708).

These benefits will only be realized, however, if there is an intentional effort by a social movement to build active solidarity in the ways described above. Without that effort, the interests, perspectives, priorities, and concerns of privileged groups are likely to define the movement, potentially alienating and turning marginalized groups away from a movement they come to believe does not meaningfully represent them (Tormos and Weldon, 2016: 6).

While active solidarity is a value that can animate social movements, it is also reflected in specific rules and procedures and can be empirically observed. As Einwohner et al. explain, "Active solidarity is both an empirical and a normative concept, in that in addition to being a normative goal, it can be measured as a set of observable practices that value diversity and intentions of inclusion" (Einwohner et al, 2016: 9). In other words, "the 'active' part of active solidarity is a collective commitment, visible at the level of organizational structure, agenda, or policy" (Einwohner et al., 2021: 710).

Einwohner et al. develop a set of five indicators to assess the extent of active solidarity in a given social movement, and place different social movements on a continuum that ranges from passive to active solidarity (Einwohner et al., 2016: 11-12; Einwohner et al., 2021: 711-712):

1. Active solidarity requires an accessible decision-making process centred on discussion and deliberation. Decision-making must unfold through public and transparent deliberations rather than executively by movement leaders in a top-down manner.
2. Organizationally, active solidarity requires special caucuses or other bodies for the autonomous self-organization of marginalized groups within the movement. Their absence would be indicative of passive solidarity.
3. Discursively, active solidarity requires an explicit acknowledgement of difference and diversity and the resulting marginalization. Emphasizing homogeneity and suppressing difference would be indicative of passive solidarity. Active solidarity requires that movement discourse reflect the perspectives of marginalized groups.
4. In terms of the composition of a movement's leadership, active solidarity requires the representation of marginalized groups in leadership. Homogeneity in leadership would be indicative of passive solidarity.
5. Finally, active solidarity requires opportunities for dissent and criticism by marginalized and other groups. Active solidarity is not present when participation is based on pre-defined rules and when participants lack opportunities to partake in defining them and to express dissent (Einwohner et al., 2016: 11-12).

The Broader Context of Solidarity in Social Movements

While we ground our discussion here in the active solidarity framework, it is important to note that such work builds on a much larger body of scholarship on inclusion and solidarity in social movements (Weldon, 2006; Smith and Glidden, 2012; Juris, 2008; Blackwell, 2018). These authors also note the importance of explicitly recognizing the ways that power relations permeate all social relations, and the necessity of separate spaces in which historically marginalized members develop and articulate their distinct perspectives and have their own distinct voice. Inclusivity also requires a commitment to finding consensus and common ground, while being mindful and accepting of conflict and disagreement between dominant and marginalized groups in the process of deliberation.

Weldon (2006) showed that inclusive deliberation within diverse movements can help organizations and activists cooperate and develop common collective action frames. A sense of shared interest positions them well to develop a policy agenda that everyone can support and to capitalize on available political opportunities.

Rather than assuming that a pre-existing shared identity, common interest, or frame will make cooperation possible, Weldon posited that norms of inclusivity can foster agreement and consensus across politically relevant differences even in the absence of a shared identity at the outset. She showed how three elements of inclusivity can build solidarity in diverse movements: descriptive representation, autonomous self-organization by marginalized groups, and the institutionalization of dissent in the process of consensus building. Descriptive representation refers to the participation of minorities and marginalized groups in significant numbers and in leadership positions. This requires intentional efforts to include them and to facilitate their participation. Beyond descriptive representation, inclusivity requires that members of marginalized groups have the opportunity to organize separately and autonomously within the movement to develop and articulate their distinct perspectives and have their own distinct voice. Finally, inclusivity requires an effort to reach consensus, while remaining aware of and embracing disagreement between different groups. Recognizing and affirming conflict resulting from inequality and identity (as opposed to suppressing it) while pursuing common ground can ensure that dominant groups' perspectives, identities, and interests will not carry the day in the name of building consensus and fostering cooperation (Weldon, 2006).

Others, including Smith and Glidden (2012) and Juris (2008), have also shown that these norms of inclusivity can help activists avoid the common pitfalls of decision-making procedures that privilege certain groups while creating barriers to participation by marginalized or disadvantaged groups. While Weldon's account is based on her study of the global women's movement, the norms of inclusivity she highlights also reflect the lessons that can be drawn from the global justice movement, in particular the World Social Forum process (Smith and Glidden, 2012) and the US Social Forum process (Juris, 2008). Those most familiar with these processes emphasize the importance of what Juris refers to as intentionality in fostering leadership by members of marginalized communities, and mindful consideration of issues of culture and identity. Processes for deliberation and decision making must ensure opportunities for participation by all and avoid putting in place procedures that only reflect and reinforce inequality (Smith and Glidden, 2012; Juris, 2008). Because social movement spaces can reflect prevailing power relations and social exclusions, it is not enough to simply improve descriptive representation. It is critical to intentionally empower members of marginalized groups to participate meaningfully and on an equal footing (Juris, 2008). Overall, the global justice movement has engaged in intentional efforts "that disrupted prevailing inequalities and centred the voices of oppressed groups" (Smith, 2020: 119). As Smith explains, "understandings of intersectionality and organizational practices and principles that have emerged from movements have facilitated cooperation across diverse groups and collectives" (2020: 131).

This dovetails with della Porta's (2005) definition of deliberative democracy, which is present "when, under conditions of equality, inclusiveness, and transparency, a communicative process based on reason (the strength of the argument) transforms individual preferences into consensual decision making oriented to the public good" (pp. 74-75). As della Porta (2005) has shown, the global justice movement aspires to translate these principles of democratic deliberation into movement procedures and practices. It thus adopts the principle of horizontality, a "mode of political organizing characterized by nonhierarchical relations, decentralized coordination, direct democracy, and the striving for consensus" (Juris, 2008: 354).

The concept of active solidarity and our discussion here are especially relevant to transnational social movements because they face additional challenges in building truly inclusive movements. Transnational social movements connect diverse locations to form a global movement space. These disparate places often come together via communication and mechanisms, such as meetings and events, that require economic resources and cultural capital which are not equally available to everyone. Resource-poor organizations and groups may find it particularly difficult to develop strong ties, a sense of trust, and commitment to distant allies and the broader movement. Resource-poor nodes in a global network may not be able to shape the network, its direction, and its governance to the same extent as the most affluent groups, whose economic resources and cultural capital position them to lead the network. In sum, connecting activist places to form a global movement space is a process that requires the commitment of resources needed to overcome the obstacles of

distance and diversity so that all nodes can participate and shape the movement (Nicholls, 2009).

In the following section we contribute to this body of literature by applying the concept of active solidarity to the SF movement, with a special focus on their work with indigenous communities. In doing so, we add another example of efforts to build solidarity and foster inclusion in highly diverse transnational movements. We also offer some insights into the impact of efforts to build solidarity on the evolution of a social movement and its discourse, its organizational structures, and its decision-making procedures over time.

Methods for Examining Active Solidarity in the Slow Food Movement

To examine SF's intentional efforts toward inclusive solidarity, we draw primarily on semi-structured qualitative interviews (Rubin and Rubin, 2005) with twenty-four key participants who have longstanding or in-depth knowledge of SF processes and activities. Following an approved Illinois State University Institutional Review Board protocol IRB#2018-28, we recruited participants through personal connections and word-of-mouth. Our interviewees included nine current or former International Councillors (seven from the Global South), two SF leaders from Africa, and two leaders of SF's ITM network who also serve on the ITM Advisory Board. These movement leaders, along with additional interviews with three SF central office staff members, helped us understand changes to SF's organization, campaigns, and decision-making processes over time. We also interviewed eight individuals external to SF, including officers of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), a UN specialized agency, and leaders in non-governmental organizations who have partnered with SF for rural development initiatives. These interviews offered perspectives on SF's relationships with rural and indigenous communities. All interviews occurred face-to-face in person or via Zoom, lasting from 30-75 minutes. We prompted interviewees with a short list of open-ended questions derived from our theoretical model. The appendix contains a list of interviews and these interviews are cited by number in our discussion below (e.g., I2, Interview 2). Finally, our work is also informed by our observations at the 2018 Terra Madre/Salone del Gusto, where we first met and interviewed several of our participants, our attendance at the 2020 Slow Food USA Leader Summit (online), as well as a close reading of SF's many public documents and declarations.

Using Einwohner et al.'s (2016) indicators of active solidarity as a guide, we identified in our data several mechanisms through which SF has been working to achieve a more diverse and inclusive global movement. Our findings show that SF has: 1) publicly recognized both the value of diversity and the challenge of overcoming inequities; 2) intentionally fostered diversity in leadership and established organizational mechanisms to create a more diverse and equal membership; and 3) created spaces for public and transparent deliberation as well as autonomous spaces for historically marginalized populations. In what follows we give special attention to SF's efforts to build solidarity with indigenous peoples.

Indicators of Active Solidarity in the Slow Food Movement

Discursive Shifts: Explicit recognition of the value of diversity and need to address inequities

The recent discourse of the SF movement shows that the movement now explicitly and directly recognizes diversity and difference, as well as the inequalities associated with them. This aligns with the third indicator of active solidary in our model. The Chengdu Declaration, adopted at the SF International Congress in 2017, is a key SF movement document that explicitly marks the shift in discourse to address diversity and inclusion more explicitly. It reflects the culmination of the Slow Food movement's efforts unfolding over a longer period of time to grapple with issues of diversity, difference, and inclusion (I14). It states that "diversity is the greatest wealth we possess as human beings and as a community. Be it genetic, cultural, linguistic, generational, sexual, or religious", and "that the unjust division of riches and opportunities originates suffering and discrimination, hence needs to be addressed courageously at every decision-making and practical level (…)" (Slow Food, 2017a). These and other statements are significant because the International Congress is an important

governance body of the SF movement.

SF's statements on biodiversity represent another aspect of the movement's recent discourse that is indicative of an effort to recognize difference and diversity and the inequalities they entail. They provide evidence of the presence of the third indicator of active solidarity. A position paper on biodiversity released in 2020 states that "the cultural and gastronomic heritage of food products falls fully within the category of biodiversity to be protected" (Slow Food, 2020a: 39), emphasizing the significance of artisanal products that are connected to their local setting and of the centrality of traditional knowledge in their production. This position paper has a section on indigenous peoples that highlights their role in preserving biodiversity through the sustainability of their traditional food systems. It emphasizes the significance of protecting their rights (e.g., rights to land and to natural resources), their cultures, their knowledge and practices, and their food sovereignty, for the protection of the world's remaining biodiversity (Slow Food, 2020a: 43-45).

Relatedly, SF also released an urgent call to action to be discussed across the world ahead of the 2022 International Congress. It stated: "We believe in the fundamental importance of assembling the diverse voices that call for and manifest changes in the food system via their words and actions around the world." In addition, it stated: "… we find strength in the diversity of the participatory network that is Slow Food" (Slow Food, 2020b: 6). Beyond this affirmation of the movement's commitment to diversity and embracing diversity as a strength, the call to action identifies three broader goals: education, protecting biological and cultural diversity, and political advocacy. The focus on biodiversity, and the link established between protecting biodiversity and protecting cultural diversity, also shows a commitment to active solidarity, much in the same way as the position paper on biodiversity expresses that commitment. Both documents emphasize that biodiversity cannot be protected unless cultural diversity and traditional agricultural knowledge are protected: "When we defend biodiversity, we go beyond the biological diversity of plants and animals and think about the relationship between people and nature, as well as the traditional knowledge that has given rise to thousands of techniques for transforming raw materials into breads, cheeses, cured meats, sweets, and more" (Slow Food, 2020b: 7).

This approach to biodiversity elevates the role of indigenous peoples and artisanal and small producers in the movement because they are the guardians and stewards of traditional agricultural knowledge (17, 112, 121, 126). Protecting indigenous cultures, rights, and food systems is therefore essential for the protection of biodiversity (17). This approach makes these marginalized producers the key actors in the SF movement and makes indigenous interests, knowledge, and food sovereignty central to the movement's goals (Slow Food, 2020a: 43-45).

In line with the discursive recognition of diversity and the need for the organization to reflect the global movement has been the intentional inclusion of leaders from the South and indigenous communities at the highest executive levels within SF (114). As our model posits, such representative diversity does not necessarily indicate active solidarity unless it is accompanied by opportunities for socially marginalized voices to be heard. We see these opportunities as existing in the creation of the ITM network and in the recent shift in forms of SF membership, as discussed below.

Autonomous Spaces and Leadership Diversity

The SF movement builds solidarity with indigenous peoples[1] in ways that reflect many of the dimensions of active solidarity discussed earlier, in particular the second indicator which highlights spaces for autonomous organizing. ITM, for example, is "a network of indigenous communities, partners and organizations. It was born out of the wider Terra Madre network to bring indigenous peoples' voices to the forefront of the debate on food and culture, to institutionalize indigenous peoples' participation in the Slow Food movement and its

[1] We recognize that the constructions used by SF and in this article, such as "local food community" and "Indigenous peoples" are diverse categories themselves, and that however defined, such communities are also marked by internal power dynamics.

projects as well as to develop both regional and global networks" (Slow Food, n.d.f). With its own Advisory Board consisting of indigenous leaders from around the world, ITM mirrors what the theoretical framework we use posits is critical for building active solidarity and inclusion. ITM holds its own regional or global meetings that are led by indigenous groups and take place in indigenous territories. These meetings "represent key moments for ITM members to meet, debate, exchange knowledge and food products as well as to raise awareness among governments and civil society on indigenous peoples' issues" (Slow Food, n.d.g). In addition, ITM meetings are held as part of the Terra Madre/Salone del Gusto event. SF staff and International Councillors have described the expansion of spaces and events for indigenous communities as a turning point for SF that has significantly shaped SF campaigns and agenda (I10, I20, I7).

A motion adopted at the Seventh Slow Food International Congress in 2017 offers some evidence that there was awareness of the need to create opportunities for indigenous voices to be heard, and to value indigenous knowledge as key for achieving the goals of the SF movement. The motion acknowledges that indigenous knowledge is "traditionally undervalued" and that it "is essential to addressing global challenges such as climate change, food insecurity and inequalities". The motion expresses "commitment to supporting and strengthening the voices and participation of indigenous peoples within the Slow Food movement and Terra Madre network". Other specific commitments in this motion include "giving strength to the voices of indigenous peoples' (sic) within Slow Food communications" and "promoting indigenous peoples' holistic vision of food…and creating opportunities for exchange in which the network can learn from indigenous peoples' practices and visions" (Slow Food, 2017b). Overall, the spirit and tenor of this motion are consistent with what scholars of social movements have posited is important for building meaningful forms of solidarity. We highlight the importance of ITM as an autonomous space, within the broader SF network, for indigenous peoples. One of our interviewees noted that this space for autonomous and independent organizing is a strength of the SF movement (I25). Another noted that an indigenous network within the broader SF network allows indigenous peoples to be part of the SF movement on their own terms and participate according to their own "logic" and at their own pace, in ways that acknowledge and affirm indigenous identities and cultures (I15). A third respondent noted that participation in SF gives indigenous groups a sense that they are part of a global movement and that there is a place for them (I16). Finally, a fourth interviewee explained that indigenous groups have a different reality and therefore need their own space (I19). This helps recognize difference and value all groups (I19).

Our interviewees also explained the ways in which an autonomous space is important for building solidarity. They explained that ITM creates a space for indigenous groups to display indigenous foods, create horizontal linkages, and discuss issues that are critical to them (e.g., biodiversity), and that ITM amplifies indigenous voices and makes it more likely that they will be heard (I22) because of the global reach of SF (I24). Additionally, this autonomous space represents a "safe space" or "safe caucus" to collectively share and exchange knowledge, build networks, engage youth, and move forward separately from spaces that can be exclusive. It enables them to advance indigenous goals that are not necessarily shared by the movement more broadly (I25). While, according to an interviewee, this may not be the best venue for political organizing, it is a very effective space for knowledge sharing, exchange, and building networks (I25).

SF's engagement with indigenous communities allows these communities to define the terms of their participation. It provides them with opportunities to lead the movement, define its direction, introduce innovations, and shape the rules and processes that guide local work.

Organizationally, the ITM network is represented by two individuals on the SF International Council (I10). Representation on this governing body is a significant step towards diversifying movement leadership and the subsequent direction of the movement. The success of ITM paved the way for organizational innovations in the larger SF network, such as the formation of producer-based networks (e.g., Slow Fish or Slow Food Coffee Coalition) that overcome the limitations of geography-based organizations to provide fora for global collaboration (I17)

From Convivia to Communities

Since the International Congress in Chengdu (2017), another way SF has worked to build active solidarity is by modifying the terms of membership of Slow Food, from formal convivia to less structured food communities. Many of those we interviewed consider the addition of the communities model to be a significant development towards greater inclusivity within the SF movement (I1; I2; I5; I8; I12; I26).

For many years SF has operated locally through convivia that consist of a minimum number of dues paying members, a board of directors, by-laws, and appropriate financial reporting for fund-raising and tax law regulations (Slow Food, n.d.h). Membership provides access to resources, such as branding (the Slow Food Snail) and networks, as well as official participation and input in the organization. Countries with larger dues-paying membership can send more delegates to, and therefore have a larger voice at, International Congresses. Countries in the Global South, where there are many people extensively involved in SF work but are not dues-paying members, are not represented at International Congresses to a degree commensurate with their role in the SF movement (I12).

As SF expanded its reach, the convivium structure proved to be a barrier to inclusion. Leaders from the South pressured SF to adopt a new model of affiliation (I20, I1) that would allow those working on projects that align with SF principles to be officially counted and represented in the movement. As one Councillor put it: "where we come from, in [Africa], a single individual was paying membership, but representing a larger group. So instead of us saying that we have five paid-up members (…), we can now say we have 1000 members, though not necessarily paying members, but they are doing other things. They're using and following the [Slow Food] philosophy; they are participating in activities" (I9; also I4 and I12). Loosely organized "food communities" allow membership status and coordinated efforts under the SF umbrella. This expanded membership through communities translates into greater representation of the Global South at SF Congresses (I26).

A SF community forms around a particular set of activities, goals, or a project within a local area. The community takes a name that indicates its focus as well as the locality represented and generally cooperates with convivia to support the international network's strategic projects (such as the Presidia, or global campaigns). Although communities represent smaller and more targeted aims, SF affirms that "[B]ased on the decisions taken in Chengdu, convivia and communities will have equal dignity and the right to speak within Slow Food. Slow Food's policies will be developed with equal attention and listening equally to both structures" (convivia and communities) (Slow Food, n.d.i). In short, the community model allows SF to unite diverse efforts—both short and long term—that advance the goal of good, clean, fair food without becoming tied down to bureaucratic strictures of chapter organizations whose members must pay dues.

Our interviewees universally understood the shift as one way that SF can be inclusive at the structural level in the face of economic disparities between the North and South. To be sure, the change in organizational structure does not erase power differentials inherent in the global economic landscape, but it does allow for greater representation in movement Congresses and leadership (I4, I13). We also note that this new organizational structure is part of ongoing efforts to enhance the representation of marginalized groups. SF has long addressed economic inequity by funding the travel of delegates from indigenous communities and those in the global South – a vital practice according to many of our interviewees (I1, I9, I20). Also, whereas years ago Africa was represented by only one International Councillor, there are now several, which is significant since International Councillors vote on the leadership and direction of the movement (I4). At the most recent SF International Congress in 2022, Edie Mikiibi, from Uganda, became the President of Slow Food, a position previously held only by founder Carlo Petrini. These efforts to overcome some of the barriers that prevent the equal representation of the Global South can be understood as an effort to address the obstacles that distance and diversity create (Nicholls, 2009). Additionally, these intentional efforts by the SF movement are cosnsistent with the fourth indicator, which pertains to having diversity in leadership. Because it is intended

to amplify the voices and enhance the representation of SF movement praticipants in the Global South at SF Congresses and other entities within the movement that have a strong influence on decision-making, the addition of communities to SF's structure is evidence of the presence of the fourth indicator of active solidarity. By ensuring the equal representation of the Global South at Congresses and the International Council, the SF movement may also be taking steps towards ensuring that marginalized communities will be better positioned to express dissent and define the rules that govern participation and decisionmaking, which aligns with the fifth indicator.

Impacts and Effects of Active Solidarity: The Example of Indigenous Terra Madre (ITM)

What then has been the impact of SF's efforts towards active solidarity with rural populations and indigenous groups, especially in the South? First, SF has become recognized as a leader in working with indigenous peoples and has been able to partner with other international organizations working in rural development. The development agency staff we interviewed perceived SF as having developed long-standing and effective partnerships with indigenous communities, as we discuss below. Indeed, the continued opportunities that SF has had to partner with development agencies and with indigenous communities clearly reflect the enhanced legitimacy of the movement, which is consistent with what the active solidarity literature has maintained.
In 2012 SF founder and president Carlo Petrini was invited to address the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) session on the issue of food sovereignty and the right to food. He was the first invitee not representing an indigenous group, the United Nations, or a government (Slow Food, 2012). We consider this invitation to be evidence of SF's legitimacy and of UNPFII's recognition of SF's commitment to indigenous communities. We also believe it is indicative of the positive impacts that a commitment to meaningful forms of inclusion can have on the effectiveness and political influence of a movement, as discussed by the scholars who elaborated the concept of active solidarity. More significantly, SF's commitment to meaningful solidarity and inclusion has been effective in fostering trust between indigenous groups and the SF movement, and has allowed SF to partner with IFAD to advance its agenda and goals by working with indigenous communities (Slow Food, n.d.j). Once again, this is indicative of some political influence and is consistent with what the active solidarity literature posits.

From our interviews with coordinators at international development and philanthropic organizations, we have learned that these organizations appreciate SF's networks, its membership model, and its Presidium projects. What they have told us provides further evidence of SF's international legitimacy. While UN agencies work with and through governments, SF's local networks help identify community partners for development projects. SF's networks and membership are long term and not dependent on one funded project. In addition, SF participants are viewed as members, not beneficiaries – unlike all too many cases in the development world. As one UN agency coordinator noted, "in Slow Food, there are these local sections. People are members. They are seen as equals and they are being strengthened as that, and they are given a voice in the events and other activities that Slow Food is organizing. And that I think, is very good in that it gives them also a lot of confidence and allows them to speak to their local governments and to industry leaders in a way that is very different than if they were just a small community from some area" (115). Other interviewees (117, 127) concurred that participation in SF builds indigenous groups' political confidence and capacity. Political empowerment is, therefore, another impact of SF's engagement with indigenous communities. Participation in SF networks and indigenous Presidia can put indigenous groups in a better position to interact with governments (115; 121, 122). Additionally, through SF, indigenous leaders gain access to other international forums like the United Nations or the International Indigenous Women's Forum (117) where indigenous issues and concerns are voiced.

Another example of the impact of building solidarity with indigenous communities is the development of a locally and collectively controlled certification system for indigenous products. SF has piloted the use of a Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) for indigenous Presidia (110). The PGS is an alternative to third party certification systems for quality assurance and further development of the Presidia programme. Third party

certification can be costly and bureaucratic, and the certification process is standardized, led, and controlled by external actors. A PGS, by contrast, is a community-based system designed to ensure that products meet "good, clean, and fair standards" using a process that is defined and controlled by local stakeholders and that is based on trust within local social networks (Slow Food, 2020c). SF and IFAD piloted a PGS in two indigenous Presidia, one in Mexico and one in Kenya: "Slow Food and indigenous leaders were interested in adopting a bottom-up system to ensure that products are good, clean and fair with minimal intervention from Slow Food headquarters. This grassroots initiative would give local areas almost complete independence, be resilient over time and would add international credibility and value to the Slow Food system, in particular to the Presidia project" (Slow Food, 2020c). Through the PGS, local communities gain greater control of their participation in the Presidia. While the PGS model is not unique to SF, its application to indigenous presidia (and its later expansion to the SF Coffee Coalition), speaks volumes about the ability of SF to adopt alternative approaches and adapt them to its work in innovative ways. This is also consistent with the impacts that the active solidarity literature posits will result from intentional efforts to foster solidarity.

The Presidia also offer additional advantages to some indigenous communities. Some Presidia focus on fostering leadership based on traditional systems and on traditional leadership forms and structures. The aim is to create a local actor that can define community-wide priorities and have a place at the decision-making table (I18) in conversations with local and national governments.

Valorization, revitalization, and celebration of indigenous cultures and sense of identity

Our interviews highlighted the ways that SF's efforts to celebrate and revitalize indigenous cultures have had positive impacts on indigenous communities.

Indigenous Presidia valorize and enhance the visibility of indigenous products (I15); they contribute to cultural valorization and preservation, and to social development and sustainability (I19). The Presidia model, based on the local ownership principle, strengthens local identities and fosters pride (I22, I17), and participation in the indigenous network can help indigenous groups rediscover their identity as food producers (I18). Involvement in the indigenous network can also strengthen communities and engage youth, thereby preserving traditional knowledge (I15) and fostering new leadership (I22). Finally, some interviewees noted that SF adopts an asset-based approach focused on potential and opportunity (as opposed to a problem-based approach) in engaging indigenous communities (I23), and encourages communities to leverage their own resources (I22). Valorizing indigenous knowledge (I22; I18) was also emphasized by our interviewees.

Indigenous Rights and Self-determination

SF builds solidarity with indigenous communities by allowing them to define the terms of their participation. They thereby shape the movement in ways that centre indigenous struggles for autonomy and self-determination. This, as noted below, allows the SF movement to be more influential by offering alternative ways and venues for addressing politically sensitive and contentious issues. Such autonomous spaces align with the framework for establishing active solidarity.

One way in which SF furthers the self-determination of indigenous peoples – a key principle of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (I22) – is by allowing local groups to self-organize and lead SF work, without prescribing a specific model for carrying out this work (I23). One interviewee noted that SF has a respectful attitude towards indigenous communities and is eager to learn from them (I23). Moreover, two different development partners form very different organizations made similar points about the contribution of SF to upholding indigenous rights and the right to self-determination. One explained that SF provides a different "entry point" (I24) or a "different space" (I24) and a venue less fraught with conflict (I24) to address critical and politically charged issues that indigenous communities face, such as land rights or the right to self-determination (I24). The focus on food and biodiversity provides another way

to address the politically contentious issues surrounding indigenous rights (e.g., land rights). The other one noted that SF represents an approach to building solidarity by asking local groups to self-organize, and that this local work is "tied to larger struggles for sovereignty" (I25). This is an example of how active solidarity can broaden participation and create opportunities for political influence in ways that are consistent with active solidarity.

Conclusion

Our initial research questions revolved around how a diverse movement can build meaningful solidarity and be truly inclusive. In applying the active solidarity framework to the SF movement, we find examples that illustrate the intentional effort of SF to build active solidarity. These efforts include official statements, such as the Declaration of Chengdu, that celebrate diversity in membership and leadership (Slow Food, 2018). Organizationally diversity goes beyond representation, by incorporating mechanisms for inclusion through the creation of autonomous spaces for marginalized groups, such as ITM, and through the removal of barriers to participation in the movement and its leadership. We consider these efforts to be important steps even as we acknowledge that building solidarity is a long process (I13) and can be "complicated" (a word used several times by one of our interviewees, I2).

We also considered the nature of SF as a movement. As it expanded globally, SF had to explicitly address a variety of issues pertaining to food and agriculture policy, the right to food, and global justice. Our respondents emphasized the movement's origins as a "wine and dine club" (I1, I4, I8). One Councillor commented that SF had been "an elitist movement that was exclusive and it was handled by a bunch of chefs from [the city]." Now, he explained, "…we helped open the movement to anyone, to indigenous communities, to young people, to women" (I1). The categorization of SF as a lifestyle movement may have been more accurate in the past. The contemporary SF network has evolved to become a social movement with a more explicit political agenda.

This evolution is quite relevant to the issue of solidarity. Our respondents saw it as a requirement for (and consequence of) the expansion of the movement to include areas outside of Europe or the West more generally (I4). While there may always have been political aspects to SF, it had to engage directly with issues such as climate change, GMOs, and land grabbing to expand and build solidarity worldwide (I4, I7; also, I12). This finding is also relevant for the study of social movements, including the question of how a social movement evolves and changes over time.

More specifically, some of the previous research that developed the concept of active solidarity has focused on more recent movements (e.g., the 2017 Women's March) or protest waves that for a variety of reasons were relatively short in duration (e.g the Gezi Park protests). This article focuses on a case that can be studied over time using the concept of active solidarity. The case study in turn deepens our understanding of the concept by elucidating how it may unfold in practice over time. By analysing a movement over a long period, we can also contribute to the active solidarity literature with some perspectives on how a social movement's intentional efforts to foster active solidarity impact its trajectory and evolution.

Additionally, not all of the examples and cases discussed in the active solidarity literature that we cite are transnational social movements, and those that are considered are discussed briefly as one of several examples in each source. Our study provides a more in-depth discussion of one transnational social movement, allowing us to more deeply and comprehensively examine issues of active solidarity in transnational contexts. This can contribute to the development of the concept of active solidarity.

While this article has focused on the global SF movement, future research could deepen our insights into processes of building active solidarity, by focusing on SF's work in specific countries. It could investigate the ways in which these efforts are tailored and respond directly to the challenge of fostering equity, justice, and

inclusion in specific contexts that are characterized by more idiosyncratic forms of injustice. Additionally, future research that included surveys on SF participants' understanding of solidarity would provide important additional perspectives that are not represented in this article, which is based on interviews with SF leaders and partners. Finally, comparative studies of other highly diverse transnational social movements or advocacy networks, that focused on issues not connected to the food system, could further advance research on active solidarity, the ways it can intentionally be prioritized, and its implications for networked activism. Examples of such networks include Girls Not Brides, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the International Action Network on Small Arms.

Appendix

Note 1: In the article interviews are referred to by the letter "I" and a number (e.g., I1, I2, I3) corresponding to the list of interviews below.
Note 2: The International Councillors we interviewed were not all members of the International Council (IC) when we interviewed them and may not currently be members of the IC.

Interview 1 (I1): In-person interview with International Councillor, 18 September 2018
Interview 2 (I2): In-person interview with International Councillor, 19 September 2018
Interview 3 (I3): In-person interview with International Councillor, 19 September 2018
Interview 4 (I4): In-person interview with International Councillor, 21 September 2018
Interview 5 (I5): In-person interview with International Councillor, 21 September 2018
Interview 6 (I6): In-person interview with International Councillor, 21 September 2018
Interview 7 (I7): In-person interview with International Councillor, 21 September 2018
Interview 8 (I8): In-person interview with International Councillor, 22 September 2018
Interview 9 (I9): In-person interview with Slow Food leader from Africa, 23 September 2018
Interview 10 (I10): Zoom interview with Slow Food International staff member, 20 April 2021
Interview 11 (I11): Zoom interview with International Councillor, 10 May 2021 (follow up with I1)
Interview 12 (I12): Zoom interview with Slow Food International staff member, 11 May 2021
Interview 13 (I13): Zoom interview with International Councillor, 11 May 2021 (follow up with I3)
Interview 14 (I14): Zoom interview with International Councillor, 13 May 2021 (follow up with I6)
Interview 15 (I15): Zoom interview with IFAD staff member, 21 May 2021
Interview 16 (I16): Zoom interview with IFAD staff member, 8 June 2021
Interview 17 (I17): Zoom interview with Indigenous Terra Madre Advisory Board Member, 14 July 2021
Interview 18 (I18): Zoom interview with indigenous Presidium partner, 8 September 2021
Interview 19 (I19): Zoom interview with indigenous Presidium partner, 10 September 2021
Interview 20 (I20): Zoom interview with Slow Food leader from Africa, 17 September 2021
Interview 21 (I21): Zoom interview with Slow Food leader from Africa, 20 September 2021
Interview 22 (I22): Zoom interview with IFAD staff member, 21 September 2021
Interview 23 (I23): Zoom interview with IFAD staff member, 5 October 2021
Interview 24 (I24): Zoom interview with IFAD staff member, 11 October 2021
Interview 25 (I25): Zoom interview with Slow Food Turtle Island partner, 14 October 2021
Interview 26 (I26): Zoom interview with Slow Food International staff member, 18 November 2021
Interview 27 (I27): Zoom interview with Indigenous Terra Madre Advisory Board Member, 29 November 2021

References

Andrews G (2008) *The Slow Food Story: Politics and Pleasure*. London: Pluto Press.

Blackwell K (2018) Why people of color need spaces without white people. *The Arrow: A Journal of Wakeful Society, Culture and Politics*. 9 August. Available at: https://arrow-journal.org/why-people-of-color-need-spaces-without-white-people/ (accessed 19 August 2018).

Chrzan J (2004) Slow Food: what, why, and to where? *Food, Culture & Society* 7 (2): 117-132.

Della Porta D (2005) Making the polis: social forums and democracy in the global justice movement. *Mobilization* 10(1): 73-94.

Donati K (2005) The pleasure of diversity in Slow Food's ethics of taste. *Food, Culture, and Society* 8(2): 227-242.

Dunlap R (2012) Recreating culture: Slow Food as a leisure education movement. *World Leisure Journal* 54(1): 38-47.

Einwohner RL, Kaire J, Sinclair-Chapman V, Subramanian M, Tormos F, Weldon L, Wright J, Wu C, Weldon L (2016) *Active solidarity: strategies for transnational political cooperation in contexts of difference, domination and distrust.* Purdue University Working Group on Social Movements, Diversity and Inclusion. March. Available at: http://www.laurelweldon.com/uploads/1/4/1/9/14197205/solidarity_and_identity_spsa_march_29.pdf (accessed 15 December 2022).

Einwohner RL, Kelly-Thompson K, Sinclair-Chapman V, Tormos-Aponte F, Weldon SL, Wright JM, Wu C (2021) Active solidarity: intersectional solidarity in action. *Social Politics* 28(3) Fall 2021: 704–729.

Haenfler R, Johnson B, and Jones E (2012) Lifestyle movements: exploring the intersection of lifestyle and social movements. *Social Movement Studies* 11(1): 1–20.

Herring C and Henderson L (2011) From affirmative action to diversity: toward a critical diversity perspective. *Critical Sociology* 38(5): 629–643.

Juris, JS (2008) Spaces of intentionality: race, class, and horizontality at the United States Social Forum. *Mobilization* 13(4): 353-372.

Laudan R (2001) A plea for culinary modernism: why we should love new, fast, processed food. *Gastronomica: The Journal of Food and Culture* 1(1): 36–44.

Laudan R (2004) Slow Food: The French terroir strategy, and culinary modernism. *Food, Culture and Society* 7(2):133–149.

Milano S, Ponzio R and Sardo P (2018) *Slow Food Presidia: How to create a Presidium, build relationships with producers and organize activities*. Slow Food. Available at: https://www.fondazioneslowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/ING_libretto_presidi_b.pdf (accessed 18 May 2022).

Nicholls W (2009) Place, networks, space: theorising the geographies of social movements. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34 (1): 78-93.

Petrini C (2001) *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pietrykowski B (2004) You are what you eat: the social economy of the Slow Food movement. *Review of Social Economy* 62 (3): 307-321.

Rubin HJ and Rubin I (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rupp LJ and Taylor V (1999) Forging feminist identity in an international movement: a collective identity approach to twentieth-century feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 24 (2): 363-386.

Schwaderer I (2021) Slow Food: the becoming of a bourgeois utopia. *Food, Fatness, Fitness: Critical Perspectives* 1 October. Available at: http://foodfatnessfitness.com/2021/10/01/slow-food-the-becoming-of-a-bourgeois-utopia/ (accessed 15 March 2022).

Sinichalchi V (2013) Environment, regulation and the moral economy of food in the Slow Food movement. *Journal of Political Ecology* 20(1): 295-305.

Slow Food (2012) *Slow Food at UN Indigenous Meeting 2 June*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/slow-food-at-un-indigenous-meeting/ (accessed 19 January 2020).

Slow Food (2017a) *Declaration of Chengdu*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/00_Dich_Chengdu3.pdf (accessed 13 June 2022).

Slow Food (2017b) *Seventh Slow Food International Congress Chengdu, China, 29 September – 1 October 2017. Motion number 4: Indigenous peoples' knowledge, a key ally in facing global challenges*. Available at: https://

www.slowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/04-Indigenous-Peoples.pdf (accessed 13 June 2022).
Slow Food (2018) *Slow Food: Good, Clean and Fair Food for Everyone*. Press Kit 2018. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ING_Press-Kit-2018.pdf (accessed 19 April 2021).
Slow Food (2020a) *If Biodiversity Lives, the Planet Lives*. Slow Food's Position Paper on Biodiversity. Available at: https://www.fondazioneslowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ENG_Biodiverisity_Paper_Long_Version.pdf (accessed 8 June 2022).
Slow Food (2020b) *An Urgent Call to Slow Down*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/EN_Calltoaction_doc_A4.pdf (accessed 8 June 2022).
Slow Food (2020c) *A Participatory Guarantee System for Indigenous-led Slow Food Presidia*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/a-participatory-guarantee-system-for-indigenous-led-slow-food-presidia/ (accessed 13 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.a) *About Us*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/about-us/ (accessed 17 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.b) *About Us: Our History*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/about-us/our-history/ (accessed 15 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.c) *About Us: Our Structure*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/about-us/our-structure/ (accessed 15 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.d) *About Us: Slow Food Terminology*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/about-us/slow-food-terminology/ (accessed 13 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.e) *Good, Clean, and Fair: The Slow Food Manifesto of Quality*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Manifesto_Quality_ENG.pdf (accessed 15 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.f) *Indigenous Terra Madre Network: About Us*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/our-network/indigenous/about-us/ (accessed 19 January 2020).
Slow Food (n.d.g) *Indigenous Terra Madre Network: Events*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/our-network/indigenous/indigenous-terra-madre-event/ (accessed 19 January 2020).
Slow Food (n.d.h) *Welcome to Our World: Companion*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/filemanager/AboutUs/Companion13ENG.pdf (accessed 17 June 2022).
Slow Food (n.d.i) *FAQs: The Communities and the New Model*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/our-network/slow-food-communities/faq/ (accessed 23 March 2021).
Slow Food (n.d.j) *IFAD & Slow Food: 2017-2020*. Available at: https://www.slowfood.com/our-network/indigenous/ifad-slow-food/ (accessed 19 January 2020).
Smith J and Glidden B (2012) Occupy Pittsburgh and the challenges of participatory democracy. *Social Movement Studies* 11 (3-4): 288-294.
Smith J (2013) Transnational Social Movements. In: Snow DA, Della Porta D, Klandermans B, and McAdam D (eds) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbespm454.
Smith J (2020) Making other worlds possible: the battle in seattle in world-historical context. *Socialism and Democracy* 34 (1): 114-137.
Terra Madre (n.d.) *Terra Madre: Who We Are*. Available at: https://www.terramadre.info/en/organization/who-we-are/ (accessed 14 June 2022).
Tormos F and Weldon SL (2016) *Inclusive deliberation, diversity and solidarity in transnational social movements*, April. Available at: http://www.laurelweldon.com/diversity-and-inclusion-in-social-movements-research-group.html (accessed 20 July 2018).
Weldon SL (2006) Inclusion, solidarity, and social movements: the global movement against gender violence. *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (1): 55-74.
Weldon, L, Kelly-Thompson K, Wright J, Goldwasser D, Mansingka A, Hussein A, Einwohner R, Sinclair-Chapman V, and Tormos F (2018) *Black Lives Matter and Say Her Name: how intersectional solidarity strengthens movements for social justice*. Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois. 5-8 April. Available at: http://www.laurelweldon.com/purdue-diversity-and-inclusion-in-social-movements-research-group.html (accessed 20 July 2018).
Wexler MN, Oberlander J and Shankar A (2017) The Slow Food movement: a 'big tent' ideology. *Journal of Ideology* 37 (1, Article 1).

Wright JM, Weldon SL, Wu CKS, Tormos F, Sinclair-Chapman V, Kelly-Thompson K, and Einwohner RL (2018) *Pathways to inclusion? social movement approaches to building solidarity in the context of diversity.* Diversity and Inclusion in Social Movements Research Collaborative Working Paper, 5 February. Available at: http://www.laurelweldon.com/purdue-diversity-and-inclusion-in-social-movements-research-group.html (accessed 20 July 2018).