

HOLISTIC APPROACH: THE PERSPECTIVE OF OUR PUBLIC FOOD SYSTEM AND FOOD AS COMMONS

“The commons are not concessions. They are resources that belong to the people as a matter of life necessity. Everybody has a right of an equal share of the commons and must be empowered by the law to claim equal and direct access to it” Ugo Mattei, 2012.

When we share a society, we live in a complex relationship and we are inevitably together for a common goal –our success –whether consciously or not. Be it material or immaterial, under a conventional arrangement or others: we share obligations, rights and values in an organised society to promote our wellbeing and conserve our limited resources which we share as commons. E.P. Thompson uses “moral economy” to depict the common life style of early working class of England who through “societal conventions handed over millennia by which it is never called into question that all human beings are to be provided with the conditions necessary for their lives to continue,” Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen. Every society and generation has this sacred and sacrosanct role to play –it either fulfils it or betrays it.

In 1990s, the Western-style Consumerism presented a ‘trouble time in the world’ and two decades after that, the upheavals were clear ranging from ecological crises such as climate change, resource shortage (from water to oil) and waste to financial and geopolitical uncertainties, including escalating religious and ideological divides (Yiannis Gabriel and Tim Lang, 2015). Our latest uncertainties from unconscious military and political disorders and the financial crisis of 2007-2008 all continue to hamper our harmonious survival and sustainability of our ecology. Yet, our social, economic and ideological consumption patterns are not doing any better and the coming of big consumer markets like China, India, plus other developing countries as producer and consumer hotspots, call more rooms for concern.

Our public food system is the anchor of our lives that brings together people from different works of lives and social arrangements and promotes a sustainable social fabric through the provision of food. Public food service is the first commons any society would sustain to promote food as a common. Food is a common and a basic subsistence for all. However, under the evolution of modernity, “commons as societal institutions”(Ostrom/Helfich 2011) have been merely interpreted and reinterpreted to refer to material objects rather than as a social fabric. In that brilliant line of Ostrom and Helfich; commons are the social relations beyond material faces. They are merely not the resources by themselves but the social relations that are created between humans concerning a resource that is open to many people and used for consumptive and productive means. Through this social base analysis influenced by Marxian social theory and contemporary social ontology –contrast with mainstream “resources-based analysis” (De Angelis, 2010) we are able to “conceptualised commons as social relations and roles over the use of shared resources – material or immaterial – that generate normativity through language and communication and create a specific set of shared norms of behaviour and a property regime of a different kind” Rafael Zanatta, 2015. In the face of the emerging global food-crisis in the realm of food, some argue that the corporate food system is broken (Baker, Campsie, & Rabinowicz, 2010; Scharf, Levkoe, & Saul, 2010), while others see it on the road to collapse (Fraser & Rimas) and others see it as corporate

political weapon propelled by market forces and control by the privileged few which produces numerous externalities. In the other side of the debate, others see state and private property as the carriers of the world view, that is to say, the state is no longer an “aggregate of individuals” (Capra 2016) but instead a market actor among many. With the correct understanding of the commons, we need more than anything else an opposition to the market system that presents food as a utility and a mere commodity to a phenomenological perception of food as a commons that binds us together. That is how social values become real and regenerative.

This paradigm which places social justice directly in the drills of the state requires that social justice rather than economic models of profit and efficiency, is stimulated to produce emancipation from this mainstream market of utility. The state must provide services that the market cannot, yet to the interests of the citizens (Adams Smith). If it follows that nature is a common and it belongs to all equally then why a fundamental product of nature such as food is projected as a mere utility or commodity and not a commons? Although, the deliberation that leads us to this point is the transformation of social justice that has been expelled from the core domain of the state and private law to the market system. Distributive and commutative justice has been abandoned at the outset of modern Western jurisprudence since in the 16th century. However, with Grotius in the 17th century concerns over justice were equated to the issues of contractual exchanges between individuals while distribution was considered as applying to the whole society and not just to its parts, and was assumed as a social fact. From that end and time, distributive justice was expelled from legal science (Ugo Mattei 2012). Meanwhile, we have seen another important change of paradigm in the 17th century with the so-called scientific revolution giving rise to positivism and the famous wisdom of modernity (Capra 2009) according this paradigm the world of “is” different from the world of the “ought to be”. Fact must be separated from values they mean. Economics as a dominant science developed in the 18th century shares such a vision (Blaug 1962). Consequently, distribution has not only become a political domain an “ought to be” but has developed to become a strong economic discourse where social values are nearly marginalized. Yet, with the correct concept of the commons, we can restore social justice where every member of the society will be guaranteed adequate and nutritive food in the public food service both as a right and a necessity.

Public food system in Europe is an important societal and organizational obligation and value that promotes equality, communing, and non-discrimination and therefore, a concrete interpretation of a commons. Using this paradigm to recognise the potential futures of the commons within our public food system is an important step to understanding public food services in schools, hospitals and prisons. The number of food producers, marketers, consumers and the process it takes for its budgeting down to its utility and social functions in the future generations, all go deliberately through a societal connecting process. Other food commentators called it as the food dots. The best interest of the children in schools, sick persons in hospitals, the elderly and prisoners under public custody are catered for and promoted, all to build a better social fabric that will prolong our civilization and protect the most vulnerable amongst us. Though, these values are not being given a primary focus, they

are indispensable for our uniformity and common progress. Recognizing the commons and protecting them is absolutely everyone's obligation and a necessity for the sustainability of our ecology. Food as a product of our ecology and a backbone of our living should be analysed as a commons to empower all.

Engels describes the privatization of the commons as the most fundamental economic pattern of European development and it is from this vision that dominant social sciences refuse to catch up with the idea following the zero-sum analysis of the market and the government. According to the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the overall goal of the globalized development policy lies in integrating as many areas relevant for daily existence as possible into the monetary and commodity-based economy (Veronika Bennhold-Thomsen). For this reason of commercialising every aspect valuable for our daily life, the EU public food system should take a step ahead to recognise its public food system as a commons through better policies (from production, distribution, consumption and dumping) and integration (by opening markets to small-scale farmers thereby financially supporting them and also by welcoming migrants as a labour force).

Subsistence is the sum total of everything that humans need to survive: food and drink, protection from cold and heat, caring and company. If subsistence needs are met, life can continue (Mies/Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1999). Given that subsistence is life beyond commercialization and means commonality to reproduce rather than to exploit for marketing sake, subsistence living holds vital fundamentals of our lives that should not be left to the market. Food for the mainstream is tragically understood first as a mere commodity and second as a political weapon used by big business.

Public food as a subsistence need, a social bond, and as an upkeep of our living comes first and depicts more than market politics. It is one of those subsistence basics neither political nor commercial forces should attempt to absolutely control. As brilliantly put by Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen: certain vital elements of subsistence, the ones that signify humanity, so to speak, cannot be commercialized. Accordingly, as the neoliberal market forces turn to redefine the role of the state, Europe is now facing a free-market model that cuts apart the commonality our public food system should exemplify. Brigitte Kratzwald in 2012 wrote that; by default, the provision of goods and services occurs according to the market criteria, or this responsibility is delegated entirely to private companies with the expectation that they would improve efficiency and customer responsiveness. This has been an unfulfilled promise, however. Indispensable goods and services like food, health, shelter and clothing have become more expensive, and often no longer available everywhere and their quality has diminished. What is learned from the tragedy of commercializing these basic substance needs of our society is that the state has a role not merely to act to the interest of the general public but also to reflect societal power relations (Michel Albert, 1993). Accordingly, when public food service is seen as a commons and promotes the societal values that are attached to food (beyond just its utility function), consequently, most of the food related problems we are facing today; global warming, obesity, diabetics, and cardiovascular diseases will be significantly reduced since much attention will be shown to it. Subsequently, our public food services have become more expensive, less socially responsive and producing less quality to

satisfy the nutritive needs of our bodies and minds all because food in most contexts is seen just as a mere commodity unrelated to its social functions. According to Millstone & Lang; food is no longer viewed first and foremost as a sustainer of life. Rather, to those who command our food supply, it has become instead a major source of corporate cash flow, economic leverage, a form of currency, a tool of international politics, an instrument of power –a weapon!

The 2016 Global Nutrition Report said 44% of countries were now experiencing “very serious levels” of both under-nutrition and obesity. It means one in every three people suffers from malnutrition in some form, according to the study of 129 countries. Professor Corinna Hawkes, who headed the research said a lot of attention must be paid to the food we eat and policies that make this tragedy possible. As spectators and actors of these externalities that comes fairly from the public food service, redefining our perspectives and policies to reduce this, has become inevitable. Rather than seeing food as a mere market commodity at the mercy of the few privileged market operators, we can advocate for public food service to promote social justice. This can be done by defining food as a human right and their service as a commons. This will hold to ransom all private and public hands that inattentively produce avoidable externalities.

Malnutrition is sweeping the world, fuelled by obesity as well as starvation, in almost equal proportions all over the world but in Europe this is becoming even more important and concerns over the public food service is on the increase. Given that this public service hold the lives of millions in the EU within an organised system (and in the name of the commons) and on a “fairly level ground”, it can promote social justice like any other commons through equitable distribution of fundamental nutritive diets, respect for human dignity and diversity that it stands for, more, it can also conserve our depleting ecology by making rational and sustainable choices. When the public food service is understood to be an instrument of social justice that will give to all what they deserve, as an interpretation of Aristotelian social justice, then we will begin to see public food service not just as a political obligation but most importantly a sacred and moral duty all commons pursue to administer. Allen (2008) uniting the social justice to food in the American food system claimed that the agrifood system is paused by injustice using empirical evidences on the high level of obesity, and hunger in low income populations and of farm workers. To a different level, this scenario is true of Europe as well. Using Allen’s interpretation of social justice, she gave three futures; (a) meeting basic human needs (b) freedom from exploitation and oppression and (c) access to opportunity and participation. Arguing that the criterion above is not achieved, as many people (women, children, poor farmers and ignorant consumers) are becoming victims of the food system, the challenge is to enhance a system where global commoners, including the poorest and most vulnerable are catered for (Ugo Mattei 2012). This is refers to as communing –sharing problems we bear even individually.

Soon after the declaration of adequate food as a fundamental human right by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948, other international organisations and human right instruments like the Food and Agricultural Organisation also introduced policy measures to see that everyone has the right to adequate standard of living. This policy

measure to guarantee food as a fundamental human right is captured in almost all EU countries' constitutions . Hence, food is accepted to be a sustiener of our living and that every soul should have it adequately, manifests that we all share it in common –paradoxically not many have the common sense that recognise our dependency on each other, our community and our environment for quality food sufficiency and sovereignty – thus food as a commons should be viewed very meticulously by all institutions. It is not a corporate property or an instrument of power politics on the society. Rather, public food service should replicate those vital values connected to food and view it as a commons.

The public food system as a social fabric should function as a pillar of local food systems' infrastructure that simultaneously builds communities and prosperity. Sadly, the modern EU economy that “sees” people as *Homo economicus*, which is defined in the *Duden Dictionary of foreign words* (2005) as “a person guided exclusively by economic considerations of expedience” while the second definitions sees *Homo ecomomicus* as the current-day man per se implies egoism, competitiveness, and a habit of reducing life to utility (Friederike Habermann, 2012). This is indeed the advantage of modern economic theories: “It assumes a realistic image of humanity and...does not claim that people become ‘better’ under different circumstances”(Kirchgasser 2010: 394). Theorists(especially feminists) of poststructuralism attempt to analyse “people’s deep integration with their social context and their constant construction of themselves, thereby changing that very context” and “for this reason our bodies and our emotions and our empathy can only be imagined together with everything that leaves its marks on us; we are nonetheless more than a blank page that is an entirely passive object, inscribed by societal discourse (Friederike Habermann, 2012). We are surely not individuals who think and feel autonomously, rather members of a society with all our being (Habermann 2008). After all, we are human beings in an organised society and within a social framework sharing almost everything directly or indirectly, whether tangible or intangible, successfully or otherwise, that solidify and represent us. Integrating all our fundamental characteristics like food, water, health, shelter and clothing that make us who we are, will strengthen our successes. We are not independent producers and consumers, we are significantly interdependent on each other. This social and human attributes of sharing, empathizing and supporting each other in all spheres of live is a manifestation of our biology. Canadian physician and author Gabor Maté argues that nobody can be separated from the surrounding he or she grew up in. This argument with all its empirical evidences that makes it truer, the predominant neoliberal model shows the direct opposite, it presents human beings as independent, competitive, and selfish individuals by nature who are unwilling to communicate to each other. This is the predominant argument many economists used to say commons induce laziness and inefficiency, while they bargain out their market models. Brigitte Kratzwald in 2012 wrote that; by default, the provision of goods and services occurs according to the market criteria, or this responsibility is delegated entirely to private companies with the expectation that they would improve efficiency and customer responsiveness. This has been an unfulfilled promise, however. The state must be aware of the moral limits of the market and its obligations which must be regulated each time it steps out of its boundaries. It will be “considered utopian and ultimately destructive attempt to build society on the basis of self-regulating markets” (Karl Polanyi, 1886-1964, The Great

Transformation). Basic necessities such as food should be given a prior consideration and must not be controlled or seriously influenced by the market. Such basic sustenance should be protected with the values of the commons and supported by the law.

SUSTAINING FOOD AND PUBLIC FOOD SYSTEM AS A COMMONS

Exchange, competition and authority have left their marks on us! Now, we need new experiments and experiences that will provide us with perceptions to build a better Europe and a better world. Since the 2007-2008 financial crisis, the world has taken a complete new turn living many without houses, proper clothing, medical care but most importantly without adequate and nutritive food – a direct evidence that commons are not a third alternative after private and state failure. Our financial system is so broken that almost everything is turned into a commodity including food. Mainstream market forces illustrate food towards only its utility function separating it completely from its social functions. Now, not only do we lack food sovereignty and self-sufficiency, sadly enough, we also suffer from many preventable foodborne problems and diseases. More than 60 years after the first affirmation of the right to food by the UDHR, 795 millions of lives all around the world continue to painfully suffer from hunger and malnutrition (FAO, 2015), meanwhile, this syndrome has been aggravated by the 2007-2008 financial crisis but many of these complications are a result of our reductionist approaches – “separating the object from the person resulting to commodification” (Rota 1991). In many sectors as in food, citizens are left either at the deceiving or receiving point. As noted by Gabriel and Lang; “the future of global consumption must remain the object of questioning on economic, cultural, environmental and moral grounds.” So follows our argument that food as a commons provides everyone a platform to critique and pay obligations. Because after all food is more than an object that defines our lives. “We are what we eat” said Feuerbach arguing that we can improve by improving our diets.

We would now have to see where we got it wrong and look up for better experiments that will lead us to a paradigm that will be democratic and sustainable while connecting all the food dots from consumption to wastage. Part of the learning process is going by the famous statement of Adam Smith that; the state must provide certain things that the market does not provide yet which are in public interest. However, what is true for our case is the contrary! The market provides us with food and in many cases not to our interest as “unimaginable consumers” (Gabriel and Lang 2015).

Today clearer than any time in history we have been provided with ample tragic evidences from the recent economic crises towards future speculations of more tragedies, and with the many fruitless global conferences on global warming, that modern liberalism and rationalism is to be seriously questioned. The choices we made to provide food on our tables is most times individualistic neither backed by informed conscience nor sustainable ecology. Connecting the food dots – from production to wastage needs an institutional evaluation that provides a regenerative and sustainable patterns. In the words of a sociologist and networker, Franz Nahrada; the idea of patterns is to understand reality as a set of patterns that assume an intrinsic design for connectedness between elements of a living reality. Following the same

argument that we do need sustainable and well-planned patterns, the architect Christopher Alexander detailed that there are a thousand ways of doing things wrong and only a few ways of doing things right. For doing things right he ask the question; what if we had a toolbox that would allow us to understand and combined solutions in a given field, such as architecture? Although, we are talking about a better food architecture, we still need tools to moderate our production, control our food markets and make a sustainable ecology. This is the idea of patterning a sustainable public food service that is healthy and regenerative. Of course we do need many significant tools such as: non-poisonous chemicals, environmental education, fresh and nutritive diets, empowerment of the citizenry, the list goes on, what is fundamental of all is better institutions that will allow this patterning.

Integrating food aggregation, storage, processing, distribution and production functions in a well-designed, energy efficient, iconographic structure that we referred here as food patterning, in other words, connecting the food dots. A growing number of local governments across the world are rebuilding their food systems through innovative public policy and understandings of the commons. Our food choices are made individually but the consequences of these choices are shared collectively and of course not proportionately. An understanding of a food system anchored on the commons will teach us that our food choices should be backed by societal values and moral responsibilities. This includes increasing attention for urban food systems and responding to the many needs to place food principal on the urban agenda. Public food systems are an increasingly important drivers for many other urban policies such as health and nutrition, education, occupation, tourism, transport, waste and water management, adaptation to climate change and social welfare. These are indispensable moral busters and connecting all this essential social amenities and letting them all function alongside will need an insightful patterning and this is among the many reasons why public food system seriously need the knowledge of the commons and adaptation of its practises for the wellbeing of all and the sustainability of our declining ecology for the generations yet born.

This paradigm shift in both planning and policy formulation is required in order to ensure access to food, foster inclusion and innovation, improve environmental management, enhance rural-urban linkages and provide policy guidance at both national and municipal level that will advocate for food as a commons by boosting social justice and will make the European Union better off –it will create an informed, healthier, and productive citizenry that are socially and ecologically responsive. “The reintroduction of multiparty system in Nepal in 1990 after the peaceful revolution against the autocratic Monarchical Panchayat regime provided a political space for communities to get organised and managed common pool resources including water and forest.” This has help engineered grassroots-based, self-governing institutions that have organised 16,000 community forest user groups (CFUGs), managing 1.2 million hectares of land (one fourth of Nepal’s forest areas) that benefited about 1.7 million households (Shrikrishna Upadhyay, Community Based Forest and Livelihood Management in Nepal, 2012). This is why all commons need a patterning system which cannot excludes the public food system. Building sustainable public food systems and policies whether in the urban or rural areas, national or continental levels need a fair level consultations between primary institutions and the citizenry to better know their needs, to know there understanding about their own environment and nutritional progressions.

This public food sustainability project should best capitalise on partnerships with existing organizations to create services, facilities and collaborative management structures oriented

on the commons and managed my commoners. This will not just promote and regulate healthier relationships and developments within the urban and rural settlements, it will also augment the access to fresh, and healthy food. In a novel work by Olivier De Schutter and Kaitlin Y. Cordes on the fight against hunger, they maintained that food is a right and must be supported by government intervention at both domestic and international level with appropriate policies that will diminish many odds associated to our global food cycle.

Achieving many of these collaborative models against big corporate food business that ignore their social responsibilities can be very simple. We can diminish their powers by developing a business prototypical deep-rooted in collective economics that brings prosperity and jobs to the indigenous thereby empowering ourselves. Another way out from the exploitation of the market could be in investing in the local communities, creating a labour force that cultivates local foods and develop local food schemes. All these will build a sustainable ecology that is capable of catering us a system of food sovereignty and self-sufficiency free from the complicated food system fully control by the privileged few in the global market.

CONNECTING THE FOOD DOTS?

The production of healthy adequate and nutritive food in Europe is attracting popularity not only as a mechanism to social justice, but most importantly as a necessity to empower the citizens. One of the fundamental role of any society is to regenerate its ecology to the generations yet unborn but in a manner that prevents future problems. The manner in which governments treat their own people have become an international concern and questions that matter are always ask even if they come most of the times with inappropriate responses or sometimes when intervention could do less danger. The question we are to ask most of the time is not superficial, reasonably enough, it is more related than most questions we often ask about our political projects that institutionalised the self-regulating market system since the nineteenth century. If the government should play any role in our modern market system, which role should they prioritize? In our present modern global economy run by the few but supported by all, where “intensification, extension of alienation, exploitation and commodification of human life and nature”(Stephen Gill, 2000) has become a normality, what we face is an inescapable reconstruction between the very old and the present to construct a new perspective that render a moral society. Building a society that echoes the commons or a government or other authorities like the market that will reinforce the spirit of communing, is a fundamental value that must be restored. Guaranteeing full access and control to some fundamental elements of our subsistence like food, water, healthcare and land are values that the present market system cannot offer or at least do not want to offer. Such social responsibilities are either too big for the modern market operators thus rendering it either inefficient or are more altruistic and morally oriented hence making it non-liberal. So whose role is it to render these basic needs every society needs?

The moral philosopher Adam Smith argued that; reciprocity, benevolence and friendship are the most natural attributes humanity most achieved. Arguing that the market is a place where people meet to exchange goods and services that maintain their own dignities. While concentrating on food as a basic need that is almost entirely controlled and influenced by the few privileged big businesses, we are by default refuting it as a common. Food in this regard as a basic subsistence should be recognised by authorities and enforced by law to ensure its values. Food must not be projected as a simple market commodity or utility. This is deductive and unfair. Smith contrasted with Hobbs, emphasized that people can earn happiness if they are willing to think less of themselves and more about others. Recognising humanity, he

continues –is oriented on some fundamental characteristics of which sympathy is basic. According to his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 1759, Smiths opposed *homo economicus* and presented man as altruistic and willing to earn happiness from giving and sharing. To maintain our true human nature, Smith argues, we must respect our human virtues and wellbeing. For these to be achieved he said, the market must be altruistic. However, the predominant market theories of today controlled the commons, privatized and commercialized them, hence, our modern market system is not a representation of our true nature. Basic subsistence such as food, should be defended as a human right and as a common against commercialisation free and fair access to its production, distribution and consumption. In such a way, every one of us is protected and when people are protected from market exploitation as the “most dominant institution of our modern society” (Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776) especially in the provision of basic needs like food and others, our civil rights are guaranteed. Markets must be regulated for the common good since they are the most central and powerful of our modern institutions, they create new cultures and values while destroying old ones and it will be “considered utopian and ultimately destructive attempt to build society on the basis of self-regulating markets” (Karl Polanyi, 1886-1964, *The Great Transformation*).

The concept of food as a common is gaining world power and provides tangible solutions to a bundle of problem connected to our food system. As our cities expand, the provision of healthy, nutritious food is becoming more problematic. Institutions are busy constructing better food designs that will appropriately respond to the nutritive needs of these people. As can be transparently noticed almost everywhere, but most especially in the designs of sustainable, transparent and open food supply chains, is soon confronted with major obstacles related to and stemming from the lack of infrastructure to the lack of enhanced food polices.

For connecting cities with rural areas, one must answer the question of how can local growers, farmers and artisans aggregate, process, market and share their goods? How can they get what they grow and produce from their fields and home kitchens to the consumer’s dining table and local institutions? The proposed Kitchen Food Hubs are the missing link in the local food chain. The Kitchen Food Hubs are central locations where goods and produce can be aggregated, processed and shared with consumers and institutions. They become key components to the success of the urban food system, by reaching out to the community and educating people about the benefits of real, good food. The Kitchen Food Hubs are not just part of the food supply chain, but also part of local “values network.” So while providing infrastructure to local farmers and business people is a vital part of what the Kitchen Food Hubs do, an equally important role is to engage people who feel isolated or lack skills in nutrition and cooking. Through this very mechanism, food will become a common and a link for integration. For now, facilitating a wide ranging combination of life and employment skills, personal support, healthy eating, and togetherness is what turns a commercial kitchen into a hub for socialising the pleasure of food and eating.

PATTERNING: CREATING ACCESS THROUGH THE KITCHEN FOOD HUBS

The Kitchen Food Hubs paradigm will be composed by different elements and sub systems as an all-inclusive process –the commons. This will be a productive system where the Kitchen Production will transform raw ingredients into meals. The Kitchen Food Hub intends to

revalue the meals provided to urban communities by public and private kitchens, which are traditionally produced and delivered by catering companies.

A full scale commercial kitchen will process and cook food for wholesale to public and private clients as well as to individual customers through the Canteen. The Kitchen Food Hub will play a key role in a paradigm shift: from the commodification of food and daily life of children and adult citizens, to the broader concept of “common good” that serves the urban and agricultural community. This kitchen will accommodate facilities to transform raw ingredients into food, including meat and vegetable processing areas. Therefore it will be able to enhance local products without the need for intermediate steps and pre-processed operations and ingredients.

An Aggregation, Processing and Distribution Centre which serves as the terminal destination along the various supply chains that lead to the Kitchen Food Hub from farms and packing houses in the surrounding community. Arriving produce may be aggregated, washed, sorted and graded here, if this service was not already provided by a packing house prior to arrival. Once food is ready for wholesale distribution, it is stored in cold and dry storage units before being loaded onto refrigerated trucks for delivery to various clients such as institutions, schools and restaurants. The premises will include cold and dry storage, packing facilities, processing facilities sufficient for sorting, washing and grading (and may include state of the art flash freezer), loading docks. Storage should also include bulk purchasing, storage and collection (postconsumer of compostable utensils, plates, cups, etc. for use at festivals and other community events).

Also, a Kitchen Incubator , provides start up food processing entrepreneurs with commissary kitchen space that meets health and safety regulations. Food entrepreneurs will have wholesale accounts with the Aggregation, Processing and Distribution Centre to directly source produce, meat, eggs, honey, dairy and other local farm products. This space also functions as an additional teaching/event kitchen to support taste and nutrition education, product promotion and destination itineraries related to cooking classes, demonstrations and community or private events.

A Canteen (60/100 pax), provides citizens an educational canteen experience where menu and products are transparent and seasonal. All from fresh and raw ingredients. Offering a balanced meal option for any needings. The Canteen is a space that involve citizenship and promote the importance of food towards wellness into daily life. A specific focus is to organized with schools to involve children into understanding how the food system works and how they can live with a balanced diet.

Furthermore, an Urban Garden and Recycling System for waste management and valorisation (biogas/compost), a Farmers Market or Shop will add a lot of value to this project and create a formidable ground for the commons. There can be an IT System 3.0 that will be supported by various services that follow a plan “from seed to stomach” in order to: connect small scale producers with the Production Kitchen and provides access for voucher owners (public workers) to small restaurants. This approach will optimise the logistic and transport process and in disseminating information on the seasonality and nutritional value of menus in offer, as well as the availability of products in the farmers market. On this track, we do not only regenerate food as a common, we also create a welfare state. To Aristotle, man was a *zoon politikon*, a social being by nature who is destined to organised a society and to act within it.

To Smith, political decisions have assigned many roles to the state such as; the provision of education, energy, water, public transportation, housing, public media and health care to create a welfare state. He said the state's role was to provide things that the market cannot provide yet to the benefit of the citizenry and that a state must take its responsibility to provide all these basic necessities to all. Nevertheless, almost all EU countries struggle to make those visions a reality as privatisation appears stronger and governments are allocating some of its basic responsibilities into private hands, food as a basic need and as a commons should be defended by the state from commercialisation. Even if all the other basic needs are to be fully provided and maintained by the state, when food is not recognised and seen as a subsistence outside market politics, a fundamental human right is ignored. With the same tune for social justice, we call for the organisation of a productive welfare state where the provision of sufficient nutritive food takes the pattern of a feasible communing. Where everyone participate in decision making to create food self-sufficiency and sovereignty as part of the MDGs hunger targets. Because food as a right drives directly from being a human.

In their 2015 report, Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) has shown that hunger has dropped to 795 million with figures for Europe and Central Asia declining to less than 6 million. However, food is not at the limits of every EU citizenry and for the global hunger statistics still more shocking with 1 from every 9 person living in hunger. This terrifying figures are becoming prevalent in Europe calling a common framework to approach our food system and better our diminishing ecology for a sustainable and productive society. Through a common network and the perspective of food as a commons, we can create a sustainable society and a "Zero Hunger generation FAO Director, Josè Graziano.

To achieve a sustainable welfare state that will regenerate the commons and empower EU countries with the slogan of social justice, we need more than any time in history a *Common Logistics System* that optimises the operations on the urban food system supported by the *Kitchen Food Hub* in a sufficient and energy efficient manner which is now a heated debate. This system encompasses key components such as;

1. Mapping of food producers. This will fundamentally include farmers, fishermen, artisanal food processors at regional level and establishing a kind of food self-sufficiency ratio for these services.
2. Assessing the appropriate dimension of the kitchen and related facilities (*i.e.* logistics platform) in terms of meals per day/shift; lunch or dinners service (*i.e.* 5000 shift?), etc.
3. Assessing the *Kitchen Food Hub* scheme for restaurant.
4. Harboursing a fleet of fully dedicated or leased refrigerated vans.

We claim that the commons are visible and they matter for a consistent interpretation of our food chain. We believe that the notion of the commons can afford exactly the necessary tools, both legally and politically, to conform and address our transformations into a sustainable society. If properly theorised and politically perceived, the Commons can serve the crucial function of reintroducing social justice into the core of the legal and economic discourse by empowering the people to direct action(Ugo Mattei).