

- 1) The paper talks about the rhizomatic and autonomous character of the movement, focusing on its relative autonomy from clearly identifiable leaders who usually steer movements in a vertical manner. This acknowledged, the paper does talk about how the opposition party leaders raised and debated several demands germane to this movement on the floor of the State Legislative Assembly. The amorphous and de-centered nature of the movement, thus, simultaneously had at least the seeds of some integrationist counter-currents.
- 2) Also, this movement, and several such mass mobilizational movements, cannot be understood simply as anarchic, indisciplined, uncontained 'mob' behavior. Rather, it was 'disciplined' in the sense that it was guided by clear objectives and informed by a notion of legitimacy. Surely, there were some instances in which the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate practices got blurred and as a result there were setbacks. But speaking generally, and drawing on the idea of the moral economy of popular action developed by E.P. Thompson, it may be argued that there are moral assumptions, and not just actual deprivation (in this case the non-availability of food grains and their rising prices), that ideally shape and somewhat contain the relatively autonomous impulses of such movements.
- 3) A general point was made about the forms of mass political action, suggesting that in practice often there is a co-mingling of the mainstream and the movement.
- 4) Revisiting the idea and practice of this movement is particularly important since the food movement is not over. Globally and in the country, the campaign for right to food is vibrant, so is the initiative to recognize it as a socio-economic right. Also, the debate has evolved to focus not just on 'food security' but on 'food sovereignty', insisting on people's right to access not only food but also the 'decision space' where land ownership issues and production processes are politically debated, settled, and unsettled. Extending this argument further, it may therefore be argued that the question of food has got tightly entangled with the land question. In this connection, it is essential to engage with the important observation made by Professor Ranabir Samaddar regarding the essentially urban character of the food movement under review. Using a comparative perspective, it is possible to explore to what extent contemporary campaigns for food rights extend beyond the urban confines and get aligned with people's 'land wars'.